

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Vivia Sandulescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Viorica Ghiban

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Best Regards

Cu stimă, Victor Sima

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Teodor Gheorghiu, Arad, Romania

Cu stimă, Teodor Gheorghiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Sincerely,

Udrea Stefan-Sebastian

Cu stimă, Stefan-Sebastian Udrea

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Stefan Lupu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Respectfully yours,  
Cu stimă, sorin paulian tiron

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Simonq Truțiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Silvia Radu

Dear readers,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you in advance! Sergiu Oprea

Bucharest, Romania

The efforts of Apele Romane to destroy precisely the "Apele Române" (Romanian Waters / Romanian Rivers) are simply insane. But quite relentless. They made their business as a thorough enemy of healthy rivers and aquatic life.

Therefore, the only way to keep the situation under a modicum of control is to include a very precise set of mandatory measures in the Danube Basin Management Plan.

Nature - and eventually people - needs a binding instrument that will mitigate the active destruction of the - barely alive - rivers that feed the Danube (especially the Jiu Basin)

Thank you very much,

Serban Alexandrescu

Cu stimă,

serban alexandrescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you very much!

Dan Vasile / ROMANIA

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Cu stimă, rozica bursumac

Dear Sirs/Ladies,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Romul Merlas

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, RODICA-LIVIA SASU

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Rodica Ciovica Cu stimă, Rodica Ciovica

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following:

In figure 2 the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin is depicted. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan it is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Robert Negut

Dear Sir / Madame,

My name is Razvan Pauta and I live in Romania, Bihor County, Mehedinți street no. 33. I am very concerned about the status of the rivers in our country and for that I would like to submit to your attention that ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a very localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Cu stimă, Razvan Pauta

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Razvan Horatiu Corduneanu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP..

Cu stimă, Rares Maier

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Ramona Neamtu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Raluca C.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Radu-Paul Apetrei

Hello,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Best regards, Radu Jilecovici

Hello,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Best regards, Radu Florea

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Kind regards  
Pia Prade

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Paula Bulea

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
paul iacobas

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Nicoleta Sava and I would like to send you the following observations.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Nicoleta Sava

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Mutu Alina Corina

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Mona Pop

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Mihail Radu Severineanu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Mihail Balas

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Mihai Valentin

From Rachitan Mihai,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Thank you, Rachitan Mihai

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you for yours attention! Mihaela Gondor

Cu stimă, Mihaela Gondor

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Dear Sir / Madam,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Simcerely, Matei Muntiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Best Regards, Lungu Emil Marius

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Marinela PASCARU

Cu stimă, Marinela Pascaru

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following. In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests. As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters". So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP). The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum. The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Mariana Murgoci

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Mariana Fiastru

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Mariana B

Hello

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Thank you, Cu stimă,

Marian Pintilie

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Marian Danscăi

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
maria-ana astalas

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Maria Butan

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interests which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters" and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania by new river regulation works in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden;
- river re-profiling works are forbidden;
- building of new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last, but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed White River from Dambovita county (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

With consideration,  
Magdalena Mande

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Kind regards,  
Lucian Gavril

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Kind regards!

Cu stimă,

Lucian Alexandru Poanta

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you for hearing us out.

Cu stimă,

Lorena Olaru

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Respectfully,  
Liana Damian

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so it just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), barely saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Levente Andras

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1).

Cu stimă,

Lenuta Călin

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Laura Tosa

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Laricea Roman

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Am fost în multe excursii în zona Jiurilor, la Dunare, în Delta Dunării. Respect natura, iubesc plaiurile unde m-am născut și doresc pastrarea acestor minuni ale naturii și pentru generațiile viitoare !!! Multumesc anticipat. Cu stimă,

Klara Morariu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

K.Vlaic

Cu stimă,

Karin Vlaic

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Iuliana Armas

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

IULIAN MINDRUTA

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Iulia Ganciu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Iulia Anamaria Tothăzan

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Isabela Guzei

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

IONEL DRAGOS STEFAN

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

With consideration,

Ionel Cojocariu.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Ion Simaciu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Ion Geagă

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thanks,  
Daniel Dinca

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

ion boamfa

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Inocentiu Ionita

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

ILIE BALUT

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Best regards,  
Ileana Veizu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Iana Antohe

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Horia Mocanu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Gina Soare

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

George Popescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP..

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Francisc Czobor

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Florin Patapie – Raicu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Florin Marc

Dear ladies and gentlemen,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Best regards,

Florin Ciucă

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following. Stakeholder consultations are very important from my point of view and I wholeheartedly endorse the points below:

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan it is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new human-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Filip Alexandrescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Eugen Pluti

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Eliza Fati

I am born in Bechet, Romania, on the Danube. As a young girl I used to go on the beach in The summer, 50 years ago. Then the water was clear and clean, what I'm hardly missing now.

The rivers here are now devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a very localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you in advance for your understanding!

Elena Kraemer-Stamin

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Edward Popescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Dragos Tarcau

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Sincerely,

Doru Subtirica

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Tudor Dorina

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Dorin Zavoiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Throughout our history, of mankind, we have built our settlements and life around water. That hasn't changed yet. Where there is water is life, where life disappears, disappears. There can be no argument for destroying a stream, none. Delia Breaz

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Darius Rotaru

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

DANIIL CATALIN PARASCHIV

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Daniel Popa - Constanta, ROMANIA

Cu stimă,

Daniel Popa

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Daniel Petre

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Daniel Huhu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Daniel Groza

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Dana Patriche

Good day Misters/Misses/Miss,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Regards, Dan Zanfir.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

DAN RUSU

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Dan Roman

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Dan Craioveanu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Csaba Jambor

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristina Zarioiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristina Neagu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

CRISTINA GARLEA

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristiana Cioflec

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following:

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristiana Banita

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristian Kocza

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristian Ionitoiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristian Din

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Cristian Dicu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Kind regards,  
Cristian Balan

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

cristian badescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Respectfully,

Cu stimă,

Cornelia Feraru

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Claudiu Cr

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

CLAUDIA RADU

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Catalin Carcu

Cu stimă,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Carmen Tica

Dear members of ICPDR,

Please, consider the following observations for the improvement of the management plan for the Danube River Basin.

In order to have a management plan that protects the region, the commission needs to consider the conflict of interests that might exist for some of the national agencies responsible for the application of this plan. This is the case for the Romanian Waters National Administration. This agency is financed from activities that deteriorate the chemical and ecological status of bodies of water, so it is clearly in a conflict of interests as mentioned also in the European Parliament resolution from 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R.

To overcome this problem, we propose to

1. Include strict measures for the protection of rivers in the Danube River Basin, prohibiting any works or activities that would affect the natural status of a river. Tens of water bodies have been destroyed in Romania by river regulation works performed by Romanian Waters Administration in the last years in spite of the two previous DRBMPs. In the current conditions, the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is useless.

On page 55 in the draft plan it is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRBD must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures that need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided they have a very low, localized impact and are performed to save human lives. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

2. Consider data from reliable sources .The Danube River Basin management plan is based on some false data from the above mentioned institution and from its satellite companies. As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persist, the non-deterioration principle is not applied. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories counted for Romania in this plan are underestimated. For example, the number of significant water abstractions reported for Romania (in figure 26) is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, and it only collects data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative, independent organizations, must be considered as data sources as well. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Moreover, good examples of rivers well preserved in their native state should be included as standards in DRBMP. For example, the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), saved from a hydropower project and from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Sincerely,

Carmen Tanase, Romania

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Carmen Radu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Carmen Otilia Spinu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Carmen Constantin

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

Carmen Bharucha

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Carmen Babiceanu

Bucharest/Romania

Cu stimă, Carmen Babiceanu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Calin Dejeu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Bogdan-Sorin Chelu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Bogdan Șerban Iancu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Yours sincerely Balc Nicolae

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
aurelian Miron

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,

AURELIA MIHALACHE

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Aurel Mironescu

Dear Madam/Sir

My name is Lukács Árpád I am living in Romania, Făgăraș, Brașov

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Best regards, Lukács Árpád

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Arpad Csiki

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you, Cu stimă, Antonia-Ferihan CIOLAC

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, ANTONELA LAZIN

Hello!

My name is Antoanett Medregan from Romania.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Cu stimă, Antoanett Medregan

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă, Anitta Ghișă

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Angela Muraru

Hello,

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Thank you,

Andrei Tescan

Dear Sir / Madame,

My name is Revesz Andrea (str. Lapusului nr. 44, bl. An 221, ap. 16, Oradea, jud. Bihor, Romania) and I am writing to ICPDR, that states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Sincerely,

Revesz Andrea

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Anda Zevedei

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Regards,  
Anca Gogonea

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
ANCA IRIMIA

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP..

Cu stimă,  
Anca Gabriela Zaharia-Zamora

Good day!

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following. In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

With respect and hope that you will take the above-mentioned arguments into consideration,  
Anamaria Strezoiu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Ana-Isabelle Iliovici

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Ana Maria Neagu

Hi,

My name is Ana Adam-Teodorescu and I am from Bucharest - Romania.

I kindly ask you to take some minutes read to this important email because ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following:

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless.

Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed.

Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1).

The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures".

So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document.

As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.

- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable.

Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth.

In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry.

For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant.

We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture.

Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

I am looking forward to your answer.

Thank you,  
Ana Adam-Teodorescu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Alina Molnar

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
alina iordache

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Cu stimă,  
Alin Eugen Berechet

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Alexandra Neacsu

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please

consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers.

Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Adriana Orban.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Thank you,

Adrian Nicoara – Romania

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Alin, Cu stimă, Alin-Ioan Sacota

Dear Madams and Sirs,

My name is Florian Alexandru Sarivan, a Romanian citizen, living in Bucharest, near of the Dambovita river shores and a beautiful chain of lakes . Our, me and my family, faith is to keep these waters clean, without any pollution, for good health of the peoples.

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following:

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied.

Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP. Faithfully Yours, Florian Alexandru Sarivan

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP..

Cu stimă,  
Ana Tocana

ICPDR states that "communicating with the public is the public communicating with us", so please consider the following.

In figure 2 is depicted the grim situation of the rivers in the Danube River Basin. Despite the grim picture, the situation is getting worse, instead of improving. A quite large share of the DRB is in Romania. The rivers here are devastated, and the cause of this devastation can be found in the European Parliament resolution of 17 December 2020 on the implementation of the EU water legislation, at letter R: the conflict of interests.

As long as these conflicts of interest which govern Romanian Waters National Administration persists, the non-deterioration principle is useless. Fake studies of impact assessment on the water bodies are always available in Romania, from the satellite companies of "Romanian Waters".

So the DRBMP needs to include strict measures, at least basic, common-sense restrictions, instead of descriptions and statistics. Strict measures cannot be bypassed. Otherwise, the plan is just a kind of fairy tale. The two previous DRBMPs failed to address the appetite for destruction of "Romanian Waters", and we cannot afford a third failure. Tens of water bodies were destroyed in Romania, by new river regulation works, in the last years. And the alterations are about to increase, due to the financing of grey infrastructure measures from EU funds (LIOP, SO 5.1). The most outrageous is the river regulation project meant to alter the course of the Western Jiu River (such wrong examples should also be mentioned in the DRBMP).

The draft plan states that: "Hydromorphological alterations in the DRBD are mainly caused by flood protection measures". So new morphological alterations must be reduced to the minimum.

The negative impact of the river regulation works is mentioned throughout the document. As written on page 94 of DRBMP, the EU Biodiversity strategy imposes restoration of 25.000 km of rivers. Before restoring, we must stop altering new river stretches by new river regulation projects, otherwise, the whole effort is non-sense.

On page 55 in the draft plan is stated:

"Considering described changes, it is even more important to prevent rivers from further deterioration due to new man-made physical modifications."

It follows from the above that clear prohibitive measures against new morphological alteration in DRB must be included in the DRBMP.

Examples of minimal measures which need to be introduced in the plan:

- Bank reinforcements outside the built-up area of the settlement are forbidden.
- River re-profiling works are forbidden.
- Building new weir sills is forbidden.

Exceptions can be included, provided that these have a levy localized impact and are very rarely applied. Massive morphological alterations must be clearly forbidden.

Last but not least, there are obvious fake data in the draft plan that must be corrected, otherwise they make the whole document seem unreliable. Most of the morphological alterations of different categories, counted in the plan, are underscored. As for significant water abstractions, the data in figure 26 is very far from the truth. In Romania, there are several hundreds of significant water abstractions caused by the hydropower industry. For instance, as you can find on page 155 in the book "Water Resources Management, Methods, Applications and Challenges", 81 watercourses are diverted for only one hydropower plant. We understand that ICPDR has no means to perform a real count, so just centralizes data from the water administrations of each country, which have no interest to describe the real picture. Alternative sources must be found. For instance, for significant water abstractions in the Balkan part of the DRB, you can contact Riverwatch.

Fortunate cases, like the one of the undisturbed Râul Alb River (valuable for reference conditions), hardly saved from a hydropower project and, so far, from an industrial fish farm project, should also be mentioned in the DRBMP.

Sincerely,  
Ioana Mocan