



Summary Report 6th Workshop on the Follow-up of the Joint Statement on Guiding Principles on the Development of Inland Navigation and Environmental Protection in the Danube River Basin

10-11 September 2015, Vienna (AT)

Version: FINAL
Date: 2015-10-19

Table of Contents

1. Welcome and introductory statements	1
1.1 International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River	1
1.2 Danube Commission	1
1.3 International Sava River Basin Commission	1
2. Inland waterways and the environment – Policy developments relevant for the Danube region	2
2.1 EU policies on inland navigation and financing opportunities – latest developments	2
2.2 EU environmental policies relevant for inland navigation – latest developments	2
2.3 Discussion	2
3. Overview current state of IWT projects in the Danube basin countries	3
3.1 Overview feedback on current state of IWT projects via project data sheets	3
3.2 Recent experiences of projects with the practical implementation of the Joint Statement	3
3.3 Conclusions Day 1	7
4. Future plans and perspectives for enhancing navigation and environmental protection	8
4.1 EUSDR related developments – Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan	8
4.2 Sustainable and efficient transport on the Danube – viewpoints from an industry association	8
4.3 Alignment of inland navigation with biodiversity conservation objectives – WWF reflections	9
4.4 Outlook for Danube navigation in the context of the Rhine-Danube Corridor	9
5. Inland Waterway Transport related projects and developments	10
5.1 Platina 2 and FAIRway Projects	10
5.2 Elaboration of a Sediment Management Project Proposal for the Danube River Basin	10
5.3 Guidance note on inland navigation and adaptation to climate change in the Sava Basin	11
6. Discussion on key lessons learned and future steps in support of the implementation of the Joint Statement	11
Annex 1 - Agenda	13
Annex 2 - List of participants	16

1. Welcome and introductory statements

1.1 International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River

The ICPDR Executive Secretary Mr. Ivan Zavadsky welcomed the participants on behalf of the ICPDR and opened the 6th Joint Statement Meeting. The agenda for the meeting can be obtained from Annex 1. Participants from the three River Commissions, the European Commission, Transport and Environmental Ministries, stakeholders and NGOs participated at the meeting. Further details on the participants can be obtained from the Annex 2.

Mr. Zavadsky highlighted that the meeting will allow to have an exchange on progress made in the practical implementation of the Joint Statement, occurring challenges and to draw lessons learned. The presentations on day one on the different projects will allow for stock tacking while the second day is dedicated to discuss the future of Inland Waterway Transport (IWT) and environmental protection in the Danube River Basin, taking into account opportunities stemming from the EUSDR. He highlighted the Joint Statement as the only platform of its kind in the basin, bringing together experts from the field of IWT and environmental protection, allowing for a civilised dialogue.

1.2 Danube Commission

Mr. Horst Schindler, Chief Engineer of the Danube Commission, welcomed the participants and expressed appreciation for the participation of experts from different fields. He informed that the President of the Danube Commission is supporting the Joint Statement Process and announced that the Danube Commission will organise the next Joint Statement Meeting in the upcoming year.

Mr. Schindler furthermore informed that the Danube Commission Secretariat signed an agreement with the European Commission (EC), DG MOVE, and applied for funding from the EC what will bring along opportunities but also challenges in case the application is successful.

1.3 International Sava River Basin Commission

The Executive Secretary of the International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC), Mr. Dejan Komatina, welcomed the participants on behalf of the ISRBC. He confirmed the commitment for applying the integrated planning approach and highlighted the synergies between the Joint Statement Process and the implementation of the Sava Agreement.

Mr. Komatina furthermore informed about the various activities which took place in the past period, including the further improvement of inland navigation safety and related technical issues, the development of Sava GIS and HIS, flood forecasting and warning, and the approval of the first Sava River Basin Management Plan. Furthermore, the water and climate change adaptation plan has been finalised recently, whereas different guidance notes have been elaborated, including inland navigation. Furthermore, the protocol on sediment management has been signed at a Ministerial Meeting in July which aims to contribute towards sustainable sediment management in the Sava basin, concerning also inland navigation. Finally, Mr. Komatina informed about the ongoing work on the Sava Water Council which is complementary to existing Observers and appreciated the good cooperation with the Danube Commission and ICPDR, what is important for the Joint Statement Process in order to make further progress.

2. Inland waterways and the environment – Policy developments relevant for the Danube region

2.1 EU policies on inland navigation and financing opportunities – latest developments

Mr. Cesare Bernabei (EC, DG MOVE) provided a presentation on the recent developments on EU policies on inland navigation and financing opportunities. The implementation measures of NAIADES II include infrastructure development, innovation, market development, environmental quality, skilled workforce and quality of jobs, integration of IWT into a multimodal chain and the quality of governance. Information on infrastructure development and the core network corridors was provided.

With regard to financing, Mr. Bernabei informed about the CEF-T calls as the largest ever EU investment in transport infrastructure for boosting jobs and growth, next to other financing opportunities from the ERTF, the Juncker Plan, EFSI and EIB. Further details can be obtained from the presentation, which is available together with the other presentations which were held at the meeting following the link:

http://www.icpdr.org/pls/danubis/danubis.wvw_main.main?p_siteid=1&p_cornerid=108140

2.2 EU environmental policies relevant for inland navigation – latest developments

Mr. Nicola Notaro (EC, DG Environment) provided a presentation on the latest developments regarding EU environmental policies relevant for inland navigation. He highlighted the key results from the 3rd and 4th Water Framework Directive (WFD) Implementation Reports and informed that public consultation on the 2nd WFD River Basin Management Plans were performed in the first half of 2015 in most cases. The Plans should be finalised in December 2015.

He informed that hydromorphological pressures affect a large proportion of Europe's waters. 88% of Heavily Modified Water Bodies (HMWBs) are used for navigation. EC recommendations include that the designation of HMWBs should be transparent and justified, the objective of Good Ecological Potential (GEP) should be a driver for ecological restoration with minimum impact on the use. Existing gaps should be addressed in the 2015 RBMPs. Finally, Mr. Notaro informed about the recent Court Ruling C-461/13, clarifying inter alia that WFD obligations are applicable to individual projects, that Member States should refuse authorisation of individual projects if it may cause deterioration of the status of the Water Body and no derogation according to Art. 4(7) applies. Deterioration is established by change of class of at least 1 quality element, even if that does not entail change of the overall status. More details can be obtained from the presentation.

2.3 Discussion

Mr. Zanetti from Witteveen+Bos asked for clarification regarding the WFD no-deterioration principle since it is difficult to implement infrastructure projects without deteriorating a quality element. He further asked whether it is possible to take compensatory mitigation measures also in another river as compensation for the effected river.

DG Environment clarified that deterioration of a quality element does not imply that the project cannot go ahead but that an exemption according to WFD Art. 4(7) is required. All practical mitigation measures are needed in the water body which is deteriorated. Taking compensatory measures in other places is a possibility envisaged by the Habitats Directive but not the WFD.

Mr. Nagl from the Danube Environmental Forum (DEF) appreciated the presentations and expressed concerns regarding HMWB designation in the lower Danube and Sava. He plead to make decisions based on facts and considered and exchange on this topic as useful.

Mr. Mitrovic (PLOVPUT) appreciated the presentations and honesty but expressed dissatisfaction that Serbia is not eligible to obtain CEF funding. Also since shortcomings for navigation in Serbia will affect transport in the whole Danube.

Mr. Bernabei expressed understanding and informed that until now Non EU Member States can only receive funding up to 10%. The regulation cannot be changed immediately. A revision can take 2 years whereas the overall situation and a complete assessment would be useful. However, other ways to provide support might be possible.

Ms. Moisi from the ECO Conselling Center Galati on behalf of DEF expressed concern about the way projects have been approved along pristine river water bodies, in particular small and medium size hydropower plants. Furthermore, Ms. Moisi informed that according to TEN policy recommendations transparency is need, however, Romania is under infringement due to shortcomings in WFD implementation.

3. Overview current state of IWT projects in the Danube basin countries

3.1 Overview feedback on current state of IWT projects via project data sheets

Mr. Mair (ICPDR Secretariat) provided an overview on the feedback provided on the current state of IWT projects via project data sheets. Updated project data sheets were provided by Austria (viadonau), Croatia (Agency for Inland Waterways) and Romania (AFDJ). Croatia further informed that a number of data sheets provided in 2014 are still valid. Other project data sheets from 2014 were as well provided in preparation of the meeting. Further detailed information can be obtained from the presentation. All available project data sheets are online available following the link: http://www.icpdr.org/pls/danubis/danubis.wvw_main.main?p_siteid=1&p_cornerid=107552

In summary, a number of (updated) project data sheets were provided and further information on the different projects will be provided at the meeting. However, relevant actors were asked to provide/update project data sheets also on the remaining projects following the meeting, helping to exchange information as an important source of information on approaches for the implementation of the Joint Statement Principles in different projects.

3.2 Recent experiences of projects with the practical implementation of the Joint Statement

3.2.1 Danube Project Straubing – Vilshofen

Mr. Schiller from the Directorate-General for Waterways and Shipping, Branch Office, Würzburg, provided a presentation on the development of the Danube waterway between Straubing and Vilshofen. Different steps were taken in the past, including inter alia a Variant-independent investigation from 2009 to 2012. In 2013 the decision for development according to Variant A (stream control) was taken. Details on the different planning steps and involvement of stakeholders can be obtained from the presentation.

Ms. Lucius from WWF expressed satisfaction that Variant A was chosen, constituting a compromise between the needs of inland navigation and environmental protection based on a discussion process which was long but worth the efforts. WWF asked for lessons learned in the frame of the process.

Mr. Schiller informed that politics had a big stake in the decision making process with involvement of authorities from Bavaria and also the German Federal level. A decision could in case have been made already earlier, however, further investigations were made. Lessons learned is that at one point a phase is reached where a decision has to be taken.

DEF expressed that a step forward was made in a positive direction. All involved actors have learned and concessions were made by all parties.

Mr. Schiller informed that compensatory measures in the frame of this project are only possible related to the impact of the project. What is going beyond has to be addressed in a separate project. Regarding Variant A, Mr. Schiller informed about the limitations of the soft measures. For further increasing the draught, other infrastructural measures would be needed.

DG MOVE informed about the long involvement in the discussion process and the view that the decision on Variant A was a political decision and not a technical decision, bringing along shortcomings for the improvement of inland navigation. The broader environmental perspective should have been considered, with inland navigation allowing for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. A public discussion on technical level and not a political debate would have been more useful for the decision making process.

Mr. Beyer from the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, expressed appreciation for the presentation provided by Mr. Schiller. It took a long time to come to a decision, however, the project is a showcase for the need of the Joint Statement Process. Since neither environmental NGOs nor navigation stakeholders are fully satisfied with the decision it might be a good compromise. In case the decision would have been different and more in favour of navigation, it would have been acceptable as well following the discussion and decision making process. Therefore, the process itself has an added value.

3.2.2 Measures on the Danube East of Vienna and results of an integrated planning approach

Mr. Marius Radinger from viadonau provided a presentation on the river engineering measures on the Danube East of Vienna and the results of the integrated planning approach. Riverbed degradation, a heavily regulated river in the National Park area and inadequate fairway depths are the key deficits addressed in the frame of the project. An integrative planning structure was set up and different measures were taken. Details can be obtained from the presentation.

Mr. Schindler expressed that he has seen the information provided in the presentation several times. The reconstruction of groynes simply does not work in his point of view, causing worse and additional problems, wondering when improvements for navigation can be achieved. The project was initially planned years ago as an infrastructure project and Mr. Schindler was wondering what is left for infrastructure.

WWF expressed satisfaction with the stakeholder forum which was set up, which could draw from the experiences gained in Germany at Straubing-Vilshofen. Following, the Serbian project could draw from the experiences gained in Austria. It is therefore a model which is spreading. WWF furthermore highlighted that the lessons learned on river bed erosion and sediment management could be shared with other project teams as well.

Mr. Radinger informed that the environmental measures were designed in combination with the infrastructure measures. Further adaptation of measures is taking place based on lessons learned.

Mr. Zinke from Zinke Environment Consulting raised the point that it might seem that progress is limited, however, many things have happened, i.e. in terms of research. It revealed that river morphology is much more complex and dynamic as previously thought. Working with the river is the approach viadonau is applying for the improvement of river ecology and navigation. Based on the experiences gained more measures are planned to be taken which will also help to improve navigability.

Mr. Muilerman from viadonau added that one main lessons learned is that the principle of learning from the river and the adaptive planning process was taken seriously. A blue print for the planning process is not applicable. Therefore it cannot be estimated from the beginning that by applying certain measures the level of service will be approved by an x-amount. What is possible is to work towards a certain objective. During the planning process all kinds of stakeholders were involved, including

businesses and NGOs, what should be continued. Maintenance works are progressing towards the establishment of a stable situation in an unstable environment.

Mr. Schindler expressed the view that a trial and error approach is pure luxury and only possible in case resources are not limited, what is not applicable in other countries.

Mr. Zinke informed that in his point of view the approach prevented significant malinvestments in the past in case previously discussed measures would have been implemented.

3.2.3 Improving navigation conditions on the Drava and Sava Rivers in Croatia

Ms. Hubalek (Agency for Inland Waterways) and Mr. Tadić (Hidroing d.o.o.) provided a presentation on the projects for improving navigation conditions on the Drava and Sava Rivers in Croatia. The participants were informed that for the projects which started before the adoption of the Joint Statement all main principals are taken into account from the beginning, but not entirely in the forms listed in the Joint Statement. In later phases additional adjustments in line with the Joint Statement were performed (Sava River project). For projects which started after the adoption of the Joint Statement, all main principles in the recommended forms have been taken into account from the beginning (Drava River project). Details on the participation of stakeholders and the different measures can be obtained from the presentation.

DG ENV informed about screening the project fiches and asked whether links are established in the Croatian River Basin Management Plan to the navigation projects. The Croatian representatives informed that the projects are very much in relation to the River Basin Management Plan and that Croatian Waters is the responsible body for elaborating the River Basin Management Plan. Representatives from the water authorities are participating in the discussions on the navigation projects.

Mr. Zinke asked for clarification whether such project discussion forums also exist for the Danube projects in Croatia. The Croatian representatives informed that the forum for the Drava project is the first one of its kind in Croatia.

DEF asked for clarification regarding the state of play of the planned Danube Sava Canal. The Croatian representatives informed that suggestions from JASPERS are currently waited for on how to proceed.

DG ENV reiterated that a list of projects should be included in the River Basin Management Plan, including information on the planned projects and general timelines. In case projects are more advanced than more information is expected to be included. In case water status is expected to be deteriorated than the WFD Article 4.7 procedure on exemptions needs to be applied. Following a quick check of the Croatian draft River Basin Management Plan no level of detail regarding the indicated navigation projects could be observed. DG ENV was therefore wondering whether a missing link exists and suggested, in the spirit of the Joint Statement, to get in touch with colleagues working on the River Basin Management Plan to address this issue. Croatian representatives thanked for the suggestion and informed that they are planning to have this kind of exchange with colleagues working on the River Basin Management Plan.

3.2.4 Overview IWT project status on the Sava

Mr. Milković from the ISRBC provided a presentation on the rehabilitation and development of navigation and transport on the Sava River. The identified needs for improvements (preliminary design) include training works and dredging at 19 locations, river bend improvements at 20 locations, bridges at 3 locations and measures on the River Information Services. Information on the project status of the sectors upstream and downstream of Brčko was provided, next to information on related activities of the ISRBC. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

DG MOVE asked for clarification what the figures on the estimated costs for the rehabilitation of the Sava for Category IV and Va are referring to. Mr. Milković informed that the figures are for the

rehabilitation of the Sava Waterway downstream of Sisak, which are mainly for the costs of the works.

Plovput informed that in Serbia in 2014 the transport volume exceeded one Million tons, including import, export and domestic transport. Mr. Milković informed that the figures indicated by him do not include the figures for traffic in the Belgrade region which can be regarded as the Danube traffic (very short distance navigating on Sava) in order to avoid showing a wrong picture.

3.2.5 Balance between planning and executing infrastructure measures and provision of dynamic fairway information services

Mr. Mitrovic from Plovput Serbia provided a presentation on the balance between integrated planning and executing infrastructure measures and provision of dynamic fairway information services. The different Joint Statement principles and measures taken for applying the principles was presented, next to information on the importance of a proper fairway information system. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

DEF asked for clarification regarding the low water levels on the Danube and whether it is considered to be possible to overcome them during the whole year. Plovput highlighted to importance of the Iron Gates impoundment for navigation on the Danube and in Serbia, ensuring navigation conditions. For other stretches on the Danube, also in other countries, case by case approaches are needed, as also outlined by the Joint Statement, but there are no easy solutions. Fairway information systems are considered as important. Even more would be possible to be done in Serbia in case participation in the FAIRway project would be possible with more available resources.

WWF highlighted the good practice approaches performed in Serbia, including navigation and ecological objectives, stakeholder forum, multi-criteria analysis and the use of the fairway information system. With regard to long term monitoring, WWF asked whether sufficient funds are available for that. Plovput informed that more available funds would be useful but more is actually available than expected before for supervision and monitoring. A certain budget is also available for compensation measures which might also be picked up by other projects. For the process, the importance of establishing a joint understanding and trust was highlighted.

Mr. Schindler from the Danube Commission expressed appreciation for the presentation and highlighted the approach as good practice example.

3.2.6 IWT Projects on the Danube in Romania

Ms. Dumbrava from the River Administration of the Lower Danube (AFDJ) provided a presentation on the improvement of the navigation conditions on the Danube between Calarasi and Braila as well as on the Romanian – Bulgarian Common Sector of the Danube. On Calarasi-Braila, following different activities which were performed in the past, the decision was taken to restructure the project to identify alternative solutions together with the works already executed, what is currently ongoing. With regard to the common border stretch, it is estimated that a tender will be published in the beginning of October 2015. After contract conclusion the establishment of working groups of stakeholders is planned to be performed. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

DEF informed about the long-term involvement in the discussions on Calarasi-Braila and asked which NGOs were involved in the monitoring before and after project development and which NGOs are planned to be involved during continuation of the monitoring. AFDJ informed about participation of representatives from WWF International, WWF Romania, IAD and the Danube Sturgeon Task Force. Other NGOs can also be invited in case contact details are provided. Information on monitoring results and interim reports are published monthly on a website.

WWF asked which recommendations can be provided for other projects based on the experiences made. AFDJ informed that involvement of stakeholders from the beginning is a crucial point, next to

the clear definition of the different objectives. Close cooperation with NGOs needs to be ensured what is planned to be done for the upcoming common border project.

Mr. Bloesch from IAD informed about the long-term involvement in the Calarasi-Braila project. Lessons learned include that alternatives should be elaborated what was initially not the case and what took 10 years. Furthermore, monitoring and construction should not take place at the same time. After parts of the bottom sill and the guiding wall were constructed, a discussion of alternatives is taking place. The existing structures might have to be decommissioned for realising an alternative solution. Finally, the importance of ensuring sturgeon migration was highlighted. AFDJ expressed appreciation for the comments and informed that the project is restructured based on modelling results. The execution of the full bottom sill was stopped and monitoring information on sturgeon migration through the existing sill is available. Ms. Cuc from the Romanian Ministry of Transport added that alternatives which are under discussion are not for the bottom sill but for solving the problem of navigation on the Danube. Alternatives are under discussion how to get more water from Bala to the Danube. Monitoring took place already before the works started. IAD replied that the guiding wall is also related to erosion in the Bala branch and expressed doubts regarding the quality of sturgeon monitoring which was performed.

3.2.7 Study on current situation and likely development of the Bystroe canal and Kiliya arm

Mr. Pastori from TRT Transports and territory Ltd. provided a presentation on a study on the current situation and likely development of the Bystroe Canal and Kiliya Arm, which is a project funded by the European Union. The objective of the presentation was to inform about the scope of the study and to collect points of view of the experts attending the meeting. The study is intending to provide information about the project history and its actual status as well as collect the opinions of the different parties and stakeholders, whereas consultation of different relevant actors is currently ongoing. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

DG MOVE informed that the study was launched due to activities in the frame of the Eastern Partnership where a map on Inland Waterways in the Region is under elaboration. Therefore the task was given to the consortium team to outline the past and current situation. The study is planned to be finalised within one month and relevant meeting participants were asked to help the project team in performing the study.

IAD informed that Kiliya arm is silting up rapidly and dynamically, posing a challenge for dredging activities. A solution might be a political one by making use of the Sulina arm for navigation. DG MOVE clarified that the aim of the study is not to find a solution but to analyse the current situation.

DEF expressed higher expectations regarding the presentation since more information should be available. Mr. Pastori agreed that more information is actually available and clarified that the objective of the presentation was not to present interim results but to ask for support for the finalisation of the study.

3.3 Conclusions Day 1

Mr. Zavadsky summarised that a good overview on the current state of play was provided. More strategic discussions on the way forward and the future needs of the process are planned for the second day. Important topics and lessons learned include the need for better linking the projects with the River Basin Management Plans and the application of Article 4.7. Progress was made with regard to the establishment of stakeholder processes. Sediment management seems to be a key issue to be addressed on the second day. With regard to this, the importance of fairway information systems was inter alia highlighted.

4. Future plans and perspectives for enhancing navigation and environmental protection

4.1 EUSDR related developments – Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan

Mr. Muilerman from viadonau provided a presentation on the EU Danube Strategy related developments, in particular on the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan. The purpose of the Master Plan is to raise transparency in the area of fairway maintenance: in terms of problems, activities undertaken and activities planned, to highlight national needs and short term measures in the field of fairway rehabilitation maintenance, the definition of coordinated maintenance measures that lead to efficient and effective measures and investments, as well as to provide fairway continuity. As next steps roadmaps are prepared by the EUSDR PA 1a Technical Secretariat to define the measures needed to achieve good navigation status and to implement the FAIRway project. An update of the roadmaps is foreseen through the FAIRway project which is starting September 2015. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

WWF recognized the need for the Master Plan but expressed disappointment that integrated objectives were not taken on board. Furthermore, WWF asked whether an Environmental Impact Assessment or Strategic Environmental Assessment was performed for the Master Plan. Mr. Muilerman informed that the integrated objectives are mentioned in the preamble. Ensuring the integrated approach is subject to the national activities, however, for the update of the roadmaps this point can be further emphasized. Since the Master Plan is providing summarized information on navigation bottlenecks and project needs, there is no need to undergo an SEA or EIA.

DEF highlighted the importance of dredging activities and the relation to river hydromorphology, potentially also causing ecological problems, and the need for close cooperation on this subject. Mr. Muilerman confirmed the need for cooperation for maintaining rivers in good navigable status while respecting environmental legislation. Gaining additional transparency on measures where sediments are extracted would be a step forward.

DG ENV appreciated the informative presentation and agreed that transparency is very important and essential for the integration of objectives. Daily contact with the Environmental Ministries revealed that in many cases involvement during the elaboration of the Master Plan was not ensured. It therefore generated more concerns than it would otherwise attract. The advice was therefore given to ensure for future activities the exchange between national authorities. Furthermore DG ENV suggested not to miss the opportunity to mention the WFD and Joint Statement in the future work on the Master Plan since while legislative requirements are expected to be known it is also known what is happening on the ground. This becomes obvious through the assessment of the River Basin Management Plans where over the entire European Union only few cases were found where Article 4.7 was explicitly mentioned, revealing the need to work closer together.

4.2 Sustainable and efficient transport on the Danube – viewpoints from an industry association

Mr. Rafael from Pro Danube International provided a presentation on sustainable and efficient transport on the Danube – viewpoints from an industry association. Priorities for Pro Danube include inter alia the engagement for better waterway maintenance & execution of TEN T bottleneck projects, the elimination of administrative barriers and active involvement in EC initiatives & programs. Top priority is fairway maintenance and bottleneck elimination. Pro Danube International furthermore demands a European structure for waterway management and development as a sustainable solution for Danube problems. Supporting this a Danube Waterway Industry Declaration was signed. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

DEF expressed disappointment regarding the presented industry viewpoint since bottlenecks are still seen as problems and not as environmental assets. Mr. Rafael stressed the importance of working

together with the environmental representatives and within the environmental legislative framework, what should be continued.

4.3 Alignment of inland navigation with biodiversity conservation objectives – WWF reflections

Ms. Lucius from the WWF Danube Carpathian Program provided a presentation on the alignment of inland navigation with biodiversity conservation objectives. As most controversial discussion point the topic of necessary water depth / draught was identified, however, the issue of width and benefits of River Information Systems was identified to be often overlooked. More flexible width requires inter alia hydrographic surveys, waterway marking and maintenance, as well as real time fairway information equipment next to the necessary budget for maintenance and staff capacity. With flexible width fewer bottlenecks occur. For the remaining bottlenecks dredging and structural measures would be necessary and designed to minimize the impact on biodiversity. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

Mr. Schindler identified WWF viewpoints as not being too far away from the industry viewpoint. A key issue is to ensure safety for navigation and draught is an important precondition. 2.5 meters during the whole year was identified to be currently not realistic but rather future oriented. In case the Danube Commission recommendations, would be changed, impacts could be expected on the whole fleet. In cooperation with DG MOVE it is planned to establish a group of experts for the harmonization of standards which can also be used for maintenance.

DG MOVE expressed appreciation for the presentation and indicated that different aspects could be further analyzed taking into account the needs of the navigation sector and environment. The presentation will be useful as a basis for the discussion.

DEF experienced the presentation as useful and supported a flexible approach since 2.5 meters are not considered as possible in key areas for biodiversity.

Mr. Zanetti of Witteveen+Bos expected the implementation of the suggestions as challenging since this would require the implementation of extensive IT systems and the education of shippers. However, in case implementation is started concerned colleagues might be ready for change.

4.4 Outlook for Danube navigation in the context of the Rhine-Danube Corridor

The European Coordinator for Inland Waterways, Ms. Peijs, provided a presentation on the Rhine-Danube Corridor and an outlook for Danube navigation. Ensuring navigation on the Rivers Danube and Sava is seen as a key priority supported by the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan, the need for coordination with Transport Ministries and coordination within the European Commission between DG ENV, DG REGIO and DG MOVE. Ms. Peijs perceived that navigation did not increase on the Danube during the last years, indicating the NGOs were successful in blocking navigation projects. The benefits of inland navigation as a clean mode of transport were stressed while being cautious with the environment, what requires cooperation. Since environmental legislation can be complex the need for support from specialists was pointed out. Ms. Peijs therefore proposed that ICPDR would be the appropriate organization to set up a team of environmental and navigation experts in order to help countries to properly design and implement projects.

DEF proposed to work out a Biodiversity Master Plan next to the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan which was already developed.

WWF expressed appreciation for highlighting the importance of environmental issues but pointed out that emission reduction is only one aspect. Biodiversity issues were highlighted by WWF to be also important, what should also be capture in the objectives. Ms. Peijs finally stressed that more pressure on navigation finally also means more pressure on the environment. Cooperation is therefore needed.

5. Inland Waterway Transport related projects and developments

5.1 Platina 2 and FAIRway Projects

Mr. Bäck from viadonau provided presentations on the PLATINA 2 and FAIRway projects. Under PLATINA 2 a Good Practice Manual on Waterway Maintenance is under elaboration. The main target group are waterway administrations and the focus is on the fairway in free-flowing river sections. Lessons learned from practice across river corridors are collected and recommendations for practical implementation elaborated. The final version of the manual is planned to be ready in December 2015. The objective of the FAIRway project is to contribute towards a harmonized realization of the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan. The project started in July 2015 and the duration is 5 years. Key activities include the elaboration of coordinated national action plans and to define pilots, procuring equipment for hydrological services, executing and evaluating pilots, harmonizing basic data on critical locations, coherent monitoring of navigational status and harmonized water level prognosis, next to others. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentations.

DEF asked for clarification regarding the relationship between PLATINA 2 and FAIRway. Mr. Bäck informed about NAIADES as the EC Communication and overall EG MOVE policy on inland navigation and PLATINA as the implementation platform. The Good Practice Manual for Waterway Maintenance is one measure under PLATINA. FAIRway on the other hand is the first set of implementation vehicles for the implementation of the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan.

Mr. Schwaiger from the Austrian Federal Environmental Ministry identified fairway maintenance as a core interest for navigation and at the same time a core issue for the environment. He therefore asked for clarification regarding the planned involvement of environmental actors. Mr. Bäck informed that the project just started and that ICPDR will serve in the Advisory Board and help to guide the process. The first meeting is planned for November and the project counts on ICPDR support. Partners in the countries are also asked to organise kick-off events with relevant stakeholders dealing e.g. with the WFD, Natura 2000, etc. Mr. Zavadsky highlighted the development of national roadmaps as a critical issue requiring dialogue in order to avoid misunderstandings from the beginning. Since first drafts were developed there is still the chance for relevant authorities and stakeholders to get involved.

Mr. Zinke asked for further clarification regarding the relationship between the FAIRway project and the Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan. Mr. Bäck informed that FAIRway is the overall body for guiding the implementation of the Master Plan. In Slovakia for instance, concrete plans for the rehabilitation of Gabčíkovo and other measures were elaborated. In other countries partners are selecting other measures which will be dealt with within the FAIRway project.

5.2 Elaboration of a Sediment Management Project Proposal for the Danube River Basin

Mr. Bakonyi from Budapest Technical University provided a presentation on the elaboration of a Danube Sediment Project Proposal. Sediment management was identified by the ICPDR as a key issue requiring cooperation between countries and different sectors. Budapest Technical University took the lead in the elaboration of a project proposal which will be handed in under the upcoming call of the Danube Transnational Program in September / October 2015. More detailed information on the different works packages, consortium and timelines can be obtained from the presentation.

Mr. Zavadsky stressed the importance of the project and expressed hope that the project will be funded. He furthermore highlighted the importance to have the ISRBC and Danube Commission involved as strategic partners. Broad consultation and involvement of the navigation community will be important, next to other relevant actors like hydropower, flood risk management and biodiversity.

Mr. Komatina expressed the big interest for being involved on behalf of the ISRBC, which is ready to step in. Mr. Schindler also expressed the willingness for being involved on behalf of the Danube Commission.

Mr. Zanetti asked for clarification how the different hydrodynamics of the river is considered. Mr. Bakonyi informed that the upper, middle and lower part of the basin will be dealt with separately. However, the objective is still to handle the river as a whole.

Mr. Schwaiger expressed appreciation for the interest of the navigation community on the project and proposed to have a closer look at the navigation bottlenecks regarding issues related to sediment transport in the frame of the project. Cooperation with FAIRway and PLATINA 2 might be considered in this regard.

DG MOVE asked for clarification why the first project proposal was rejected in 2011. Mr. Bakonyi informed that a first project proposal was handed in already in 2011 under the SEE Program. The reasons for rejection are not entirely clear. Mr. Zavadsky proposed to focus on the new project proposal and invited relevant colleagues to provide support for the project.

5.3 Guidance note on inland navigation and adaptation to climate change in the Sava Basin

Mr. Komatina provided a presentation on the Guidance Note on Inland Navigation and Adaptation to Climate Change in the Sava River Basin. A Water and Climate Adaptation Plan for the Sava River Basin is elaborated, including inter alia an analysis of historic climate trends, climate and hydrological modelling, a main report and guidance notes for adaptation on navigation, hydropower, agriculture, flood protection, as well as the economic evaluation of climate change impacts. All outcomes will be posted on the ISRBC web-site in October 2015. More detailed information can be obtained from the presentation.

6. Discussion on key lessons learned and future steps in support of the implementation of the Joint Statement

Mr. Zavadsky highlighted the progress made in the implementation of the Joint Statement. More information is on the table and the platform for exchange and discussion is in place at the international level. In many cases also platforms for dialogue at the national level were established, facing still some challenges but in principle organised in a structured way. Thinking further, Mr. Zavadsky raised the question on bottlenecks in the process and challenges which have to be overcome.

DG MOVE reiterated support for the Joint Statement Process from the beginning. On different points the process is delivering, like for instance establishing the dialogue between the navigation and environmental community, leading to positive results on the project level. Other cases are more challenging. DG MOVE therefore proposed the establishment of a team of experts supporting navigation projects in meeting the Joint Statement principles. Internal consultation on this idea within the European Commission between DG ENV, DG REGIO and DG MOVE is planned to take place. Feedback is planned to be provided afterwards. This is considered to be important since legislation is often difficult to be interpreted. Finally, DG MOVE stressed again the importance of respecting different legislation which is in place.

WWF agreed that progress was made in establishing a fruitful dialogue. Compliance with environmental legislation is possible but can be a challenge. The important role of stakeholder fora was recognised, however, further efforts are needed for the creation of multi-disciplinary expert groups. NGOs can provide certain expertise but input from scientists and environmental authorities is also needed. Project data sheets are useful but they are not good enough to capture the lessons learned. WWF therefore proposed for the preparation of the next Joint Statement Meeting to perform a small survey with interviews to capture what project teams are currently dealing with. This could be

useful for the preparation of the next meeting and also useful information for other processes like EUSDR PA1a.

Mr. Komatina agreed with many points which were made by the previous speakers and highlighted the encouraging growing number of project data sheets where further progress was made.

Mr. Schwaiger stressed the usefulness of the Joint Statement Meeting. In different aspects the process has already delivered. Maybe not always to the expectations of navigation or environmental experts, what we have to be aware of. The process has improved results and provides a basis for authorities in decision making. Although the Joint Statement lines might not always be followed in detail, the potential is there for making better decisions. The proposal which was made for the establishment of a team of experts is expected to be in need for more detailed discussion since involvement of a River Commission in national issues might be a tricky question. Finally, the bottleneck for the involvement of countries should be addressed, whereas the Serbian approach was highlighted to deserve support.

DEF agreed that despite conflicts a positive discussion culture was possible to be established due to the Joint Statement Process. The need to work closer with EUSDR PA6 on biodiversity issues was stressed.

Mr. Schindler confirmed progress which was made towards establishing a civilised discussion culture. Despite a possible lack of involvement of one or the other country at the international level progress is still taking place at national level. Mr. Schindler furthermore announced that the Danube Commission will organise the next Joint Statement Meeting next year in Budapest where it might be interesting not only to have a look at the positive developments but also the problems and drawbacks which are happening in different projects.

Mr. Milković also welcomed the obvious progress in the Joint Statement implementation and dialog between the relevant stakeholders during the development of the Navigation Projects in the Danube Region. He also proposed, taking into account number of the planned Environmental Protection Projects in the Danube Region which may have impact on the navigation conditions, that the representatives of the navigation sector should be involved in the process of the development of such Projects. Navigation Community will certainly welcome such approach to the environment protection on and around the rivers in the Danube Region and will also be able to contribute to the overall goals.

Finally, Mr. Zavadsky thanked all the participants on behalf of the ICPDR for the fruitful discussions and closed the meeting.

Annex 1 - Agenda



6th Workshop on the Follow-up of the
Joint Statement on Guiding Principles on the Development of Inland
Navigation and Environmental Protection in the Danube River Basin
Draft Agenda

Date: 10-11 September 2015

Venue: Vienna International Centre, C-Building 7th Floor, Room C3, Wagramer Straße 5, 1220 Vienna (AT)

The objectives of the meeting are to:

- Inform about progress on the implementation of the Joint Statement on Guiding Principles on the Development of Inland Navigation and Environmental Protection in the Danube River Basin
- Discuss challenges and solutions in relation to the practical application of the integrated planning approach and distill lessons learnt
- Inform and discuss new facts and perspectives of European inland waterway transport, including the EU Danube Strategy

DAY 1 • 10 September 2015 – Tacking stock

12:30	Arrival and registration of participants	
13:00	1. Welcome and introductory statements	<i>Chair: Ivan Zavadsky, ICPDR</i>
	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	<i>Ivan Zavadsky, ICPDR</i>
	Danube Commission (DC)	<i>Horst Schindler, Danube Commission</i>
	International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC)	<i>Dejan Komatina, ISRBC</i>
13:15	2. Inland waterways and the environment – Policy developments relevant for the Danube region	
	EU policies on inland navigation and financing opportunities – latest developments	<i>Cesare Bernabei, European Commission, DG Move</i>
	EU environmental policies relevant for inland navigation – latest developments	<i>Nicola Notaro, European Commission, DG Environment</i>
	Discussion	

14:15	3. Overview current state of IWT projects in the Danube basin countries: Experiences with integrated planning and implementation	<i>Chair: Dejan Komatina, ISRBC</i>
	Overview feedback on current state of IWT projects via project data sheets	<i>Raimund Mair, ICPDR</i>
	Presentations and discussion on recent experiences of projects with the practical implementation of the Joint Statement	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Danube Project Straubing – Vilshofen 	<i>Johannes Schiller, Generaldirektion Wasserstraßen und Schifffahrt, Germany</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures on the Danube East of Vienna and results of an integrated planning approach 	<i>Marius Radinger, viadonau, Austria</i>
15:15	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15:30	Presentations and discussion on recent experiences of projects with the practical implementation of the Joint Statement - <i>continuation</i>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving navigation conditions on the Drava and Sava Rivers in Croatia 	<i>Lidija Hubalek, Agency for Inland Waterways and Zdenko Tadić, Hidroing d.o.o. (Croatia)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview IWT project status on the Sava 	<i>Željko Milković, ISRBC</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Balance between planning and executing infrastructure measures and provision of dynamic fairway information services 	<i>Ivan Mitrović, Ploput, Serbia</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IWT Projects on the Danube in Romania 	<i>AFDJ and Ministry of Transport, Romania</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study on current situation and likely development of the Bystroe canal and Kiliya arm 	<i>Enrico Pastori, TRT Transports and territory Ltd.</i>
17:50	Conclusions day 1	
18:00	<i>End of day 1</i>	
19:00	<i>Joint dinner – Restaurant “Zur Alten Kaisermühle”</i>	

DAY 2 • 11 September 2015 – Upcoming developments and outlook

09:00	4. Future plans and perspectives for enhancing navigation and environmental protection in the Danube and its navigable tributaries	<i>Chair: Horst Schindler, Danube Commission</i>
	Outlook for Danube navigation in the context of the Rhine-Danube Corridor	<i>Karla Peijs, European Coordinator for Inland Waterways</i>
	EUSDR related developments - The Fairway Rehabilitation and Maintenance Master Plan for the Danube and its navigable tributaries	<i>Gert-Jan Muilerman, EUSDR PA1a Technical Secretariat</i>
	Sustainable and efficient transport on the Danube – viewpoints from an industry association	<i>Robert Rafael, Pro Danube International</i>

	Alignment of inland navigation with biodiversity conservation objectives - reflections by WWF	<i>Irene Lucius, WWF Danube-Carpathian Programme</i>
	Discussion	
<i>11:00</i>	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11:15	5. Inland Waterway Transport related projects and developments	<u>Chair:</u> Ivan Zavadsky, ICPDR
	Platina 2 and FAIRway Projects	<i>Andreas Bäck, viadonau</i>
	Elaboration of a Sediment Management Project Proposal for the Danube River Basin	<i>Péter Bakonyi, Budapest University of Technology</i>
	Guidance note on inland navigation and adaptation to climate change in the Sava River Basin	<i>ISRBC</i>
	Discussion	
12:30	6. Discussion on key lessons learned and future steps in support of the implementation of the Joint Statement	
<i>13:00</i>	<i>Closure of the workshop</i>	

Annex 2 - List of participants

#	Name		Organisation and Address	Contact
1	Mr.	BÄCK Andreas	Via Donau Donau-City-Str. 1 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: 0664-80842-1609 Email: Andreas.baeck@via-donau.org
2	Mr.	BAKONYI Peter	Budapest University of Technology Hungary	Tel: +36-30-9196733 Email: Bakonyi.peter@outlook.com
3	Mr.	BERNABEI Cesare	European Commission Policy Coordinator Trans European Network Rue de Mot 28 1049 Brussels Belgium	Tel: +0032 22958149 Email: Cesare.Bernabei@ec.europa.eu
4	Mr.	BEYER Knut	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, Robert-Schuman-Platz 3 53175 Bonn Germany	Tel: +49 228 305 2536 Email: knut.beyer@bmub.bund.de
5	Mr.	BLOESCH Jürg	International Association for Danube Research Stauffacherstrasse 159, CH-8004 Zürich Switzerland	Tel: 0041-44-241 1119 / 0041-52-212 3638 Email: Juerg.Bloesch@emeriti.eawag.ch
6	Ms.	CUC Cristina	Ministry of Transport Dinicu Golescu Blvd. 38, Bucharest Romania	Tel: +0040 722 362 173 Email: cristina.cuc@mt.ro
7	Ms.	DUMBRAVA Catalina	River Administration of the Lower Danube Portului St 32 800025 Galati Romania	Tel: +0040 745 432 443 Email: dumbrava.catalina@afdj.ro
8	Mr.	DUMITRU Dorian	River Administration of the Lower Danube Portului St 32 800025 Galati Romania	Tel: +0040 744 642 140 Email: dumitru.dorian@afdj.ro
9	Ms.	GYOSHEVA Valeriya	ICPDR Permanent Secretariat Vienna International Centre Wagramer Strasse 5 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 1 26060 3973 Email: valeriya.gyosheva@unvienna.org

10	Ms.	HADŽIĆ Snežana	Ministry of Communication and Transport Bosnia and Herzegovina	Tel: +387 33707 670 Email: Snezana.Hadzic@mkt.gov.ba
11	Mr.	HALMO Norbert	Slovak Water Management Enterprise Karloveská 2, Bratislava Slovakia	Tel: +421-911 044 353 Email: norbert.halmo@svp.sk
12	Ms.	HLAVENKOVA Ludmila	Ministry of Transport, Construction and Regional Development, Námestie Slobody č.6, 810 05 Bratislava Slovakia	Tel: +421/2/59494397 Email: Ludmila.hlavenkova@mindop.sk
13	Ms.	HUBALEK Lidija	Agency for Inland Waterway, Parobrodarska 5, Vukovar Croatia	Tel: 00385914120332 Email: Lidija.hubalek@vodniputovi.hr
14	Ms.	IGNJATOVIC Jovanka	Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC) Ady Endre ut 9-11, 2000 Szentendre Hungary	Tel: +36209345839 Email: jignjatovic@rec.org
15	Mr.	ISTUK Miroslav	Agency for Inland Waterway, Parobrodarska 5, Vukovar Croatia	Tel: 0038532445049 Email: Miroslav.istuk@vodniputovi.hr
16	Mr.	KOMATINA Dejan	International Sava River Basin Commission Kneza Branimira 29, Zagreb Croatia	Tel: +385-1-4886960 Email: isrbc@savacommission.org
17	Mr.	LIEDERMANN Marcel	BOKU University Muthgasse 107 1190 Vienna Austria	Tel: 0664 5322777 Email: marcel.liedermann@boku.ac.at
18	Ms.	LUCIUS Irene	WWF International, Danube- Carpathian Programme Ottakringer Straße 114-116 1160 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 676 842728215 Email: ilucius@wwfdcp.org
19	Ms.	MAFFII Silvia	TRT Trasporti e territorio Via Rutilia 10/8 Milano Italy	Tel: +393483330386 Email: maffii@trt.it

20	Mr.	MAIR Raimund	ICPDR Permanent Secretariat Vienna International Centre, D0412 Wagramer Strasse 5 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 1 26060 5733 Email: raimund.mair@unvienna.org
21	Mr.	MANDL Benedikt	ICPDR Permanent Secretariat Vienna International Centre, D0412 Wagramer Strasse 5 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 1 26060 4373 Email: benedikt.mandl@unvienna.org
22	Mr.	MATOUSEK Karl	IC consulenten ZT GmbH Austria	Tel: Email:
23	Ms.	MATKOVAC Marina IVICA	Ministry of Maritime Affairs, Transport and Infrastructure, Prisavlje 14 Croatia	Tel: +3851/6169029 Email: marina.ivicamatkovic@mmpi.hr
24	Mr.	MILKOVIC Zeljko	International Sava River Basin Commission Kneza Branimira 29, Zagreb Croatia	Tel: +38514886962 Email: zmlkovic@savacommission.org
25	Mr.	MILOVANOVI C Ivan	ICPDR Permanent Secretariat Vienna International Centre Wagramer Strasse 5 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 1 26060 5567 Email: ivan.milovanovic@unvienna.org
26	Mr.	MITROVIC Ivan	Directorate for Inland Waterways (Plovput) Francuska 9 11000 Belgrade Serbia	Tel: +00 381 11 3029 842 / 00 381 63 384 814 Email: imitrovic@plovput.rs
27	Mr.	MOISI Petruta	ECO Conselling Center Galati on behalf of DEF 2 Basarabiei Str., 800201 Galati Romania	Tel: +0040.236 49 99 57/0040 724 049 138 Email: petrutamoisi@cceg.ro
28	Mr.	MUILERMAN Gert-Jan	Via Donau Donau-City-Str. 1 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 5 04321-1604 Email: gert-jan.muilerman@viadonau.org
29	Mr.	NAGL Gerhard	Danube Environmental Forum (DEF) Martin-Luther-Str. 14 94469 Deggendorf Germany	Tel: +49-991-3831609 / +49-0157-36256456 Email: gerhard.nagl@donaufluss.de

30	Mr.	NEUMAYER Vincent	TINA Vienna International Liechtensteinstraße 12/10, 1090 Vienna Austria	Tel: +0443 1 400084272 Email: Vincent.neumayer@tinavienna.at
31	Mr.	NOTARO Nicola	European Commission Avenue de Beaulieu, number 9, 1160 Auderghem Belgium	Tel: +0032 229 90499 Email: Nicola.notaro@ec.europa.eu
32	Ms.	OSTOJIC BARJAKTARE VIC Zaneta	Ic consulenti d.o.o., Kneza Miloša 19, Belgrade Serbia	Tel: +381 63 38 47 97 Email: z.ostojic@ic-group.org
33	Mr.	PASTORI Enrico	TRT Trasporti e territorio Via Rutilia 10/8 Milano Italy	Tel: +393396544972 Email: pastori@trt.it
34	Ms.	PEIJS Karla	European Coordinator Rhine-Danube Core Network Corridor Netherlands	Tel: - Email: karla456@icloud.com
35	Mr.	RADINGER Marius	via donau - Österreichische Wasserstraßen-Gesellschaft mbH Donau-City-Straße 1 1220 Wien/Vienna, Austria	Tel: +43 50 4321-2604 Email: marius.radinger@viadonau.org
36	Mr.	RAFAEL Róbert	Pro Danube Management GmbH Handelskai 265 A-1020 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 1 890 6647-25 Email: rafael@prodanube.eu
37	Mr.	SCHILLER Johannes	Generaldirektion Wasserstrassen und Schifffahrt - Außenstelle Süd, Wörthstrasse 19 97082 Würzburg Germany	Tel: +0931/4108-440 Email: johannes.schiller@wsv.bund.de
38	Mr.	SCHINDLER Horst	Secretariat of the Danube Commission Benczúr utca 25 1068 Budapest Hungary	Tel: +36 1 461 80 16 Email: horst.schindler@danubecom- intern.org
39	Mr.	SCHWAIGER Karl	Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Environment and Water Management Marxergasse 2 1030 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43 1 71100/7110 Email: Karl.schwaiger@bmlfuw.gv.at

40	Mr.	SIMONCIC Victor	Free Consultant Mihanovićeve obala 31 Hr-44 000 Siska Croatia	Tel: +385 98 262 257 Email: Viktor.simoncic@gmail.com
41	Ms.	SEBESTOVA Zuzana	Waterborne Transport Development Agency Námestie slobody č.6 810 05 Bratislava Slovakia	Tel: +421 2 59 494 543 Email: zuzana.sebestova@arvd-gov.sk
42	Mr.	TADIC Zdenko	Hidroing Tadije Smisciklasa 1 Croatia	Tel: +0038531251100 Email: Zdenko.tadic@hidroing-os.hr
43	Mr.	ZANETTI Roberto	Witveen+Bos, van Twickelostraat 2 Deventee Netherlands	Tel: +31651231480 Email: roberto.zanetti@witteveenbos.com
44	Mr.	ZAVADSKY Ivan	ICPDR Permanent Secretariat Vienna International Centre, D0412 Kalksburger Str. 6 1230 Wien Austria	Tel: +43 1 26060 5738 Email: ivan.zavadsky@unvienna.org
45	Mr.	ZINKE Alexander	Zinke Environment Consulting for CEE Wagramer Strasse 5 1400 Vienna Austria	Tel: +43-1-9241196 / +43-699-19241199 Email: zinke.enviro@vienna.at
46	Mr.	ZVOCAK Zrinko	Agency for Inland Waterway Parobrodarska 5 Vukovar Croatia	Tel: +0038532445045 Email: Zrinko.zvocak@vodniputovi.hr