



# DANUBE RIVER BASIN STAKEHOLDER CONFERENCE

## June 28-29, 2005, Budapest

### Final Conference Report

**Compiled by: Nicole Kranz, Eleftheria Kampa and Thomas Dworak**

**Overall management: Jasmine Bachmann**

On behalf of the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), this conference was organised by Ecologic in co-operation with the Global Water Partnership Hungary Foundation. Generous support from the European Commission, UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project and the Regional Environmental Centre made this event possible.



## Table of Contents

1	The event .....	3
2	Proceedings and Outcomes .....	3
2.1	Opening session .....	3
2.2	Block I: ICPDR and Public Participation .....	4
2.2.1	Presentations .....	4
2.2.2	Comments from stakeholders .....	5
2.2.3	Response of the ICPDR .....	7
2.3	Work Block II: Danube Basin Analysis (Roof Report 2004) .....	8
2.3.1	Presentations .....	8
2.3.2	Work Sessions (Afternoon, Day 1) .....	10
2.3.3	Reporting back session (Morning, Day 2) .....	10
2.3.4	Work Session I: Nutrient Pollution .....	11
2.3.5	Work Session II: Hazardous Substances .....	13
2.3.6	Work Session III A: Hydromorphological alterations .....	15
2.3.7	Work Session III B: Hydromorphological alterations .....	16
2.3.8	Reporting-back and plenary discussion .....	18
2.4	Work Block III: ICPDR Flood Action Programme .....	20
3	Conclusions of the conference .....	23
4	Follow-up to the conference .....	24
5	Annex .....	25
5.1	Background to the conference .....	25
5.2	List of Participants .....	26

## 1 The event

On occasion of the first Danube Stakeholder Conference, about 100 stakeholders from the entire Danube River Basin representing

- public administrations,
- various water-use sectors (including water utilities, navigation, industry, energy production, tourism),
- environmental NGOs

convened in Budapest on invitation of the International Commission for the Protection of the River Danube (ICPDR). A list of participants can be found in the annex to this report.

This report reflects the proceedings of this first Stakeholder Conference for the Danube River Basin and serves as the basis for further discussions as well as reference point for future activities of the ICPDR.

The purpose of this report is to capture the main comments of the stakeholders. It was not the intention of the conference or this report to achieve a consensus among the stakeholders on issues raised. The report, however, notes those issues where there seemed to be general consensus among stakeholders.

## 2 Proceedings and Outcomes

### 2.1 Opening session

The opening statement of **Istvan Öri**, ICPDR President 2005, centered around the following **main messages**:

The Danube River Basin Stakeholder Conference is crucial for strengthening public participation in river basin management at the international, national as well as the sub-national level.

The conference is an occasion for exchange between the ICPDR and all relevant stakeholders in the entire Danube River Basin. The conference will contribute to a **common understanding**, necessary to face the challenges lying ahead, and to provide a basis for tackling these challenges in the future.

The ICPDR needs the input from stakeholders to **focus its efforts** and to find out what information should be brought to the local and regional level. The ICPDR will build on the impulses provided by the stakeholders and will try to find mechanisms to implement the newly discussed tasks.

**Philip Weller**, Executive Secretary of the ICPDR, presented the objectives of the Stakeholder Conference:

The foremost goals of the conference were to **present information** and to **elicit comments** of the represented relevant stakeholder groups regarding the activities of the ICPDR, especially in view of an active involvement of the public as recommended by article 14 of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD).

In particular, the following issues were to be addressed:

- the current activities of the ICPDR in the basin and the approach to public involvement,
- the Danube Analysis Report 2004, as the first milestone towards the implementation of the WFD,
- the development process of the Programme of Measures,
- the ICPDR 'Action Programme on Sustainable Flood Protection' (addressed in Work Block III),
- the possibility for stakeholder groups to be granted observership status to the ICPDR.

**What we hope to achieve:**

- Presentation of information: Flood Action Programme, Danube Analysis Report
- Ensure validity of information and results of Danube Analysis Report
- Comments on assessment and conclusions of Danube Analysis Report

**What we hope to achieve:**

- Comments on the process of the development of a 'Programme of measures'
- Comments on public involvement in future steps

**Stakeholder Conference:**

- Fulfil WFD obligation for public participation (no legal obligation on the international level)
- Express the commitment and interest in public participation on part of Danube countries

**The Stakeholder Conference:**

- is designed as an open forum for exchange among the relevant actors in the basin, so as to face the challenges jointly in attaining sustainable development of the Danube River Basin,
- serves as a starting point for further public participation activities,
- may result in stronger involvement of stakeholders through observership status with the ICPDR.

**2.2 Block I: ICPDR and Public Participation****2.2.1 Presentations**

**Philip Weller**, Executive Secretary of the ICPDR, opened the session. His presentation provided an overview of:

- the Danube River Basin Convention, its contracting parties<sup>1</sup> and observers<sup>2</sup>,
- the co-operation of the ICPDR with business and industry,
- the role of the ICPDR as a mechanism for co-operation and co-ordination among the basin countries,
- the Transnational Monitoring Network (TNMN) of the ICPDR and the Emissions Inventory,
- key elements of the EU Water Framework Directive and its implementation in the Danube River Basin, with special view to the Danube Basin Analysis Report and next steps.

**Danube Basin Analysis Report:**

- Identifies pressures and impacts and outlines the areas where actions are needed to reach 'good ecological and chemical status' of water by 2015
- Basis for the development of the Danube River Basin Programme of Measure

**Next steps:**

- Fill knowledge/data gap
- Harmonise or make comparable approaches/methodologies
- Prepare programme of measures
- Develop Danube RBM Plan

<sup>1</sup> Contracting parties are: Austria, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Czech Republic, European Union, Germany, Hungary, Moldova, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine.

<sup>2</sup> Observers are: Danube Navigation Commission, WWF International – Danube Carpathian Programme, International Association for Danube Research, Ramsar – Convention on Wetlands, Danube Environmental Forum, Regional Environmental Centre, Black Sea Protection Commission, Global Water Partnership, UNESCO – IHP, International Association for the Danube Basin, Danube Tourism Commission.

In her presentation, **Jasmine Bachmann, ICPDR Technical Expert on Public Participation**, defined public participation as ‘allowing the public to influence the outcome of plans and working processes’. However, she also pointed out that public participation:

**is not about**

everybody joining,  
continuous participation,  
achieving consensus at all costs,  
everybody deciding.

**is about**

two-way communication,  
flexible processes,  
no pre-determined outcome,  
the management of expectations.

The ICPDR Operational Plan for public participation was also discussed. The Plan is now at the crucial stage of transition from information to active participation:

**ICPDR Operational Plan:**

Phase I (Information)

- Stakeholder analysis
- Communication network between countries
- Public participation network between countries
- Launching of international Danube Day
- Update of the ICPDR website

**ICPDR Operational Plan:**

Phase II (facilitate active participation)

- WFD brochure (outcomes of the Roof Report 2004) in English/national languages
- Revision of the guidelines for participation with consultative status and for observers to the ICPDR
- Stakeholder Forum 2005 – June 2005 hearing for stakeholders, presentation of Roof Report 2004, discussion of pressures and impacts.

There are two ways for stakeholders to become active in the context of this process:

- by providing feedback to published documents (conferences, feedback forms, website),
- by becoming an accredited observer to the ICPDR (active involvement in the development of the DRBM Plan and the expert groups).

## 2.2.2 Comments from stakeholders

Comments from stakeholders centred around the topics described below. In the second part of the session, ICPDR representatives responded to the comments made by the stakeholders.

### Feedback on the Stakeholder Conference from stakeholders

The Stakeholder Conference was generally seen as a step forward towards establishing a communication platform for stakeholders with the ICPDR, with policy-makers in the region as well as among different actor groups. The openness of the process was welcomed, while the necessity of and room for improvement were clearly identified. There was a general consensus that public participation in the Danube River Basin is still at the beginning and that more effort should be put into this task in the coming years, especially considering the tight timetable of the WFD.

### Role and responsibility of ICPDR

According to the stakeholders, **the ICPDR should promote Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM) in the Danube Basin on the sub-basin and national levels**, following the provisions of the WFD.

→ The **potential risk of failure** in this task is seen to be directly related to the lack of active participation of all relevant stakeholders. Shortcomings in terms of public participation in the preparation of the Danube Analysis Report were reported by some of the stakeholders present. It was pointed out that public participation should start early, since active involvement of all stakeholders is required by the WFD throughout the whole process of implementation of the directive. Authorities should not wait until 2006 when there is the WFD requirement of information and consultation.

**The ICPDR should actively stimulate the process for public participation in the Danube river basin countries and follow-up those initiative at the basin level.** ICPDR should therefore follow up on the implementation of the Public Participation Strategy for the Danube River Basin (Danube PP Strategy) at the basin level and through the network of ICPDR PP Focal Points (as nominated by the countries). This network of people could help in stimulating the PP efforts in a harmonized way.

→ The ICPDR can play a supporting role by providing the necessary platform and structures for stakeholder interaction, by stimulating and initiating national public participation (PP) processes and by helping to disseminate best practices among the Danube countries (collection of national PP activities).

→ The ICPDR can provide support in achieving a better understanding of the goals of the WFD among stakeholders.

### Role of the stakeholders

Stakeholders can contribute to the process by bringing in more practical and economic aspects to the WFD implementation process.

→ To fulfil this task, the following support is suggested:

- more stakeholder meetings and seminars, facilitating the exchange of information,
- the establishment of a stakeholder network. It was suggested that use can be made of existing networks of NGOs in the Danube basin, such as the DEF network.

### Role of the Danube countries

It was stressed that activities at the country level are of crucial importance for fostering public participation on the international stage. Danube countries can contribute to the process by engaging in the following activities:

- the better engagement of **national focal points for public participation**, which have been nominated at the request of the ICPDR. These PP focal points should be more active at the national level and should take initiative at the national, sub-basin and local level to implement the recommendations of the Danube PP Strategy and should harmonize their activities with the basin-wide Danube PP Strategy,
- the initiation of **stakeholder conferences at the national level**. This would also offer the opportunity to reach out to the non-EU member states with the EU tools of IRBM through stronger collaboration at the regional level,
- the broadening of the stakeholder process at the base, aiming at including the **general public** as well,
- in some countries, this would include the **stronger involvement of certain ethnic minorities**.

### **Funding for public participation**

Specific concerns were raised in relation to securing the appropriate funding for public participation in the Danube riparian states; **new strategies for funding and financing** activities at the international as well as the national level would have to be identified.

#### **2.2.3 Response of the ICPDR**

In their response, ICPDR representatives pointed out that it is the mandate of the ICPDR to coordinate issues on the basin-wide level. They furthermore highlighted that it is the **role of the ICPDR** to:

- support national initiatives, accounting for the different pace among Danube riparian countries in the implementation of the WFD,
- provide assistance to the countries in defining best-practice examples.

The ICPDR expects that **participants** of the Stakeholder Conference will serve as **crystallisation points** in their countries for sparking new initiatives.

The ICPDR agrees that **financial resources as well as technical capacity are important challenges** and that new sources of funding will have to be identified. Potential funding from the corporate sector is under discussion.

## 2.3 Work Block II: Danube Basin Analysis (Roof Report 2004)

### 2.3.1 Presentations

In his presentation, **Joachim D'Eugenio, DG Environment, EU Commission**, presented the key elements of WFD with special view to international river basins, the upcoming steps of the implementation process, the current situation of implementation in the EU member states as well as the Common Implementation Strategy of the WFD.

#### **Key elements of the EU Water Framework Directive**

- the protection of all waters (surface and groundwater and coastal waters),
- the coverage of all impacts on waters,
- the achievement of good quality ('good status') as a rule by 2015,
- the definition of water quality in terms of biology, chemistry and morphology,
- the challenge of shared river basins,
- cost recovery and equitable charging,
- public participation,
- integrated river basin management.

While the first steps of WFD implementation – the transposition into national law and the environmental and economic analysis according to Article 5 – should have been completed by now, the **further implementation process** foresees the following milestones.

- December 2006:** Monitoring and assessment programmes should be operational.  
Public participation efforts should have started.
- December 2008:** Draft river basin management plan should have been prepared and submitted to stakeholder feedback.
- December 2009:** Final river basin management plan should be ready.
- 2015 and beyond:** The implementation of the first phase should be completed. Results will be assessed and strategies adjusted where necessary.

The presentation also briefly addressed the **current situation of implementation in the EU Member States**, the state of play in terms of the submission of the Article 5 report, and the WFD Scoreboard prepared by the Commission to provide an overview of the compliance of the individual member states with the directive. The WFD Scoreboard assesses the Member States performance in three categories: transposition of the directive, site selection for intercalibration and reporting of river basin districts. The overall performance on these indicators throughout the EU is good, with exceptions in some countries due to specific circumstances.

The **Common Implementation Strategy (CIS) of the WFD** was also outlined in the presentation:

The CIS is motivated by the common challenge of WFD implementation for all member states and the fact that many large rivers in Europe are shared resources. The CIS involves many relevant stakeholders and is an example for good European governance. All Member States as well as Bulgaria, Romania, Norway, Iceland and Switzerland participate in the CIS. Stakeholder groups include industry groups, irrigators, land-owners and NGOs (EEB, WWF, Bird Life etc.).



This organisation of the CIS directly responds to the upcoming challenges in the WFD implementation process. The CIS so far has resulted in 14 guidance documents on river basin management practices, the Water Information System for Europe (WISE) and the testing of approaches in several pilot river basins.

Further information on the work of the Commission is available at <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/water> and at <http://forum.europa.eu.int/Public/irc/env/wfd/library>.

**Ursula Schmedtje, ICPDR, Technical Expert for River Basin Management**, presented an overview of the main issues of the Danube Basin Analysis Report (Roof Report 2004).

The Danube Basin Analysis was prepared in response to the reporting requirements under WFD, **specifically Article 5, Annex II and III, which** require an assessment of river basin characteristics, the impact of human activities and the economic analysis of water uses, and **Article 6 and Annex IV** on the inventory for protected areas.

The full Danube Basin Analysis, as required by Article 5, consists of **two parts**:

- **Part A** contains a basin-wide overview (roof report),
- **Part B** contains detailed national reports from all basin countries.

#### **Table of Contents, Danube Analysis Report (Roof Report 2004)**

*Danube River Basin District and its international co-ordination arrangements*

*Characterisation of surface waters*

*Characterisation of ground waters*

*Inventories of protected areas*

*Economic analysis*

*Public information and consultation*

*Key conclusions and outlook*

The key objective of the Danube Analysis Report was to **achieve comparable analysis results throughout the river basin**.

The information used for the assessment in the Danube Analysis Report was drawn from several sources:

- specific data, delivered by the competent authorities of the Danube countries for the purpose of this report, based on agreed criteria,
- published data from basin-wide studies,
- modelled data (nutrient emission).

The data was collected in **agreement with the Danube countries**.

The presentation could only provide a brief overview of the main issues in the basin. A more detailed assessment is contained in the **Summary Report on the Roof Report 2004 for the Danube River Basin**, prepared by the ICPDR.

#### **Feedback from stakeholders in the plenary and discussion**

It was stressed that the general assessment of the Danube River Basin as described in the Roof Report 2004 is valuable and useful.

Some stakeholders mentioned that some information/data is missing in the Roof Report 2004. A more detailed description of the missing data will be provided in the subsequent chapter on the parallel sessions.

The ICPDR clearly stated that the Roof Report is a product of the national governments in the Danube basin and invited stakeholders to address these problems within the individual states.

The presentations provided the foundation for **four parallel work sessions** on nutrient pollution, hazardous substances and hydromorphological alterations.

### **2.3.2 Work Sessions (Afternoon, Day 1)**

The work sessions were the most interactive and therefore also the most important part of the conference. Stakeholders had the opportunity to discuss certain issues of the Danube Analysis Report in detail with each other and the river basin experts present, to voice their concern and make suggestions for further steps. The session started in the afternoon of Day 1 with smaller working groups on the respective subjects and was continued in the morning of Day 2 with a reporting-back session of the workshop results to the plenary.

#### **Four work sessions, focusing on specific problem areas of the Danube Analysis Report**

- nutrient pollution,
- pollution due to hazardous substances,
- hydromorphological alterations (two work sessions which offered different topics for discussion).

#### **Set-up of the work sessions**

All work sessions followed the same set-up. After a short summary of the main points of the Danube Analysis Report regarding the specific subject by a representative from Ecologic, two stakeholders were invited to provide short impulse statements on their views of the problem and the possible solutions. In the following, all stakeholders were invited to join the discussion, which was guided by the following questions.

#### **Guiding questions for the discussion**

**Question 1:** Do you share the perception of the specific problem area as it is presented in the Roof Report 2004?

**Question 2:** Are your priority issues adequately reflected? Do you have any further concerns?

**Question 3:** What could be possible approaches to minimise relevant impacts especially on the transboundary level?

### **2.3.3 Reporting back session (Morning, Day 2)**

In this session in the morning of Day 2, reports were given on the discussions and outcomes of the individual work sessions of Day 1. All stakeholders had again the opportunity to provide feedback to the work sessions and engage in a general discussion on the findings of the Danube Analysis Report in plenary.

### 2.3.4 Work Session I: Nutrient Pollution

Moderation: Ursula Schmedtje; Rapporteur: Thomas Dworak.

Stakeholder Statements: Milena Forejtnikova, Czech Water Research Institute; Johannes Wolf, Danube Environmental Forum.

#### **Feedback on the Roof Report 2004**

There was **consensus** within the working group on the fact that nutrients are an **issue in the entire Danube catchment**. In general, the description of the situation concerning nutrients within the Roof Report 2004 was agreed with by the workshop participants.

Further consideration was suggested concerning the issue of wetlands and their relation to nutrients, as this is not represented in an adequate way and did not receive the attention it deserved in the report. A clear statement was made that these aspects should to be fully covered in the river basin management plans to be drafted by 2009. It was also made clear that only wetlands of basin-wide importance can be covered in the roof part of the management plan.

#### **Possible approaches for minimising relevant impacts, especially on the transboundary level**

**The development of additional scenarios on nutrient reduction is necessary for better decision-making.**

→ Such scenarios should reflect the development of point and diffuse source emissions over time and refer to different baseline scenarios. Furthermore, scenarios on the effects of different sets of measures with regard to different pollution reduction targets should be developed.

**The full implementation of the EU Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive in the entire catchment, and especially in the new EU Members States, should be a major priority.**

→ This implementation is seen as the main precondition for tackling point source pollution, particularly for nitrate emissions. With regard to existing wastewater treatment plants, a clear necessity of proving the cost effectiveness of tertiary treatment as opposed to measures to control diffuse pollution was identified.

**Elaborating the potential role of the recent CAP (Common Agriculture Policy)-Reform and the upcoming Rural Development Programmes to reach the WFD objectives and especially the reduction of nutrient pollution is absolutely crucial.**

→ The CAP could provide a number of supporting tools for implementing WFD-objectives:

- the mechanism of cross-compliance,
- agri-environmental measures,
- the proposed payments linked to the WFD (Article 36 of the upcoming Rural Development Regulation)<sup>3</sup>,
- the EU LEADER+ programme for the implementation of local development strategies of local action groups,
- measures for the basic training of farmers.

---

<sup>3</sup> Proposal for a Council Regulation on support for rural development by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) (presented by the Commission), COM(2004)490 final.

In order to provide for better interlinkages between water policy and agricultural and rural development policies, the following measures should be actively promoted.

- co-operation between authorities responsible for agriculture and rural development planning and those in charge of river basin management at all appropriate levels,
- the definition of a common approach and shared objectives of all policy areas,
- public participation as a major tool for reaching a common understanding among all stakeholders involved.

**A further investigation into the potential of wetlands for nutrient reduction is needed.**

→ Wetlands have to be included in river basin management plans and the potential of nutrient removal should be adequately assessed. There is also a **clear need for ensuring adequate wetland protection** in the catchment, as a high proportion of such wetlands has already been lost.

**The introduction of P-free detergents in the entire basin was supported by all stakeholders in the working group.**

→ The discharge of phosphorus is one of the major problems in terms of nutrient pollution, which might result in eutrophication in some parts of the Danube River Basin.

**Further research is needed on nutrients trading.**

→ The potential of nutrients trading was discussed briefly and generated controversy. Further exploration on this issue is needed.

**For the upcoming task of developing the sets of measures for the river basin management plans according to the WFD implementation schedule, a region-specific approach was advocated.**

This approach could be supported by the EU LEADER+ Programme and should be based on historical developments and include a political dimension.

A further issue clearly mentioned in the discussion was the necessity for finding the right balance between economic and ecological benefits when developing the programmes of measures. Public participation was suggested as a possible tool for finding such a balance.

### 2.3.5 Work Session II: Hazardous Substances

Moderation: Igor Liska; Rapporteur: Nicole Kranz.

Stakeholder Statements: Walter Kling, IAWD; Barbara Becker, via donau.

#### **Feedback on the Roof Report**

Stakeholders present in the session approved the information on hazardous substances contained in the report as valuable and valid. The Roof Report 2004 helped in **identifying the most serious pollutants** in the Danube River Basin. However, the report could only shed light on the current situation and some issues are still missing:

- **Information on pressures from hazardous substances should be provided based on emissions data** similar to the data collected for nutrient emissions. While it was generally acknowledged by the ICPDR that this information would be desirable, the data is currently not available for the entire Danube River Basin.
- **Data on the concentration of suspended solids and biota in water bodies and the hazardous substances therein would be important**, since these contribute to a high bio-availability of hazardous substances.
- **It would be useful to obtain information about the pathways of certain substances in environmental media**, so as to better assess and develop measures for the reduction of the input of hazardous substances.
- The issue of hazardous substances is a very complex one, requiring **extensive resources for screening and monitoring**, which are not always available.

#### **Possible approaches for minimising relevant impacts, especially on the transboundary level**

**It is of key importance to make monitoring more effective throughout the basin within the next years.** The following aspects should be taken into consideration.

- **Current monitoring efforts need to be continued and harmonised between the Danube countries.** Initiatives, such as the Transnational Monitoring Network (TNMN) and the Joint Danube Survey, need to be continued and improved.
- **The monitoring efforts should be focused** on relevant substances or compounds, to reduce costs while at the same time obtaining the same information throughout the basin. There needs to be an agreement among the basin countries on the main compounds and substances.
- It is crucial to take into consideration **regional and local natural background conditions** for the Roof Report 2004.
- It is absolutely relevant to **consider cost-effectiveness aspects** at all stages of the monitoring process.

**Common environmental standards for organo-compounds and heavy metals need to be established for the entire basin.**

- An initiative for the Danube basin would have to be **co-ordinated with the work of the EU Commission** on the concentrations of priority substances in water bodies.
- It is of high importance to gain **more information on the production, use and emissions of hazardous substances.**

**Participants of the work session strongly advocated for a more source-oriented approach** towards limiting the input of hazardous substances rather than pursuing end-of-pipe solutions. This approach would have to comprise the following elements.

- **Appropriate policies** for reducing the use of priority hazardous substances need to be formulated, at the national as well as the international level.
- There needs to be an **overall political commitment at the national level to support national pollution reduction schemes.**
- **The ICPDR can play a role in instilling this commitment and help with supporting and promoting the precautionary principle** as opposed to end-of-pipe solutions at the national level.
- **The requirements** of the WFD need to be linked more explicitly with those of other EU directives, such as the EU Urban Wastewater Treatment Directive (UWWT) and the EU Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control Directive (IPPC).

The **raising of awareness for the challenges related to hazardous substances** is of high importance.

- This includes educating public stakeholders as well as industry representatives and national governments. It is necessary to achieve a shift in the mindset of people, so that improvements in water quality are seen as an investment rather than an act of charity.
- **The ICPDR can play an important role in this process** at the national as well as the international level.
- **Stakeholders** can contribute by initiating a co-ordinated approach to support the tasks of the ICPDR in this challenging field. Stakeholders who are already part of the process could reach out to other groups not yet involved.

### 2.3.6 Work Session III A: Hydromorphological alterations

Moderation: Joachim D'Eugenio; Rapporteur: R. Andreas Kraemer.

Stakeholder Statements: Jürg Bloesch, International Association for Danube Research; Otto Pirker, Verbund Austrian Hydropower AG.

#### **Feedback on the Roof Report**

The issue on hydromorphological alterations is well represented in the Roof Report 2004. Participants of this session agreed, however, that the issue of hydromorphological alteration is still new to many stakeholders involved and that **more information exchange on this topic would be desirable**.

The participants criticised that the issue of **sediments** is not taken into account in the Roof Report 2004, and suggested that ICPDR should **draft an addendum** providing an overview of the main issues related to this theme. These could include sediment deficits leading to bed erosion - which reduces lateral connectivity and lowers the groundwater table-, the apparent loss of sediment at the Danube mouth as well as the sediment balance at dams.

The addendum should also contain an **'outlook' section on planned and potential future hydromorphological modifications**.

The Roof Report 2004 would also greatly benefit from further **integration of environmental aspects with other policy areas**, such as energy (hydropower) and transport (navigation), but also planning and tourism policies.

#### **Possible approaches for minimising relevant impacts, especially on the transboundary level**

Discussions evolved around the following thematic areas:

##### **Hydromorphological structures**

There is a **potentially contradictory effect** of the Transeuropean Networks (TENs) (Danube Navigation Corridor No. 7) on the attainment of the good ecological status according to the WFD.

→ It was stressed that while hydropower and navigation are supported by the EU, no absolute priority is granted to these uses over ecological aspects.

The impacts of hydromorphological structures depend in many cases on the size, locality and design of the infrastructure as well as their mode of operation.

→ There is a clear need to differentiate between already existing and planned/newly built hydromorphological structures. Newly built structures shall include best available techniques and practice while existing ones – if they have an impact - need to be adapted to certain standards (to be included in the Programme of Measures).

**Cost-benefit analyses** should be employed to guide decision-making in planning infrastructure, but also in discussing the possible mitigation, which in spite of being feasible in some cases is not always applied when appropriate.

There is a potential 'domino effect' of hydromorphological structures: one dam might automatically lead to the next one. This is aggravated by the **short planning horizon for new hydropower projects** in the context of EU energy liberalisation policies.

Discussants acknowledged the **relevance of hydropower and navigation infrastructure for flood defence** in the Danube, while saying that the respective effects would differ with regional and geographical characteristics.

→ Careful **land-use planning** should be employed in order to account for the importance of floodplains and the necessary connection of the rivers with these plains to function as retention areas.

The discussion group also addressed the **interlinkages between longitudinal and lateral connectivity**. Morphological alterations usually affect both dimensions of connectivity. Mitigation measures can therefore lead to the rehabilitation of both dimensions at the same time.

→ Research is underway but also needs to be improved on the better assessment of these linkages, but also the trade-offs of measures.

### **Sturgeon as a symbol for the Danube**

Discussion evolved around introducing a symbolic biological species, e.g. the sturgeon, for promoting sustainable management of the Danube river basin. Such a symbolic species, as some stakeholders argued, would be a good tool for marketing different efforts (e.g. restoration) and create 'political space' for measures in the entire river system.

### **Role of the ICPDR**

A specific role for the ICPDR was seen in encouraging and supporting the Danube riparian states:

- in seeing the Danube river basin as one shared system,
- in informing about on-going research in relevant fields, such as heavily modified water bodies and ecological status,
- in facilitating the exchange of information and experiences among the Danube countries, on the level of the administration as well as on the stakeholder level.

### **2.3.7 Work Session III B: Hydromorphological alterations**

Moderation: Philip Weller; Rapporteur: Eleftheria Kampa.

Stakeholder Statements: Christine Bratrich, WWF; Markus Simoner, via donau.

#### **Feedback on the Roof Report**

The overall feedback to the content of the Roof Report 2004 from this group was positive. The Roof Report fulfilled its aim of a comprehensive *status-quo* analysis.

A realistic picture of hydromorphological pressures is given, e.g. the number of dams and the extent of the loss of floodplains. The importance of hydromorphological alterations and their impacts in the Danube river basin are reflected in relevant figures of the Roof Report 2004 (93% of water bodies at risk due to hydromorphological modifications and 78% of the Danube river classified as provisionally heavily modified).

The following **information gaps and weaknesses** were identified by the group participants:

- **Assessment methodologies** are not very precise and clear; in particular, more precise and harmonised methods are needed for heavily modified water bodies (HMWB). The ICPDR could have a role in further development of guidance on this issue.
- There was some **disagreement on the provisional identification of certain stretches as HMWB by national governments** in the context of the Roof Report 2004, especially certain stretches in Bavaria and on the border between Romania and Bulgaria. The general feeling was that the specific stretches have not really changed enough in their character due to physical alterations in order to be provisionally identified as HMWB.



- The **issue of HMWB should be examined again in follow-up action**, and more harmonisation should be aimed for. Also the issue of Good Ecological Status (GES) and Good Ecological Potential (GEP) should be further examined. It is very unclear so far what GEP is in the Danube basin. There is time pressure on clarifying issues on HMWB, since designation has to be completed as soon as possible (by 2007), because it will also serve as basis for the Programme of Measures in the RBMP.
- **Sediment issues** need to be considered in an integrated way. Sediment contamination causes problems in ports and waterways when these sediments have to be dredged, due to the high costs of disposal and/or treatment. The implementation of the WFD should ensure the wider and consistent application of the 'polluter pays' principle.
- The Roof Report 2004 is **not adequately linked to the ICPDR Flood Action Programme**.
- The Roof Report 2004 does not reflect clearly enough **that natural processes can also cause hydromorphological changes**. It should be emphasised that the Roof Report 2004 only discusses hydromorphological alterations, which are human-induced.
- **Different voices were heard on the issue of the deepening of the Danube**. On the one hand, it was argued that navigation is responsible for deepening. On the other hand, it was argued that erosion causes deepening, while navigation does not, since the Danube does not need deepening for navigation.

### **Possible approaches for minimising relevant impacts, especially on the transboundary level**

#### **Discussion on impacts due to the Transeuropean Networks (TENs)**

The specific project in the Danube is the Danube Navigation Corridor No. 7, which mainly concerns the improvement of 3 bottlenecks along the Danube.

- Participants identified the need for a **Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)** on a basin level and a potential role for the ICPDR in facilitating this. Specific concerns were voiced that the implementation of certain projects is moving ahead without the execution of the SEA beforehand (particularly in the lower Danube projects have been started).
- There is also the need for **Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), as well as legal compliance of individual projects** with national water laws and the WFD on a national level. Thus, while the ICPDR will be the transboundary platform to prepare a Programme of Measures, this does not take away national responsibility and legal requirements for EIAs. Overall on the international level, there is a need to provide a forum to generate understanding on these issues of future infrastructure projects and their impacts.
- Stakeholders also called for a **combined implementation of the WFD and the TENs projects**. It was mentioned that co-ordination of the TENs projects and other relevant EU processes (e.g. need for an SEA) may be performed by the TEN coordinator which is planned to be installed by Directorate General for Transport. It was suggested that the ICPDR and stakeholders should establish contact with this co-ordinator.

#### **Further topics**

- Flood protection projects often offer the potential for win-win situations. For the sake of synergies, it was suggested that the ICPDR Flood Action Programme should be fully linked to the development of the programmes of measures according to the WFD.
- The improvement of infrastructure can go hand in hand with ecological improvements as well. The example of an ecologically integrated river-engineering project on the Danube, to the east of Vienna,

was discussed as a potential model win-win scenario for ecological interests and economical uses (in this case ship traffic).

- The need to improve fish ecology was briefly addressed as well. The main problems for fish are longitudinal migration barriers as well as wave-splashing, which affects young fish. It was pointed out that fish passes and by-passes might not be the definitive solution, and also that the reversibility of hydromorphological structures should be examined, e.g. looking at the possibility of removing weirs. Some strategic follow-up was proposed for increased integration of policies between energy production, transport, flood protection and ecological issues. Participants also argued for a stronger link of the Danube process to EU processes, for example the recent definition of "environmental objectives" by water directors should be used in the Danube basin as well.

### 2.3.8 Reporting-back and plenary discussion

In response to the reporting-back from the individual work sessions, general comments on the topics discussed addressed the following issues:

- An **integrated approach to river basin management is absolutely imperative**. This requires the integration of all relevant policy areas and the creation of necessary interlinkages. The ICPDR should take an active role in this at the international level. „Business as usual in the past" without close co-ordination could form the main danger for achieving a proper implementation of the WFD in the River Danube Basin. The issue of a close co-ordination (bi-lateral; sub-basin where needed; multi-lateral; basin-wide) has thus adequately to be addressed.
- The implementation of the **WDF needs to be better integrated with other EU policies and directives** (e.g. transport policy, Birds and Habitat Directives).
- **Pollution reduction schemes** need to be introduced in order to address the issue of hazardous substances emissions. These need to be supported through **streamlined permitting and enforcement** throughout the basin. Linkages should be established to monitoring efforts as well as to the EPER scheme.
- Specially regarding the hazardous substances, the implementation of the WFD should not only be linked to the IPPC Directive and the EPER (European Pollutant Emission Register), but also to the UNECE PRTR Protocol (Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers), which has signed by most of the Danube countries, This protocol contains reporting requirements on several hazardous and other substances. It should also be considered that the EPER is being expanded into the E-PRTR (European Pollutant Release and Transfer Register).
- Concerning the issue of **future infrastructure projects**, the seriousness of the situation (93% failure to meet good quality standards) was re-emphasised in the plenary.
- Concerns related to the further development of the hydropower sector. Special emphasis was placed on several upcoming hydropower projects in the Balkan countries, given the liberalisation of the energy market and the dynamic changes in this field. In this context, a role is seen for the **ICPDR to monitor the list of such projects, co-ordinate relevant discussion and give a strong voice to river protection (according to the Danube River Protection Convention)**.
- The EU representative emphasised that in addition to the TENs, which have already been agreed on, there are other infrastructure projects in progress on the Danube tributaries. These new infrastructure projects, not included in the TENs, were only discussed very briefly in the work sessions. It was suggested to consider the impact of such projects by reflecting on the issue of future modifications (and their impacts) in future reporting of the ICPDR.

- Public participation is absolutely necessary with regards to the reduction of emissions of nutrients and of hazardous substances. Public participation needs to be supported on the national level as well.
- Special emphasis needs to be put on the work with **farmers**. Training initiatives might not be enough here, since farmers are faced with many other difficulties and thus might lack the willingness to proactively address water management issues.
- Action on improving public participation needs to be taken **now**. **Good practice examples** need to be established in order to accelerate and reinforce the process.

## 2.4 Work Block III: ICPDR Flood Action Programme

The session was opened by a statement from **Joachim D'Eugenio, DG Environment, EU Commission**, on the **EU Flood Action Programme**. Specific emphasis was placed on the three elements of the programme: information dissemination and research, EU funding possibilities and a future proposal for a legal instrument at the EU level.

It was pointed out that floods pose a major threat to the population in Europe and world-wide, and that floods cause considerable economic damages.

### Initiatives at the European level:

- Funding (research, regional policy, agricultural budgets)
- 2000: WFD: obligation for prevention
- 2002: EU Solidarity Fund, EU Flood Alert System
- 2003: New EU CAP
- Best Practice Document on flood prevention, protection and mitigation
- 2004: Communication on flood risk management, including a proposal for EU concerted action
- Environment Council conclusion of floods
- Proposal for rural development and new cohesion policy

**The EU Flood Action Programme consist of 3 distinct components:**

#### 1. Information and research

- Improve the exchange of information, sharing of experiences and co-ordinated development,
- Development of stronger linkages between research and authorities,
- Increasing awareness of flood risks among stakeholders, more effective communication.

#### 2. EU funding possibilities

- European Solidarity Fund,
- New Cohesion Policy 2007 – 2013,
- Rural development regulation,
- EU Neighbourhood Policy.

#### 3. Proposal for a legal instrument (Directive)

- Based on annex of Floods Communication,
- Will require development of flood mapping and flood risk management plans,
- Risk-based approach.

In the further development of the EU Flood Action Programme, stakeholders will be consulted on many different levels.

This consultation includes meetings with EU-Member States, accession countries, NGOs, and other interested organisations. International river basin commissions, such as the ICPDR, will also be actively involved.

In the second part of the session, **Sustainable Flood Protection in the Danube River Basin** was presented from two different angles.

**Igor Liska, ICPDR Technical Expert on Water Quality**, pointed out that the **ICPDR has the responsibility for flood control** (Articles 3, 9, 16 of Danube River Protection Convention) in the Danube river basin.

In meeting this responsibility, the ICPDR engaged in drafting:

→ **Action Programme for Sustainable Flood Protection (approved in 2004).**

The Action Programme for Sustainable Flood Protection comprises the following targets and principles.

**Basic Principles:**

- Connects to EU flood-risk management policy,
- Joint action of governments, municipalities and stakeholders,
- Reduction of flood risks,
- Solidarity among Danube countries and joint action in flood mitigation.

**Targets:**

- Improvement of forecasting and early warning systems,
- Creating a forum for exchange of expert knowledge,
- Recommendations for a common approach in the assessment of flood-prone areas and evaluation of flood risk,
- Support to the co-ordination of flood action plans for sub-basins.

**Sandor Toth, Chairman of the ICPDR Flood Protection Expert Group** then focused on the **Implementation of the Action Programme for Sustainable Flood Protection in the Danube River Basin.**

The **main activities of ICPDR** in this respect are:

- The **European Flood Alert System**, which is based on data from the European Commission Joint Research Centre, hydrometeorological and hydrological data from the Danube countries, other meteorological data and forecasts and utilises the rainfall run-off model LISFLOOD, **does not aim to replace national forecasts but rather to support them** with a 6 to 10 day warning horizon.
- The promotion of flood action planning in bilateral and multilateral frameworks **at the sub-basin level**. The **ICPDR acts in a supporting function**, while the Danube countries are responsible for the actual implementation of the respective measures.

In the framework of the Flood Action Programme a **number of possible non-structural and structural measures have been identified**. In addition, conducive economic and organisational conditions are endorsed by the ICPDR Flood Action Programme to the Danube countries.

The following tasks have been identified in the context of the Flood Action Programme for the coming years.

**Danube River Basin – Flood Action Programme Timetable:**

<b>Task</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Further development and testing of a basin-wide <b>Danube Flood Alert System</b> as part of the <b>European Flood Alert System</b> for medium-range forecasts, based on the LISFLOOD system, to provide additional information to national and regional flood-forecasting authorities by EC-JRC and ICPDR	<b>Dec 2006</b>
Publication of progress reports every three years, publication of the first progress report	end of 2007
Preparation of <b>sub-basin Flood Action Plans</b> – plans to be adopted and published by countries and/or international sub-basin arrangements	by the end of 2009

**Stakeholder feedback to the presentations and plenary discussion**

The stakeholders expressed approval of ICPDR activities in the area of flood protection. A few issues were mentioned for further consideration:

- ICPDR activities **should be co-ordinated with already existing programmes and approaches** (as for example the GWP project on floods<sup>4</sup>).
- The **issue of flash floods** is the main cause of loss of life in the region.  
→ There is a clear **need to harmonise the forecasting system** for these floods among the Danube countries, as communication sometimes fails and the signal reaches the population after the flood event.
- Participants also called for proposals for more non-structural measures against floods, which would require better bi-lateral co-operation, as these are basin-wide issues.
- More **co-operation is needed at the regional level**, the sub-basin and with the EU, to avoid the duplication of efforts
- **The establishment of a regular forum for exchange** on the issue of flood was clearly advocated.

### **Response by the ICPDR**

The ICPDR welcomed this **offer for co-operation and joint approaches** brought forward by the stakeholders present.

The ICPDR will extend an invitation to those interested to the next **Working Group Meeting on Floods to be held on 24-25 October 2005 in Ljubljana**.

The **need for involving other types of water users** in the basin-wide process of flood protection was clearly acknowledged.

The issue of information provision on flooding to housing and industry developments and the role of private investors was also briefly discussed. Here, according to ICPDR, the situation is very diverse in the Danube river basin. While in the more developed regions flood assessment and mapping exercises are conducted and the information is available on the web, in many countries this information does not exist and/or is not publicly available.

---

<sup>4</sup> WMO project on Associated Programme on flood management: local, regional and national involvement of several regions around the world.

### 3 Conclusions of the conference

**Philip Weller**, ICPDR, presented the main conclusions of the conference in the final plenary session.

The Danube Basin Analysis (**Roof Report 2004**) was for the most part received favourably by the stakeholders. Notwithstanding this, concrete additions and amendments were proposed in the working sessions. Concrete suggestions are discussed in the context of the workshop reports (see above). It was suggested that more emphasis should be put on the area of hydromorphological alterations, and on additional data on hazardous. The Roof Report should also address the interlinkages with other relevant policy areas.

**ICPDR** will collect suggestions and incorporate them to the possible and feasible extent in the process of further implementing the EU Water Framework Directive, namely in the development of the Programme of Measures and the DRB Management Plan.

The workshop sessions also resulted in concrete suggestions for **possible measures** to be taken under the Water Framework Directive. These ranged from concrete management options and the support of the on-the-ground implementation to the better promotion of policy linkages and co-ordination with the EU Commission efforts.

The **role of the ICPDR** was addressed several times in the course of the workshop discussions. The ICPDR was clearly seen as having an important and supportive role in the future steps of WFD implementation. Key areas of the ICPDR will focus on:

- the provision of information on a basin-wide scale to all member countries,
- the support and co-ordination of national initiatives at the transboundary level,
- creating the linkage to efforts on the EU level.

It became clear, however, that **national authorities are not exempt** from the requirement to start and maintain national activities. The ICPDR can only provide for a common approach and the establishment of stronger linkages and collaboration.

An important issue was the **representation of different stakeholders at the conference**. A large number of countries and sectors were present in Budapest.

- There was a strong representation of environmental NGOs, national river basin management authorities and other selected interest groups.
- It will be of crucial relevance to involve additional stakeholders, particularly from the agricultural and industrial sectors, especially when considering the Programme of Measures to be developed over the coming years.
- These stakeholders need to be addressed **in a different format**. The Danube River Basin Stakeholder Conference will serve as a reference point for future activities.

There is a **strong need to raise the awareness** of the challenge of sustainable river basin management among all relevant stakeholders in the Danube river basin. The Stakeholder Conference only constituted the **starting point** for a longer process. Suggestions need to be followed-up soon by the ICPDR and other actors addressed in the conference report, in order to meet the implementation deadlines set by the WFD.

## 4 Follow-up to the conference

The follow-up to the conference requires action from, and opens opportunities, for all parties involved.

In the **short-term**, the results of the Stakeholder Conference will be integrated in the current process of work at the ICPDR.

**Stakeholders present at the conference**  
comment on the content of the conference report until the end of September.

**ICPDR**  
discusses the conference report as well as the collected stakeholder feedback on the Danube Basin Analysis at the ICPDR Ordinary Meeting in December 2005.

In the **long-term**, the ICPDR invites all stakeholders to become more actively involved with the work of the ICPDR.

→ One possible option to engage more closely with the work of the Commission is **to become an observer with the ICPDR**. The guidelines for obtaining observership status can be found at [www.icpdr.org](http://www.icpdr.org).

The ICPDR will use the Stakeholder Conference as a starting point and reference for further activities. These will include:

- strengthening the dialogue with stakeholders already involved, including **more detailed discussions** on concrete topics,
- **starting the exchange with further stakeholder groups** not yet involved,
- supporting **activities pursued by national authorities** to strengthen stakeholder involvement,
- **co-ordination of efforts** at the basin-wide level.



## 5 Annex

### 5.1 Background to the conference

In the context of efforts to promote the implementation of the WFD in the entire Danube river basin, the ICPDR, in its role as co-ordinating platform, has put a special emphasis during the past years on the promotion of public participation on a basin-wide scale.

The main goals pursued by the ICPDR so far pertained to the conceptualisation of a common strategy on public participation for the Danube basin as well as ensuring a harmonised approach on implementation at all levels of RBM.

To this end, the ICPDR, in close co-ordination with UNDP/GEF Regional Project, has launched a process, which resulted in the 'Danube River Basin Strategy for Public Participation in RBM Planning' and the 'Operational Plan for Public Participation Activities on the basin-wide level', issued in the wake of a participatory process in 2003.

Among the activities carried out by ICPDR to implement these strategies, a stakeholder-analysis workshop was organised in December 2003. The objective of this event was to identify stakeholder groups on a Danube-wide scale as future addressees and partners for information, consultation and active involvement in the context of WFD implementation as well as to gauge the time and other resource requirements for realising such participatory activities.

The workshop resulted in the identification of 23 distinct stakeholder categories with relevance to WFD implementation in the Danube basin<sup>5</sup>. At the same time, workshop participants endorsed an early involvement of stakeholders in the implementation process of the WFD in line with the requirements of the WFD. Furthermore, participants identified, among other issues, the need for the following future activities:

- further research on the specific organisational capacities and structures within individual stakeholder groups,
- the development of a ICPDR communication strategy targeted at the various different stakeholder groups,
- examining the possibility of integrating representatives from stakeholder groups in the work of the ICPDR expert groups.

Based on the results of the workshop and in line with the approval of Stage II of the Operational Plan for Public Participation Activities for 2005, the RBM EG particularly expanded its activities with a focus on the information of stakeholders on the status of WFD implementation in the basin.

In reviewing the past processes, and with a view to further strengthen the active involvement of stakeholders, the RBM EG decided to use existing institutional structures in the Danube River Basin, and specifically the basin-wide Danube Day, celebrated for the first time in 2004, as an occasion for organising a stakeholder conference that would serve as a stepping stone for future participatory initiatives.

The ICPDR Ordinary Meeting 2004 in Vienna provided the official mandate for the organisation of such a conference in the official meeting resolutions.

---

<sup>5</sup> The identified stakeholders comprised the following groups: agriculture, fisheries, forestry, recreation, flood protection, transport, water supply, wastewater, industry, energy, consumers, education and research, professional organisations, European level governance, municipalities, communication and media, religious organisations, NGOs, international agreements and organisations, granting institutions, lending institutions, investors, political parties.

## 5.2 List of Participants

1.	<b>Marina Babic-Mladenovic</b>	Institute Jaroslav Cerni	Serbia and Montenegro
2.	<b>Jasmine Bachmann</b>	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	
3.	<b>Chris Baker</b>	Wetlands International	The Netherlands
4.	<b>Peter Bakonyi</b>	VITUKI	Hungary
5.	<b>Galia Bardarska</b>	Bulgarian Academy of Sciences	Bulgaria
6.	<b>Christian Baumgartner</b>	Friends of Nature International	
7.	<b>Barbara Becker</b>	via donau - Österreichische Wasserstraßen GmbH	Austria
8.	<b>Walter Binder</b>	Bavarian Water Management Agency	Germany
9.	<b>Pavel Biza</b>	Povodi Moravy, s.p.	Czech Republic
10.	<b>Jürg Bloesch</b>	International Association for Danube Research (IAD)	Switzerland
11.	<b>Igor Bodik</b>	Global Water Partnership - Central and Eastern Europe (GWP)	Slovak Republic
12.	<b>Christine Bratrach</b>	WWF International	Austria
13.	<b>Helena Carsca</b>	Danube Environmental Forum (DEF)	Slovak Republic
14.	<b>Paul Csagoly</b>	UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project	
15.	<b>Anna Csiti</b>	Central Dredging Association (CEDA)	The Netherlands
16.	<b>Eva Csobod</b>	The Regional Environmental Center for CEE (REC)	Hungary
17.	<b>Joachim D'Eugenio</b>	European Commission	
18.	<b>Eva Deseo</b>	Ministry for Environment	Hungary
19.	<b>Ursula Deutsch</b>	Danube Tourism Commission	
20.	<b>Johannes Drielsma</b>	European Association of Mining Industries (EUROMINES)	Belgium
21.	<b>Dumitru Drumea</b>	National Institute of Ecology	Moldavia
22.	<b>Thomas Dworak</b>	Ecologic	Germany
23.	<b>Kari Eik</b>	UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project	
24.	<b>Laurice Ereifej</b>	WWF Hungary	Hungary
25.	<b>David Fina</b>	Povodi Moravy, s.p.	Czech Republic
26.	<b>Hellmut Fleckseder</b>	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry Environment and Water Management	Austria
27.	<b>Erno Fleit</b>	European Anglers Alliance (EAA)	
28.	<b>Milena Forejtnikova</b>	Water Research Institute	Czech Republic
29.	<b>Maria Galambos</b>	Ministry for Environment	Hungary
30.	<b>Jozsef Gayer</b>	Global Water Partnership - Central and Eastern Europe (GWP)	Hungary
31.	<b>Boryana Georgieva</b>	Ministry of Environment and Water	Bulgaria
32.	<b>Levente Gulyas</b>	WWF Hungary	Hungary

33.	<b>Björn Guterstam</b>	Global Water Partnership (Secretariat)	Sweden
34.	<b>Joachim Heidemeier</b>	German Federal Environment Agency	Germany
35.	<b>Dora Herman</b>	Alcoa Fujikura Hungary	Hungary
36.	<b>Leticia Hernando</b>	European Landowners' Organisation	
37.	<b>Istvan Ijjas</b>	International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage (ICID)	Hungary
38.	<b>Milan Janak</b>	Danube Environmental Forum (DEF)	Slovak Republic
39.	<b>Andras Janossy</b>	For the Danube Foundation	Hungary
40.	<b>Graziella Jula</b>	Romanian Waters National Administration	Romania
41.	<b>Mihaly Kadar</b>	UN ECE Convention	Hungary
42.	<b>Eleftheria Kampa</b>	Ecologic	Germany
43.	<b>Emoke Kemenes</b>	Alcoa Fujikura Hungary	Hungary
44.	<b>Marianne Keudel</b>	University of Cologne	Germany
45.	<b>Walter Kling</b>	International Association of Water Supply Companies in the Danube River Catchment Area (IAWD)	Austria
46.	<b>Vit Kodes</b>	Czech Hydrometeorological Institute	Czech Republic
47.	<b>R. Andreas Kraemer</b>	Ecologic	Germany
48.	<b>Nicole Kranz</b>	Ecologic	Germany
49.	<b>Martien Lankester</b>	Avalon Foundation	The Netherlands
50.	<b>Ferenc Laszlo</b>	VITUKI	Hungary
51.	<b>James Lenoci</b>	LENOCI Consulting Ltd.	Hungary
52.	<b>Igor Liska</b>	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	
53.	<b>Otto Malek</b>	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	Germany
54.	<b>Milan Matuska</b>	Global Water Partnership - Central and Eastern Europe (GWP)	Slovakia
55.	<b>Miodrag Milovanovic</b>	Institute Jaroslav Cerni	Serbia and Montenegro
56.	<b>Boris Minarik</b>	Slovak Water Management Enterprise	Slovak Republic
57.	<b>Laszlo Mrekva</b>	Lower-Danube-Valley Environmental and Water Directorate	Hungary
58.	<b>Gerhard Nagl</b>	Danube Environmental Forum	Germany
59.	<b>Magda Toth Nagy</b>	The Regional Environmental Center for CEE (REC)	Hungary
60.	<b>Doubravka Nedvedova</b>	Ministry of the Environment	Czech Republic
61.	<b>Dermot O'Regan</b>	Center for Ecology and Hydrology	United Kingdom
62.	<b>Istvan Öri</b>	Ministry for Environment	Hungary
63.	<b>Hajnalka Petrics</b>	University of Bologna	Italy
64.	<b>Otto Pirker</b>	Verbund Austrian Hydro Power AG	Austria
65.	<b>Liviu-Nicolae Popescu</b>	National Research-Development Institute for Environmental Protection (I.C.I.M.)	Romania

66.	<b>Michaela Popovici</b>	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	
67.	<b>Georg Raffeiner</b>	Umweltdachverband	Austria
68.	<b>Alfred Rauchbüchl</b>	Federal Agency for Water Management	Austria
69.	<b>Jens Rupp</b>	Coca-Cola HBC	
70.	<b>Monica Russo</b>	University of Bologna	Italy
71.	<b>Michael Schabus</b>	European Anglers Alliance (EAA)	Austria
72.	<b>Ursula Schmedtje</b>	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	
73.	<b>Petru Serban</b>	Romanian Waters National Administration	Romania
74.	<b>Kinga Shalaby</b>	Budapest Major's Office	Hungary
75.	<b>Dave Sheahan</b>	Central Dredging Association - CEDA	United Kingdom
76.	<b>Markus Simoner</b>	via donau - Österreichische Wasserstraßen GmbH	Austria
77.	<b>John Solbe</b>	International Association for Soaps, Detergents and Maintenance Products (A.I.S.E.)	Belgium
78.	<b>Nike Sommerwerk</b>		Germany
79.	<b>Eva Sovjakova</b>	Ministry of the Environment	Czech Republic
80.	<b>Sabine Stadler</b>		Austria
81.	<b>Markus Starkl</b>	University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences	Austria
82.	<b>Pavla Stepankova</b>	TGM Water Research Institute	Czech Republic
83.	<b>Orsolya Szalasi</b>	The Regional Environmental Center for CEE (REC)	Hungary
84.	<b>Niels Thyssen</b>	European Environment Agency	Denmark
85.	<b>Iulia Mariana Toader</b>	Parliament of Romania	Romania
86.	<b>Sandor Toth</b>	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	
87.	<b>Jaroslav Ungermann</b>	Union for the Morava River	Czech Republic
88.	<b>Aurel Varduca</b>	National Research-Development Institute for Environmental Protection (I.C.I.M.)	Romania
89.	<b>Aurora Vasiu</b>	Global Water Partnership - Central and Eastern Europe (GWP) "Apele Romane"	Romania
90.	<b>Birgit Vogel</b>	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry Environment and Water	Austria
91.	<b>Bernhard Wehrli</b>	Green Electricity from Hydropower - Limnological Research Center	Switzerland
92.	<b>Philip Weller</b>	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR)	
93.	<b>Peter Whalley</b>	UNDP/GEF Danube Regional Project	
94.	<b>Johannes Wolf</b>	Danube Environmental Forum (DEF)	
95.	<b>Stefanie Wurm</b>	Ecologic	Germany

96.	<b>John Ralph Young</b>	International Association for Soaps, Detergents and Maintenance Products (A.I.S.E.)	Belgium
97.	<b>Alexander Zinke</b>	Zinke Environment Consulting	Austria
98.	<b>Martina Zupan</b>	Global Water Partnership - Central and Eastern Europe (GWP)	Slovenia