Co-financed by the Connecting Europe Facility of the European Union

Preparing FAIRway 2 works in the Rhine-Danube corridor

MINUTES (final)

Stakeholders' Forum Meeting 10 (SHFM10)

Date	28.10.2024
Time	10:00 – 13:00
Place	Online meeting (*Google Meet*) https://meet.google.com/oow-tjqb-dst
Participants	See List of Participants (LoP)
For the minutes	Katarina Marinković, Predrag Živadinović

The presentations are available for download on the Stakeholders' Forum website.

Welcome note

Mr. Ljubiša Mihajlović welcomed all to the 10th Stakeholder Forum meeting for the Project "Preparing FAIRway 2 Works in the Rhine-Danube Corridor." He introduced himself as a representative of the Directorate for Inland Waterways. The Serbian Ministry (MGSI) is a project partner responsible for organising and coordinating the Stakeholder Forum in the project.

Ms. Marina Ilić, the chairperson of the forum meeting, presented an overview of the agenda outlined the scheduled presentations for the meeting.

Modelling & Multi-Criteria Analysis of the common Danube section

Hydraulic and morphological modelling of the SRB-CRO common stretch of the Danube River

(Romeo Soare, Hidrozavod DTD, 2024-10-28_PPT_01_SHFM10_Project Activities Overview_Soare.pdf)

Mr. Soare, responsible for management activities, provided an update of the project status and recent progress.

The main outcomes until now include the updated value for the low navigable water level across the entire project sector, as well as the revised bottlenecks catalogue and prioritization of bottleneck areas.

For the multi-criteria analysis, agreement on the criteria is required to proceed with processing. This included establishing the baseline and developing 2D hydrodynamic models to create alternative solutions for typical navigation areas, including a do-nothing scenario. These findings will be included in the integrated report in the coming weeks.

Summary outputs indicated that the 1D model was calibrated and operational, the updated low navigable water levels for selected gauge stations were established, and the bottlenecks catalogue was updated with agreed prioritized bottlenecks for modelling. The criteria for the multi-criteria analysis were selected and proposed.

Next steps involve reaching consensus on the criteria for the multi-criteria analysis with the stakeholders forum, developing the 2D models, and creating alternative solutions. The application of the criteria for the multi-criteria analysis will facilitate prioritization of the identified sectors.

Hydraulic and morphological modelling of the SRB-CRO common stretch of the Danube River, Task 1-2: Hydrological study *(Jasna Plavšić, Hidrozavod DTD, 2024-10-28_PPT_02_SHFM10_HydrolStudy_Plavsic.pdf)*

The hydrological study has been completed, providing key updates and results. The primary objective was to characterize flow regimes and compute reference discharges for low and high navigable water levels in the Serbo-Croatian sector of the Danube, between the Hungarian border and Bačka-Palanka.

Data coverage over the last 30 years was incomplete, with Bezdan and Bogojevo being the only stations with full records. Croatian stations provided data only from 2001 and following years, limiting their records to approximately 20 years. Stage-discharge curves were also necessary for calculations, and all relevant data was eventually acquired for eight stations included in the analysis.

Inconsistencies in water level measurements and stage discharge curves were identified, particularly at twin stations (Bezdan and Batina; Ilok and Bačka-Palanka). Recommendations were made for simultaneous measurements in collaboration with both Croatian and Serbian sites to address these discrepancies in the future.

Flow duration curves were computed based on discharge data from the last 30 years, excluding the data from ice periods for Serbian stations. This exclusion was possible for Serbian stations but not for Croatian stations, for which information on ice phenomena was not available. Moreover, shorter discharge records at Croatian stations also contribute to inconsistent duration curves at Serbian and Croatian stations. This has led to the need for adjustments to mitigate bias from shorter records and the lack of ice data. Transfer functions were developed and applied to correct results from stations with limited data.

The reference discharges obtained from the flow duration curves at 8 locations It was essential to ensure that reference discharges obtained from the flow duration curves at 8 locations are consistent along the given Danube stretch (upstream discharges cannot be greater than those downstream). Comparisons on slide 6 in presentation demonstrated the adjustments made to discharges with durations of 94% and 1%.

The current analysis revealed higher low flows and lower high flows compared to the analysis for previous periods. It was shown that these results are corroborated by a shift in the frequency distribution of daily discharges at Bezdan and Bogojevo in the last 30 years compared to the 1981-2010 period. Moreover, it was shown that the latest projections of climate change impact on the middle Danube discharges by Probst & Mauser (2023) also predict higher low flows in both near and far future.

Final results of defining reference water levels based on reference discharges and current rating curves showed that these levels at stations were consistent, with minor discrepancies noted at Ilok and Bačka Palanka. The hydrodynamic modelling will be based on these hydrological results to inform final environmental assessments at all relevant cross-sections. This concludes the hydrological study.

Questions & Answers:

Q (Mr. Neven Trenc, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development): Could you clarify what the chosen water level means for nature protection?

A (Ms. Jasna Plavšić, Hidrozavod DTD): I'm focused on hydrology, not biology or environmental science.

This is simply a description of the situation over the last 30 years, compared to projections from other studies. It's important to clarify that these findings are not from our research but from existing literature.

In terms of water quantity, it looks like there will be fewer extreme low-flow situations compared to what we've seen over the last 30 years. While this is based on historical data, it's important to note that we can't predict future conditions over the next 30 years. Overall, the last three decades have been less extreme in terms of low flows compared to the period from 1981 to 2010.

As for the impact on the flora and fauna of the Danube, it's likely that having more water is generally better for ecosystems than having less, but specific effects would be best addressed by environmental specialists.

The goal was to demonstrate that these findings are consistent with expectations from the literature. There is a general anticipation of more extreme situations with climate change. The previous assessment of ENRs revealed even lower low flows than previously assessed, so it was anticipated that this decreasing trend

would continue. However, this study now shows some increase and the climate change projections from literature also suggest such an increasing trend.

Lot 1: Hydraulic and morphological modelling of the SRB-CRO common stretch of the Danube River: Hydraulic modelling and multi-criteria analysis *(Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD, 2024-10-28_PPT_03_SHFM10_1D_MCA_Hidrozavod.pdf)*

2.1 Hydraulic Modelling and Redefinition and 2.2 Prioritization of Navigational Bottlenecks

This presentation provided a detailed overview of the modelling. The consultant confirmed that the data utilized came from only one, common vertical coordinate system used in both Serbia and Croatia.

Bathymetry data and rating curves were provided in the old vertical coordinate system, meaning that the water level calculation results were also valid within this framework. The low navigation water levels were determined under steady flow conditions, using discharge rates from the common sector. Maps were created to illustrate where the required fairway width (for 200 m) and depth conditions were met.

Based on the results of 1D flow simulations, a catalog of critical sectors was developed, which has been recently updated. The updated catalog now included 13 sectors, with four sectors excluded from the previous list.

An example sector was presented to illustrate the information contained in the catalog (→ see slide #9 for an example). This included textual information and figures showing areas where the minimum navigable depth was achieved at fairway width (fairway provided by the both river administrations), along with a historical cross-sections stacked in layers, highlighting changes and trends over time.

For prioritization, the volumes of sediment located within the fairway (fairway defined and provided by the river administrations) were analyzed. A level of service approach was applied (for 100, 120, 150 and 200m), excluding sectors where the minimum width conditions were met. Five consecutive sectors were selected for further activities. Notably, while the Aljmaš sector was not deemed critical according to prior analyses, it was still integrated into the modelling to connect the remaining critical sectors.

Given that the Mohovo sector is characterized by a rocky bottom, it is not possible to apply any structural measures that would alter the riverbed. Therefore, the modeling of the Mohovo sector is excluded from the analysis.

Questions & Answers:

Additional comment (Mr. Tibor Mikuška, Croatian Society for Bird and Nature Protection): On the slide #9 with the example, it would be beneficial to include river kilometers on the map to aid spatial orientation. Additionally, certain aspects should be added or verified. One important point is the overall ecological status of the water body. Although the water framework directive is referenced, it lacks clarity on the source of this status. It should be specified which data were used—whether from ICPDR, local studies, or assessments.

Regarding protected areas, it is necessary to include Natura 2000 sites in addition to those protected by national laws.

Furthermore, the distance to the centre of the bottleneck, it would be helpful to indicate whether it is upstream or downstream from the gauging station, as this distinction is important.

There is also a need for clarification about the left and right banks, especially in areas where both states share borders. The border issue is complex, but accuracy is essential, and any disputes should be noted.

Two additional pieces of information are needed. One is the average number of days per year that navigation was impacted by this particular bottleneck, ideally covering the period from 2010 to 2023. The second is a box indicating whether this potential bottleneck can be addressed through soft measures, along with applicable measures.

It is recommended to use the term "potential bottlenecks," as referenced in the initial Hidroing study of the project. It was clearly stated that navigation is not currently hampered by these bottlenecks. The

study has provided more information, and while some sites were excluded, they should still be classified as potential bottlenecks.

Additional information regarding previous comment (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): A clear definition of bottlenecks is established making use of the Danube Commission criteria for navigation to identify the critical bottlenecks. In this context, these bottlenecks are deemed critical. Additionally, soft measures will be considered and analyzed as the preferred solutions.

Q (Ms. Kerstin Böck, WWF Austria): Is the soft measures being considered as a potential measure, or is it primarily for modelling purposes? Additionally, how does this differ from other factors, especially given the presence of certain bottlenecks? The situation regarding Aljmaš, which was not originally intended to be a bottleneck, is of particular interest. How is this currently being framed?

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): The Aljmaš sector will be integrated into the modelling activities and treated like other sectors. Possible measures will be considered for its location (removal of parts of the existing regulation structures), and ecological aspects will also be addressed for this sector. In summary, it will be treated equally to the other sectors in the analysis.

Methodology for the multi-criteria analysis

The methodology for the multi-criteria analysis was presented.

The purpose of multi-criteria analysis (MCA) is to rank solutions for improving navigation based on specified criteria. This involves evaluating each solution's impacts on navigation, ecology, and economy.

The 'do nothing' scenario serves as a baseline, representing a zero-alternative solution without any structural (e.g., training works, dredging) or soft measures (e.g., shifting of the fairway) implemented, as these do not alter the riverbed.

A sediment transport model will be utilized to compare solutions in terms of ecological changes, though it will not predict absolute morphological changes. Instead, it will assess how different solutions relate to one another regarding morphological alterations. Scoring will be based on both quantitative and qualitative indicators, with expert judgment used in the scoring process.

Each solution is assigned a score, with a base score of 1 indicating the "do nothing" scenario. Scores less than 1 suggest that the scenario is not recommended for implementation, while scores greater than 1 indicate improvement. A score of 0 is unacceptable and would necessitate modification of the solution. Specific minimum acceptable scores are established for certain criteria, such as fish and bird populations and flora, ensuring that parameters related to these sub-criteria do not worsen.

For the navigation criteria group, three sub-criteria must be met for any solution other than "do nothing." The minimum acceptable score for navigation criteria is 1.5. The environmental criteria group includes six sub-criteria, each with defined indicators and acceptable scores.

Overall, the analysis will utilize various indicators to assess the potential impacts of proposed measures on hydromorphology, biodiversity, water quality, and climate change adaptability. The scoring system is designed to ensure that solutions are effective while minimizing negative ecological impacts.

Sedimentation might be favoured in other parts of the basin without measures in place. If sediments become trapped in the shared sector without interventions elsewhere, questions arise about whether consultants can adopt this approach without a broader analysis. It is important to note that relevant documents also acknowledge navigation requirements in the design of river training structures. For instance, sediment manuals indicate that river structures should be optimized to address local navigation issues.

Questions & Answers:

Q (Mr. Georg Rast, consultant): Is the assessment for the do-nothing scenario based on data from 2023, and will that data be used to establish the initial state? What about developments in the past and recognized trends? Are the conditions from 2023 specifically being modelled? Is the model operated using a hydrograph to evaluate future conditions, beginning with the do-nothing scenario? How does that process work?

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): Yes, the initial state will be used as the basis. Channel-forming discharge will be utilized for sediment transport simulation. This discharge represents a range of conditions and will be considered the dominant discharge for morphological alterations.

Q (Mr. Georg Rast, consultant): That is close to bankfull discharge?

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): For the Danube, some research indicates that channel-forming discharge is closer to average discharge, while traditionally it has been viewed as bankfull discharge. However, only one flow is used for modelling morphological change, although not for the entire modelling process. Low flow data will be utilized for some indicators, while bankfull discharge will be used for others. For example, bankfull discharge will be applied to assess water stage elevation differences, but for morphological alterations, using a single flow is practical. As for the relationship between bankfull discharge and the 1% flow (the highest navigation water level), bankfull discharge is not directly comparable to the 1% discharge.

Q (Mr. Georg Rast, consultant): Incorporating Aljmaš between the two bottlenecks could risk distorting the assessment of environmental indicators. While integrating Aljmaš may be beneficial from a modelling perspective, should it not be excluded when conducting the Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA)?

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): No, the Alimaš will not be excluded; changes will also be evaluated in relation to the Alimaš sector. Integration is always the preferred approach. However, it should be recognized that the Aljmaš will also experience changes and will be impacted by the solutions implemented. While an integrated approach to solving these issues is desirable, it falls outside the scope of the project. some indicators, such as riverbed volume, indirectly address this issue. The challenge lies in understanding how solutions analyzed in sections, particularly with respect to sediment, will impact downstream areas. Ultimately, the desired outcome is to minimize the change in sediment outflow.

Q (Mr. Georg Rast, consultant): How can you assess lateral connectivity when you have no hydraulic modelling of the floodplain? Lateral connectivity is not just about sediment input, but it's very much about whether water can flow in and out at all. But that is something out of your range. What is the real value of the lateral connectivity in this context, if there are very limited indicators to assess it?

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): Hydraulic parameters near the bank will also be compared indirectly. For instance, lateral sediment transport is influenced by the gradient of these parameters, so changes will be analyzed in that context. A groin system, for example, affects both depth and velocity, typically reducing them. This system not only promotes sedimentation within the groin fields but also impacts lateral sediment transport. These indicators are crucial for understanding the overall dynamics.

Certain phenomena will be modelled and assessed using expert judgment, which may lead to the proposal of additional mitigation measures that complement traditional river training structures. Although a model for high-water analysis is currently lacking due to insufficient input data, any issues related to inundation and the interaction with the main channel will also be evaluated based on expert judgment, supported by quantitative indicators. This emphasis on aquatic-terrestrial fluxes highlights the importance of both material movement and the movement of living organisms within these systems. The lateral connectivity ratio is referenced. The report clarifies that one quantitative indicator and one qualitative indicator will be used for this sub-criterion. The importance of expert judgment in the assessment process is also emphasized.

Q (Mr. Georg Rast, consultant): Why is climate change only an environmental indicator? It is also an indicator for navigation. If climate change has negative effects, it will negatively impact the environmental part. And that means that the navigation is profiting from the reduction of the environmental part. So that also leads to a distortion. It should be addressed in all of these major indicators.

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): Agreed that it can be a different category. The climate change will also affect navigation. There are also a lot of indicators overlapping.

Q (Mr. Neven Trenc, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development): How reliable this assessment will be for the environment, for the nature, for spawning areas?

A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): There is a lack of input data for floodplains relevant to hydraulic modelling. Climate change scenarios are not included in the project plan. However, integration into the study will occur during the sensitivity analysis. This analysis will examine the impact of input data on the results of hydraulic analysis, as well as the implications these results may have on the project in the context of multi-criteria analysis (MCA).

Reliability regarding shallow areas, dead branches, and critical habitats for fish and other species will be evaluated. As previously noted in the modelling process, the objective is to rank alternative solutions to determine their effects on hydromorphological or morphological alterations in relation to water discharge within the main channel.

Methodology for the multi-criteria analysis, environmental part

[Presenters: *Vesna Đikanović and Stefan Skorić/Hidrozavod DTD*.

See 2024-10-28_PPT_03_SHFM10_1D_MCA_Hidrozavod.pdf, →see slides#20-22]

This part of presentation relates to the assessment of bird populations, fish populations, and flora, which serve as sub-criteria connected to environmental considerations. These indicators are classified as qualitative.

The first table on slide #20 addresses environmental indicators, specifically nesting, highlighting the various species associated with the Danube and its backwaters. The second table on slide #20 presents species linked to the next indicator: wintering.

The second environmental criterion focuses on fish populations. Key indicators include spawning, migration, growth, and living conditions. The accompanying table lists fish species recorded in this critical stretch of the Danube River, emphasizing target species that hold the highest conservation status according to the IUCN, EU habitat directives, as well as Crotian and Serbian national legislation.

Next slide (→see slide #22) was showcasing the Natura 2000 habitat types and plant species registered in this critical Danube sector.

In summary, scores are provided to evaluate the potential impacts of hydromorphological changes and alterations within this critical section of the river.

Questions & Answers

Q (Ms. Kerstin Böck, WWF Austria): The discussion revolves around the existing qualitative data and the methods used to ensure it is contextualized effectively alongside quantitative data. What approaches are implemented to standardize qualitative data, allowing it to be treated similarly to quantitative data? How is the integration of qualitative data ensured to maintain parity with quantitative data?

A (Mr. Vesna Đikanović, Hidrozavod DTD): Qualitative data serves as a strong foundation for estimations and assessments within this project. Leveraging experience and expert judgment, alongside data collected from previous studies such as the Joint Danube Survey (JDS) and various national research initiatives, information has been compiled to concentrate on critical sectors and their localities. This compilation includes data from earlier studies and surveys. The displayed table on slide#21 highlights the registered fish species within this sector.

Q (Mr. Neven Trenc, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development): Even during the preparation phase, a significant question arose regarding the utilization of biological data in the model,

particularly in relation to side habitats and shallow areas. Currently, the model does not incorporate this data, relying instead on expert judgment. While the expertise of specialists is valued, having a model to guide assessments is essential.
Can this issue still be addressed? Ultimately, a comprehensive study will be needed for review, and providing informed feedback will be necessary.
A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): A numerical example has been prepared to compare the effects of a "do nothing" scenario against an alternative solution across various criteria. Hydraulic modelling will provide data on water depth, characteristic water depth, and velocity. Based on these indicators, scores will be assigned to the sub-criteria. In the navigation criteria group, most indicators are quantitative; however, aspects such as the visibility of structures will also be considered. Notably, visibility can be improved through enhanced signage or the implementation of a marking system.
A score greater than one is achievable in this context. The tables presented will relate to the feasibility and environmental criteria groups, with comments provided for certain criteria based on expert judgment.
The final table will summarize the total score, serving as a numerical justification for selecting the best solution. In this example, fairway realignment emerges as the most favourable option. This choice is supported by overall comments across the criteria, indicating that fairway realignment—along with improvements to marking systems—offers economic benefits, making it preferable to the "do nothing" scenario and the traditional groin system.
The traditional groin system is considered less favourable primarily due to its low environmental score.

Q (Mr. Tibor Mikuška, Croatian Society for Bird and Nature Protection): How are these subcriteria being assessed or indicators, and how do it arrive at a single score for a specific criterion?
A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): Modelling team recognize that many indicators overlap, making it challenging to assign scores within certain groups of sub-criteria. The aim is to simplify the methodology by presenting a comprehensive set of indicators and then assigning scores based on their values as explanations for the scores. Unfortunately, there is no specific metric behind this approach because the indicators are interdependent, making it mathematically incorrect to distribute weighting coefficients among them. While we initially intended to implement such a methodology, it proves to be complex.
Additionally, we acknowledge the navigation aspect. We can align on criteria proposed by Tibor, especially concerning navigation, such as considering river meandering, as it presents a cross-border issue. However, it's important to note that this topic may also fall outside the project's scope. Non-structural measures should be recognized as a potential solution or an integral part of the solutions we are considering.

Q (Mr. Tibor Mikuška, Croatian Society for Bird and Nature Protection): How will the river or a specific section appear in the near future, as well as over a longer time frame? Starting with the do-nothing scenario implies that we are observing the river with no interventions taking place. It was mentioned a score for navigation of one, which would be interpret as neutral. However, it's important to consider that conditions could worsen in the near future if model indicates this possibility. Therefore, is it conceivable that the score could drop below one?
A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): Zero is a zero-for-all solution. It's unacceptable solution in some manner.

Q (Mr. Tibor Mikuška, Croatian Society for Bird and Nature Protection): In certain sections, adopting a do-nothing approach might suggest that nothing will happen, but in reality, some areas could experience deterioration, particularly regarding navigation. Therefore, a score of 1 cannot be justified in those cases. Models of the river should account for this potential decline.
It's essential to ensure that the modelling accurately reflects these dynamics to provide a realistic assessment of the river's future conditions.
A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): From a mathematical perspective, it is essential to normalize the scores, and one approach to achieve this is by adopting the "do-nothing" state as the reference state. While the do-nothing solution could have negative implications from a navigation standpoint, within the context of Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA), it serves as a neutral reference state since it reflects a baseline measure. It essentially represents how nature behaves concerning navigation and morphological changes.
However, models cannot predict with absolute certainty. Although we strive to provide predictions, it is important to acknowledge the limitations.
While we cannot make precise predictions, we can compare different solutions. For instance, we can assess various options such as groin systems, sills, or chevrons, and determine which model indicates a more favourable or unfavourable outcome.

Thus, the model is primarily utilized to compare solutions, which is why we adopt the reference state as a condition following morphological alteration in scenarios without any implemented measures.

Q (Mr. Neven Trenc, Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development): Croatian experts have previously worked on fish and target species in this area, which has prepared them to include them in the assessment. What will be the administrative process moving forward for this project for Croatian side? Following this stage, the study will be conducted. How are we progressing in terms of that preparation?

A (Ms. Lidija Hubalek, MMPI)*:* Oikon was contracted for the duration of the project to ensure their continued involvement. The study is part of the Serbian activities. While specific measures will be included in the study following the completion of the Serbian portion, we will need to determine how to proceed once this project is finalized. At this point, we don't have any concrete plans for that future phase.

Q (Mr. Arno Mohl, WWF Austria): Previously, there was inquiry about the possibility of preparing synthesis maps for the various themes or topics. Has this been accomplished? Is it feasible to create these synthesis maps within the project to visualize the bottlenecks and stretches by integrating the different teams' input into one cohesive map? Specifically, referring to GIS maps related to biodiversity or other relevant topics or themes that could be consolidated into a single map.

A(Ms. Lidija Hubalek, MMPI)*:* There are currently issues with servers due to the transition to a new provider. Unfortunately, this is an obstacle for accessing the database. However, the maps will be prepared as soon as possible, as we have not yet provided them to our Serbian colleagues.

Q (Mr. Arno Mohl, WWF Austria): It is crucial to consider not only navigation objectives but also environmental objectives to maintain a proper balance. The Danube stretch in question is ecologically significant on a European scale; however, it also has its deficiencies, primarily due to past interventions that have disrupted the sediment balance. This includes riverbed incision and the disconnection of floodplain areas, leading to their deterioration.
Once this project is finalized, it appears that we are still far from initiating any effective planning for necessary measures. How is it intended to address the limitations or this dilemma, particularly regarding the lack of consideration for environmental objectives at this stage? Which steps are planned to resolve this issue?
A (Mr. Nikola Rosić, Hidrozavod DTD): Certainly, it can be elaborated on that in a dedicated section of our report. This will involve considering numerous parameters and their dependencies on the outcomes of our modelling process. Collaboration among experts, including ecologists and river hydraulics specialists, will be essential.

Monitoring of the Croatian/Serbian Danube Common section

Monitoring activities-status quo *(Lidija Hubalek, MMPI)*

Ms. Lidija Hubalek (MMPI), the Croatian national coordinator for this project, stated that the revised final monitoring report, along with the catalogue and all annexes, was distributed to the Stakeholder Forum on Thursday, 24 October 2024. While an attempt was made to compile a single document containing all comments, it is believed that it may be more effective to review the questions posed and the actions taken during this period. A separate folder with the comments has been included for reference.

Access to the WebGIS has been included within the final monitoring report under the WebGIS section. Unfortunately, as previously mentioned, the migration to another server was ongoing, but it is anticipated that these will be resolved within a week. A transition to new web addresses is in progress, with an aim to provide access to the WebGIS by mid-2025. The project will be finalized end this year, and an additional six-month access period to the WebGIS is deemed sufficient. An extension of this access can be considered if there is interest. The development of this database as an internal resource has always been the intention.

Please feel free to make contact if further needs or questions arise. Gratitude is extended for all support, assistance, and contributions during the preparation of the documents and throughout the monitoring implementation process.

Next Steps for Finalizing Initial Reports

Following the discussions on key deliverables in today's meeting, the finalization process for several critical reports has been outlined. Specifically, these reports include:

- 1D Modeling Report (Annex 3)
- Report on Hydrological Analysis and Update of ENRs (Annex 2)
- Updated Bottlenecks Catalogue (Annex 4)
- Report on the Prioritization of Navigation Bottlenecks (Annex 5)

These reports were initially presented in the previous meeting in Bačka Palanka and final drafts were submitted for stakeholder review via on 15 October 2024 (with 14 days deadline for feedback). All feedback gathered to date, as well as additional input provided during today's meeting (or any remaining if applicable to be submitted immediately post-meeting), will be integrated by the consultants into the final versions of above-mentioned reports.

Additionally, the draft Multi-Criteria Analysis (MCA) Report, containing more details on the slides presented today, will be circulated to the Stakeholder Forum in the coming days for review.

Thanks are extended to all stakeholders who have actively contributed their insights and expertise. The finalized reports will be prepared by the consulting team and subsequently submitted to the Stakeholder Forum.

The work on 2D modelling, Bottlenecks Variants Defined and application of MCA on these variants is ongoing and will be presented during the next Stakeholder Forum meetings.

Next steps & AOB

- Stakeholder Forum meetings planning for 2024

  Following the discussions among participants at the Forum, it has been decided that the next meeting will take place on **20th of November 2024**. Additionally, one more meeting is scheduled, on 11th December 2024 (morning). Further details will be provided as the dates approach.

Upcoming Meetings

Meeting	Date / time	Place
Stakeholder Forum Meeting #11	20 November 2024	Online
Stakeholder Forum Meeting #12	11 December 2024 (morning)	Online

Attachments

- List of participants (separate file)
- Presentations (Stakeholder Forum website: https://www.viadonau.org/en/company/project-database/preparing-fairway-2-works-in-the-rhine-danube-corridor-study/stakeholder-forum