

## Preparing FAIRway 2 works in the Rhine-Danube Corridor

Twinned Actions (2019-EU-TM-0262-S/2019-HR-TMC-0263-S)

### MINUTES (Final)

#### Stakeholders' Forum Meeting 02 (SHFM02)

Date 09.06.2021

Time 12:30-15:30

Place online (*GoToMeeting*)

- Participants
- Danube Commission: Dejan Trifunović
  - WWF Adria: Branka Španiček, Nikola Matović
  - WWF Austria: Arno Mohl, Kerstin Boeck,
  - Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management - Republic Waters Directorate (SRB): Gordana Špegar
  - MMPI (HRV): Marijana Cindrić, Lana Deraković-Rakas, Lidija Hubalek, Zrinko Zvocak
  - Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (HRV): Neven Trenc
  - MCTI - Directorate for Inland Waterways (SRB): Ivan Mitrović
  - viadonau: Andreas Baeck, Gert-Jan Muilerman, Iris Marstaller, Lucia Karpatyova, Viktoria Weissenburger
  - Environmental Agency Austria: Alexander Zinke, Daniel Trauner, Kudrnovski Helmut
  - Institute of Landscape Development, Recreation and Conservation Planning
  - Austrian MAB National Committee for UNESCO: Arne Arnberger
  - independent: Georg Rast

For the minutes Ivan Mitrović

Documents distributed prior to the meeting  
Agenda

---

### Welcome note, introduction of participants, organizational issues

Mr. Mitrović (MCTI) opened the second Stakeholders' Forum meeting (SHFM) and welcomed participants. All participants introduced themselves and briefly presented expectations from participation in the Stakeholders' Forum (SHF) activities. After the *tour the table*, Mr. Mitrović reminded participants on the organizational issues: basic principles of video conferencing via *GoToMeeting* tool, methods of asking for the floor, logging in by name and surname, usage of the chat box, usage of the camera, keeping the sound muted unless given floor, and privacy protection rules. All participants acknowledged stipulated organizational guidelines and commonly agreed on them.

### Results of the evaluation of the SHFM01

Mr. Mitrović reported that only four questionnaires were submitted and that no major conclusions can be extracted. He kindly asked participants to make an effort and submit filled-in questionnaires after the meeting, so that performance of the SHF could be tracked.

## SHF Members list

Mr. Mitrović presented the latest version of the Members List containing twelve members. He noted that some members excused themselves for not participating at the SHFM02.

## Monitoring plan for navigational and environmental characteristics of the Croatian/Serbian common stretch of the Danube River – Summary of steps and the Final Monitoring plan

Ms. Hubalek gave an overview of the accepted Monitoring Plan, including steps in the run of harmonization of the document.

Mr. Arnberger asked if socioeconomic factors are included in the monitoring, and Ms. Hubalek responded no.

Ms. Špegar asked if qualitative or quantitative sediment monitoring are foreseen, and Ms. Hubalek responded that both are foreseen.

Mr. Mohl noted that many of their comments and suggestions have been included in the monitoring plan. However they have given comments and input based on their field of expertise and where they felt confident at the given time, therefore comments do not claim to be exhaustive. In contrary, if they didn't comment on certain items, it does not automatically mean that they have no input or agree with them. He also asked for provision of more time for commenting documents in the future. Ms. Hubalek responded that sufficient time will be provided.

## Hydraulic and morphological modelling of the common SRB-HRV stretch of the Danube River – general concept

Mr. Višić presented the general concept for hydraulic and morphological modelling of the common SRB-HRV stretch of the Danube River.

Mr. Trenc asked if the area of the Monitoring and Modelling is the same, and Mr. Mitrović responded that the areas of interest are the same. He added that the level of details in modelling depends of the level of prioritization of sectors and available budget.

Mr. Arnberger asked if alternative solutions include “doing nothing”, and Mr. Mitrović responded yes.

Mr. Trenc asked if there are already identified bottlenecks from practice and is it expected to have more bottlenecks than earlier identified. Mr. Mitrović responded that the riverbed is morphologically dynamic on this stretch, and navigational bottlenecks can be changeable as well, and that modelling will be used to make updated list of bottlenecks.

Mr. Mohl asked what are the desired fairway parameters and are those fixed or flexible. Mr. Mitrović responded that there are international regulations defining fairway parameters, and added that certain flexibility will be preserved during the modelling process. Mr. Trifunović noted that Danube Commission Recommendations should be followed. In addition, Mr. Trifunović asked if certain catalogue of measures will be available at the end of the project. Mr. Mitrović responded that this project is the pre-planning phase in the sense of measures, but certainly all outputs and experience gathered in the run of the project can be structured at the end in the form of catalogue.

The document describing modelling activities in more details will be distributed to the Stakeholders Forum members and observers for feedback.

The new timeframe for feedback on documents will be 14 days after distribution of the document, and later rounds of feedback timeframes can be shortened. If there are needs to prolong the timeframe due to some national holidays or similar reasons, stakeholders will inform the chairperson and he will facilitate extension of deadline accordingly.

## HRV Sotin project

Mr. Zvocak presented Croatian Sotin project (which is being implemented outside of the Preparing FAIRway 2 Works in the Rhine-Danube Corridor project).

Mr. Mohl thanked for inclusion of the Sotin project in the agenda and asked the following questions: 1. How much are water levels impacted by the measures? Is riverbed deepening expected and how much? Which impacts are expected on the nearby floodplain and floodplain water system?; 2. How does the project comply with integrated planning approach and the win-win solution for nature and navigation?; 3. Prior approval of the EU funding for the project, has an obligatory compliance check been carried out by the EU with regard to the WFD and N2K? If yes, what are the results and who was involved from EU side? Was DG Environment involved and approved it?; 4. Why is Sotin promoted prior the Fairway 2 project is finalised and its results are known? Mr. Zvocak asked if answers can be provided in written, after the meeting. Mr. Mitrovic responded yes.

Ms. Špegar asked how come that the EIA Study is not necessary for such a project, and noted that if such project would be implemented in Serbia, the EIA Study would be necessary and application of the ESPOO convention as well. Mr. Zvocak responded that the ministry responsible for environmental protection is responsible for the procedure, and that the EIA Study was not required, but only the Study on the impact to the ecological network. Ms. Špegar also asked if option with detached groins was analysed, and how was the distance between structures optimized. Mr. Mitrović said that all answers can be provided later on.

Ms. Španiček asked if it is possible to share the list of mitigation measures from the Sotin project, and Mr. Zvocak responded that document in Croatian language will be provided.

Mr. Mitrović stressed out that the project Sotin is not part of the Preparing FAIRway 2 works project, but it is thematically relevant, as it is on the SRB-HRV stretch.

## Inland waterway projects and their compliance with EU Natura 2000 and WFD requirements

Mr. Zinke gave an extensive presentation on the compliance of inland waterway projects with Natura 2000 and Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements.

Ms. Špegar asked what is the significant impact according to NATURA 2000 measures, and Mr. Zinke responded that it has to be assessed by expert judgement based on reference data.

Ms. Špegar informed participants that 1<sup>st</sup> River Management Basin Plan for Serbia was published (yesterday, 8.6.2021) in Serbian language. Both ecological and chemical status for all water bodies including Danube were assessed. Furthermore, Serbia produces each year the monitoring plan (monitoring of the status of surface and ground waters). She can provide necessary information and data if needed.

Ms. Španiček asked if it is possible to make some library with links/documents shared within the SHF, and Mr. Mitrovic responded that he will check with viadonau on available methods for document sharing within the SHF.

## Next steps, action points list, next meeting

Mr. Mitrović reflected on the next steps, summarised action points from the meeting and reminded on the provisional date for the next meeting, agreed by participants, all provided in the tables below.

## AOB

No other business has been raised at the meeting.

Mr. Mitrovic thanked all participants for their active participation and wished them all the best until the next meeting.

## Action Points List

AP code	Task	Responsible	Deadline
SHFM02-01	Provision of Draft general concept for modelling	IMI	16.06.2021
SHFM02-02	Provision of answers to questions raised during the meeting	MCI (MMPI expert)	16.06.2021
SHFM02-03	Distribution of the link for online evaluation questionnaire	IMI	16.06.2021
SHFM02-04	Distribution of the draft Meeting Minutes	IMI	16.06.2021
SHFM02-05	Feedback to the draft general concept for modelling	All	30.06.2021
SHFM02-06	Feedback on the draft Meeting Minutes	All	24.06.2021
SHFM02-07	Distribution of the final Meeting Minutes	All	29.06.2021
SHFM02-08	Publication of meeting documents, including presentations, from the SHFM02 on the SHF webpage	LKA/IMA	29.06.2021
SHFM02-09	Invitation to the SHFM03	IMI	05.10.2021

## Upcoming Meetings

Meeting	date	time	place
SHFM03	Fri, 15.10.2021	09:30-12:30	GoToMeeting

## Attachments

- Answers to questions from the meeting
- Draft General concept for modelling and multi criteria analysis

## Photos

