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Thank you for the kind invitation to participate in this, the 5th IVR Colloquium on Inland Waterway Transport and to speak about some of the challenges faced by the mode and the role of ECMT. I would like to say a few general words about waterways and then speak about some of our activities in waterway transport. I would then like to address in more detail some institutional aspects of transport at international level and give some preliminary reactions to the recent publication of the EFIN report.

There is a lot of international activity on water transport and this is an interesting time for the mode. There seems to be a new dynamic, partly driven by the fact that the broad aims of policy favour and offer opportunities for a further development of the mode. This dynamic has been supported also by an increase in the number of important events dealing with waterway transport, including the Rotterdam Conference of 2001 and the follow-up to it. One feature of this work has been the greatly improved co-operation between the international governmental organizations in the field. Moreover, in the market there have been new growth areas like containers and industrial products being increasingly transported. And the enlargement of the EU together with the reopening of the Danube is leading to strong traffic growth on this important link.

On the other hand, there are some serious difficulties and obstacles facing waterway transport. The statistics attest to this in a general way. Over the last thirty years, freight traffic as a whole has grown at about 2% a year in Europe. But road transport has grown at about 4% and rail and water have remained more or less static.

At present, waterways account for about 6% of traffic in the ECMT area, with a lower percentage in CEE. This figure is as high as 40% in the Netherlands. Market share has steadily declined as it has for railways and the two modes between them now account for only 20% of the total market. Such global figures do not always do justice to waterways. After all they are present in a limited number of Countries and cannot compete where they do not exist. So we must be careful about the global market share figures and should really look a little deeper, and study particular corridors.

The structural changes in economies have not suited the rail and water modes. The decline in market share can be explained to a large extent by changes in the structure of goods carried in our economies. Decreases in average load sizes and increases in their frequency also militate against waterways. But these structural changes are not the only reason for its loss of market share, and there are German studies which suggest that up to 40% of the loss in market share can be explained by declining competitiveness in traditional markets.

There is a widespread view that waterways have been neglected, that they are “the forgotten mode”. It is certainly true that railways, especially the passenger high speed railways, but also the attempts to create European freight rail structures and networks have taken a lot of recent policy attention.

One very concrete area where this lack of attention can be measured is in the investment. Our investment data show that waterways obtain a relatively small share of total investment. Even in the Netherlands, they account for only about 8% of total transport investment despite their large share of total freight traffic. In Germany the percentage is around 6%. This went up slightly in the late 1990’s, but declined again as new arguments about environmental harm emerged after the flooding of the Elbe in 2002. In France, waterways obtain only around 1% of total
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investments. On a European level, the priority projects drawn up in the EU in 1994 and again last year also show a very low representation of waterway projects.

There are probably several reasons for this relative underinvestment. But it is certainly a reasonable hypothesis that the existing structures and organization of the sector are a contributory factor.

In addition to the structural economic problems and the investment gap, the recent EFIN report identifies additional problems. Waterways still face technical barriers, there are new environmental debates and there are shortages of staff.

Given the advantages and the problems, the challenge is to find the optimum role for inland waterways in our transport system. This is not the same as a maximum role attempts to increase waterway traffic will need to compare the costs with the benefits. It is widely accepted that there is spare capacity on the network. In an article for us recently, Professor Aberle 1 suggested that a 20% increase in traffic would not require capacity changes. The mode can offer high levels of reliability, often a more important logistical concept than speed and it can offer low prices.

Everyone is agreed, and numerous policy statements confirm it, that there is a policy wish for a greater role for waterways. Improving waterway transport involves actions in several domains and these have been set out by different organizations and in several fora. They are a combination of technical, policy, legal and economic measures. And the Conference will no doubt discuss progress on many of these in detail.

But I would abstract from all of the, sometimes rather technical recommendations, to suggest that two particular themes should become much more central to thinking about how to take this mode forward. The first is the need to put the sector on a sound economic footing and the second is the need to ensure that users are at the heart of what is being done. I believe that both of these themes have been too absent from the reflections on waterways and have to come to the fore in the future.

The economic subject is difficult but cannot be avoided. How are waterways going to pay their way, pay for the maintenance, the upkeep the rehabilitation and then investment in the system? As I said earlier, there is an “investment gap”. But there is also a “payment gap”. Users pay relatively little to use the system and though we do not have exact figures it is most unlikely that these charges cover even the upkeep and maintenance of the system. There are similar debates for the other modes and there are different models in use. But in both road and rail we are moving towards a framework where users pay the marginal costs and make contributions to the fixed costs. Waterways will need also to start to discuss this issue.

The second concerns the market and relates to the views of those whose goods are carried. Their opinions and demands, their difficulties need to be heard and dealt with. Performance data, reliability data, productivity figures, border crossing times for example on the Danube all need to be made public. The NGOs and shippers dealing with waterways have an important role here.

---

1 “Fifty Years of Transport Policy: ECMT 1953-2003”
After these general remarks I would like to take the opportunity to say a few words about ECMT activities on waterways.

**ECMT Activities**

Waterways are a part of the European Transport system and are included in the deliberations and acts of the conference. There are several political declarations and resolutions on waterways and Ministers, who meet every year, have from time to time held discussions on the topic. But it is true that Ministerial Sessions or debates dedicated solely to waterways are rather rare.

When waterways are discussed by Ministers it is usually in the context of a broader debate. For example, we had a wide ranging debate on policies to change modal split in 2002. Ministers agreed some recommendations on waterways that provide a sound frame for its development. Ministers in ECMT set out five areas where progress needs to be made.

- Facilitate the integration of waterways in a multimodal transport system;
- Improve the operating conditions for fluvio-maritime transport;
- Overcome the barriers to the development of waterway transport;
- Improve the quality of the network;
- Facilitate market opening.


ECMT had for many years a policy Working Group on Waterways and made several contributions, through this Group, to international work, including for example, the Waterway classification system. In efforts to rationalize at international level, since there were more or less the same people going to the different meetings, ECMT decided to put its Working Group on hold and to concentrate its efforts on more specific areas.

Let me mention three. First, there are the Economic Research Activities, including for example, the publication in our Round Table Series of Round Table 108 called “*What Markets are there for Inland Waterways*”. This work identified several opportunities for Waterways to occupy new niches in the transport market.

Second, we have set up close co-operation with the Secretariats of the other international actors especially in the Group of Volunteers which came together after the Rotterdam Conference. This has been a constructive and effective way to exchange information and to work together on taking the many recommendations forward.

Third, we are taking a lead on some specific studies and particular events. As I said, we organised a wide ranging Seminar in 2002 on the theme “Inland Waterways of Tomorrow”. We will organise, in September next, a further Seminar to help prepare the special Ministerial Conference in 2006 in Romania, following the one in Rotterdam.
We are also, thanks to financing from the Dutch Government, carrying out some work on the environmental impacts of work on waterways. This has become a complex and emotive topic and we are hoping that our study will bring some clarity to an issue that has become difficult for the sector. The details of what we will do is annexed.

Like other international organizations, we have limited resources for the topic. We do not have any staff dealing full time with it. Bringing waterways more into the mainstream of policy and to the attention of Ministers would obviously benefit from additional resources.

**Institutional Aspects and Questions**

Before discussing institutional aspects of the waterways I would like to speak a little about ECMT in general terms. This may not be of direct interest for the topic of this Conference but will, I believe, provide background to the discussion on the institutional structures at international level.

ECMT celebrated 50 years of existence a couple of years ago in 2003. It’s a long time, not as long as the Rhine and Danube Commissions of course but in transport terms it covers a period of rapid growth and remarkable change.

Like all wise middle aged people, ECMT subjected itself to a rigorous health check in connection with its 50th anniversary. This took the form of a detailed three year examination of our role and actions. At the end of this process, significant changes and reforms were made. The broad message from our Members was that ECMT remained relevant and important as a forum for forward looking policy discussion. But our members, that is the (now) 43 Governments across the entire continent, approved several new directions for the organisation.

First, they want ECMT to treat transport in a more integrated way. This is one of those things that is easy to say but more difficult to do. But it is clear that it implies that we should look at the system more, we should look at interactions between the modes and combining modes more, and we should look at eliminating distortions and differences due to different framework conditions or economic circumstances between modes.

Second, our Members also said we should take a more comprehensive approach to the modes and look at extending the field of action from inland transport to the interconnections and reactions with shipping and aviation. In particular, with the recent virtual closure of the OECD Maritime activities we are looking at taking up some aspects of Maritime transport.

Third, we should take a more global approach. The transport system is not European, it is increasingly global; as a result ECMT has been asked, together with major players like US and Japan, to take account of globalisation and include its consequences in our work.

In summary, the changing world requires a response from ECMT that is more integrated, more comprehensive and increasingly global. And this is what we are trying to do.

At the same time as these substantive reforms there was a very strong push from Governments on the organisational side, especially to strengthen and reinforce links between the international organisations in transport. So we signed letters of agreement with the European
Commission and UNECE on clarifying roles and on improving cooperation. And we are implementing this. For example, with UNECE we have clarified the division of work into more legal work for Geneva and policy and economic work for ECMT. This is important as each organization can ask for assistance from the other and they can reinforce each other, with ECMT providing political direction and UN providing the legal support. In addition, we have joined up our Working Groups on Combined Transport to make a single Working Group on logistics. And we are doing something similar with our Railway Groups.

We have also managed to rationalize the transport activities in the OECD family (where ECMT belongs) and now the former Road Transport Research unit is under my responsibility and reports now to Deputies and Transport Ministers. So now in the OECD family, all transport activities will be carried out under the aegis of ECMT, strengthened by the participation of the major global players like US, Japan and Canada.

I have mentioned all of this because it is relevant for any discussion on institutional change in our sector. The present thinking in Governments is rather that there are too many organisations and actors at international level and they believe efforts need to be made to streamline, to rationalize, to combine to get them to cooperate more. On the budgetary front too, the story is more or less the same. Governments are telling us to manage with what we have, to do more work with less resources. This is a reflection of what is happening at national level where many countries are reducing the number of civil servants so it is inevitable that it is happening too at international level.

In summary, the political drive to look at the system in an integrated way and the budgetary constraint that we need to do so within very limited resources provide the framework for the discussions on future institutional structures for all of our activities including waterways.

The proposals in the EFIN report are no exceptions and will need to be implemented in this framework. While few will dispute the well argued thesis in the report that waterways have been neglected and need more political attention, I do think the detailed institutional proposals will need some refinement and tightening up.

The key to reform will lie in using better what is already there and in building on existing institutions and structures so that we can achieve the shared aims.

In particular, the special Ministerial sessions that are proposed on waterways are an important and valuable idea, but they will be better and more effective if they are integrated into general Ministerial sessions. For ECMT, such a possibility is foreseen in the Protocol which permits the creation of subgroups of Countries with specific interests. One risk in setting up separate structures for Waterways is that similar proposals for a separate ministerial organization for roads or railways or other activities could also be made.

The proposals in the EFIN report suggest a Ministerial Conference with several functions, including providing a broad political support for the actions needed but also some legal ones. The former function corresponds precisely to the role of ECMT, since we do not make laws. But I wonder whether the legal possibilities, to adopt conventions or other binding instruments need to be strengthened for waterways. At present the two river Commissions, the EU and UNECE all have legal responsibilities and powers. The addition of further law making structures or
organizations may not be needed if we can continue with the present trend to good cooperation between the existing organisations.

I would also raise similar questions about the proposal to set up a subsidiary and separate body, called the Bureau to prepare the Ministerial work. Of course Ministerial work needs careful preparation but there are bodies doing this kind of work already. Why not strengthen these bodies instead of creating something new? The report does not make very clear the relationships of the Bureau to the existing river Commissions and to other organisations in the field. The tasks assigned to it seem to be an unusual mixture of technical, policy and legal work. Perhaps it is the intention that this Bureau would evolve and eventually substitute for, or replace the river Commissions. There will need to be more discussion on this and on whether the objectives for this Bureau can be met in simpler, less expensive ways. There is a telling remark in paragraph 96 about substantial resources being made available. This would be wonderful for all concerned but it does seem rather optimistic in the present circumstances. I think that ECMT, with a small increase in resources, could do a lot to strengthen the political impacts and impetus of work on waterways.

I believe that any supporting structure for the proposed political one needs to be integrated with existing structures. It will be more difficult to prepare Ministerial decisions, statements, declarations or debates without being fully conversant and consistent with what is going on in the rest of the sector. I believe it will be more logical, more efficient, more consistent and ultimately more economic if this Bureau fits into present reporting structures for Ministers. The Bureau concept, if developed along these lines, could bring innovations to existing practice by reflecting a very strong coordinated work from the different governmental organisations and industry, building on the example of what is being done in the Group of Volunteers at present. Finally, if we are serious about strengthening the work on waterways, the implementation structures need also to have a certain distance from the existing Commissions, in order to avoid any form of capture and to ensure that the real obstacles and difficulties can be assessed objectively.

The main thrust of the EFIN report is that more political attention must be given to waterways. I am sure this is right. The rather low investment shares given to the mode confirm this. Having a special session of Ministers devoted to this regularly is a key part of trying to improve the situation. This can help correct a structural weakness whereby the existing river Commissions, because of their extremely long standing status as agencies of diplomacy, based in Foreign Affairs Ministries, were somewhat outside the framework for transport policy making. It can give political urgency. And the idea to strengthen the capability to monitor and implement what Ministers say is vital as well. EFIN sets out a very ambitious set of proposals to achieve these aims. I believe these aims are important but there are political and budgetary realities that require us to look at more integrated, more streamlined ways to implement them, that build more on what exists and that can do so at a relatively modest cost. Maybe the motto here should be “do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good”.

ECMT is ready to contribute in whatever way it can here and is looking forward to participating actively and constructively in these important discussions.
ANNEX

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF INLAND SHIPPING AND WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT

OUTLINE FOR INITIAL REPORT

Objectives

The aim of the work is to provide guidance to Ministers on the appropriate approach to environmental protection in the development of inland waterways.

Inland shipping can contribute to sustainable transport strategies as it can achieve low air and noise emissions per ton of freight transported but both shipping and the development of waterways can have major environmental impacts on water quality, biodiversity, landscape and recreational value of natural resources.

An initial desk-based report is being commissioned to summarise current environmental mitigation practice in the maintenance and expansion of inland waterway capacity and to discuss current issues in improving environmental protection and reconciling demands for expanded navigation capacity with sustainable development. The work focuses on the environmental impacts of investments in expanding the capacity of waterways for carrying inland shipping.

The report should provide the basis for a) exchanging experience on good practice and b) addressing current outstanding issues – to be taken up primarily in a conference to be organised in 2006 with Transport and Environment Ministries, IGOs and industry and environmental NGOs.

The report will cover the following main areas, discussed in more detail below:

- review existing good practice nationally;
- summarise responses to the requirements of the water framework directive and habitat directive in the main river basins that carry inland shipping;
- identify challenges still to be resolved;
- and draw conclusions designed to support a consensus on the approach to ensuring development of waterways that is environmentally sustainable and financially sustainable over the long term.
Good Mitigation Practice

Current guidelines for environmental mitigation will be summarized succinctly, and significant recent innovations and/or issues described in the following main countries. Examples of good practice in relation to recent investments in inland waterways infrastructure will be briefly described, or where appropriate, examples of failure to apply good practice.

- Austria
- Czech Republic
- France
- Hungary
- Germany
- Romania
- The Netherlands
- Ukraine

A first potential “long-list” of cases for this study is the following:

1. Staubing Vilshoffen (Germany)
2. Groyne maintenance on the Elbe (Germany)
3. Mosel mouth (Germany)
4. Rhine – Rhône link (France)
5. Seine Nord Paris-Lille (France)
6. Dunkerque Valencienne – Tournai (France)
7. Zuid-Willemsvaart bypass (Netherlands)
8. Schelde estuary (Netherlands/Belgium)
9. Waal Hoofdtransportas (Netherlands)
10. Canal Donau Black Sea (Ukraine/Romania)

The purpose of this section is to give an indication of the state of appreciation of issues of environmental protection in each country, reflect differences in legal requirements and illustrate the current state of the art in approaches to mitigation, planning and assessment. It should also be possible to compare practice between countries with a view to learning from the best.

The Water Framework Directive

The Water Framework Directive adopted by the EU in 2000 is driving a fundamental reappraisal of environmental protection and mitigation approaches in the inland shipping sector. The Directive aims to preserve and improve the quality of both natural water bodies and those modified for navigation, flood control and water abstraction. In particular it requires new assessment and planning procedures organized around entire river basins. Integrated water
protection and improvement plans are required to be produced for each basin, covering all sectors of activity. Inland navigation authorities are currently very preoccupied with developing procedures that will meet the requirements of the Directive. Key concerns include developing adequate procedures for consultation, planning and conciliation, especially across national boundaries and between authorities with different sectoral responsibilities.

As the major inland shipping river basins are international and extend beyond the borders of the enlarged EU, the Directive serves also as a model for countries outside the Union. This is reflected in international agreements, for example between the lower Danube countries including Ukraine and Moldova.

This section of the report will summarise the approach and requirements of the Directive and analyse the improvements to planning procedures and mitigation practices that will be required.

Conclusions and Challenges

Based on the analysis presented in the first two sections, the report will draw conclusions designed to support a consensus on the approach to ensuring development of waterways that is environmentally sound and financially sustainable over the long term. The key issues for improvement of environmental protection in the sector and reconciling demands for expanded navigation capacity with sustainable development will be highlighted.

Preparation of the Report

Royal Haskoning has been engaged to prepare the desk study, with a team led by Henry Opdam and Johan van Voorthuizen.

The members of the steering group will provide documentary input and revise the initial report and experts from ECMT Member governments will be sought to provide additional inputs where necessary (see Annexes).

Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Feb/March</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submission</td>
<td>with IGOs</td>
<td>by ECMT</td>
<td>by ECMT</td>
<td>to IWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and NGOs</td>
<td>Deputies</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Constanca</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Steering and Consultation

An informal steering group has been established comprising the people listed in the box below. The next meeting of the group will be held on 13 April 2005 in the Hague.
The experts listed in the second table have been contacted and sent a questionnaire to help identify the case studies that can be most usefully developed in detail.

**Steering Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Org.</th>
<th>Postal address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roelof Weekhout</td>
<td>DGG Ministry of Transport The Netherlands</td>
<td>PO. Box 20904 2500 EX DEN HAAG The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volker Hüsing</td>
<td>BIG Bundesanstalt fur Gewasserkunde Federal Institute of Hydrology Germany</td>
<td>Am Mainzer Tor 1 56068 Koblenz Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gernot Pauli</td>
<td>CCNR Commission Centrale pour la Navigation du Rhin</td>
<td>Palais du Rhin 2, place de la République 67082 Strasbourg CEDEX France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Perkins</td>
<td>ECMT</td>
<td>2, rue André-Pascal 75775 Paris CEDEX 16 France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Rochette</td>
<td>CETMEF Ministry of Public Works, Transport and Housing France</td>
<td>2, boulevard Gambetta BP 60039 60321 Compiègne CEDEX France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martine-Sophie Fouvez</td>
<td>ECMT</td>
<td>2, rue André-Pascal 75775 Paris CEDEX 16 France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viatcheslav Novikov</td>
<td>UN/ECE</td>
<td>Palais des Nations Geneva Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmut Blöch</td>
<td>European Commission DG Environment</td>
<td>Avenue de Beaulieu 9, B-1160 Brussels Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Schulte-Wulwer-Leidig</td>
<td>International Rhine Protection Commission</td>
<td>Hohenzollernstrasse 18, D-56068 Koblenz Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Experts Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rienk Dijkstra</td>
<td>Directoraat-Generaal Rijkswaterstaat Adviesdienst Verkeer en Vervoer Infrastructuur en Bereikbaarheid Senior adviseur 010 - 282 5832 <a href="mailto:r.j.dijkstra@avv.rws.minvenw.nl">r.j.dijkstra@avv.rws.minvenw.nl</a></td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Malgorzata Lewandowska</td>
<td>Department of Maritime Transport Ministry of Infrastructure tel. (+48 22) 630 1545, Fax. (+48 22) 6288515, al.Chalubinskiego 4/6 00-928 Warsaw, Poland <a href="mailto:lewandowska@mi.gov.pl">lewandowska@mi.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ryszard Zakrzewski</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Protection Instruments, Ministry of Environment secretariat: tel. (+48 22) 5792327, Fax. (+48 22) 5792217, ul.Wawelska 52/54 00-922 Warsaw, Poland <a href="mailto:ryszard.zakrzewski@mos.gov.pl">ryszard.zakrzewski@mos.gov.pl</a></td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ernő PÁL</td>
<td>Institute for Transport Sciences (KTI) Automotive Engine &amp; Exhaust Emission Technology Section Than Karoly ut. 3-5 PO Box 107 BUDAPEST H-1518 Hungary +36 1 371 5848</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Leo Grill</td>
<td>Federal Waterways Affairs Federal Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology Unit II/W3 Federal Waterways Affairs Radetzkystrasse 2 A-1030 Vienna +43 171162 5960 Fax 71162 5998 <a href="mailto:Leo.grill@bmvit.gv.at">Leo.grill@bmvit.gv.at</a></td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Richard Stadler</td>
<td>Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management Unit VII/2 International cooperation for Water Management Maxergasse 2 A-1030 Vienna +43 171100 7115 Fax 71100 17156 <a href="mailto:Richard.stadler@bmlfuw.gv.at">Richard.stadler@bmlfuw.gv.at</a></td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>organisation</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Radek Sus</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment&lt;br&gt;Vršovická 65&lt;br&gt;100 10 Prague&lt;br&gt;Czech Republic</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Jiri Bendl, MoE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Radek_Sus@env.cz">Radek_Sus@env.cz</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Vladimir MANA</td>
<td>Agency for Nature Conservation and Landscape Protection&lt;br&gt;<a href="mailto:Vladimir_Mana@nature.cz">Vladimir_Mana@nature.cz</a></td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Jiri Bendl, MoE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael Schleuter</td>
<td>Department: Fauna and Ecology, BfG, Expert regarding ecological questions related to Danube river, Co-ordinator of several EIA of Mosel river projects&lt;br&gt;Tel: +49/261-13065468&lt;br&gt;Am Mainzer Tor 1&lt;br&gt;56068 Koblenz&lt;br&gt;Germany&lt;br&gt;mail: <a href="mailto:schleuter@bafg.de">schleuter@bafg.de</a></td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hubert Liebenstein</td>
<td>Department Floristic Studies, Landscape Planning, BfG&lt;br&gt;Expert regarding impact balancing and landscape compensation planning&lt;br&gt;Tel: +49/261-13065445&lt;br&gt;Am Mainzer Tor 1&lt;br&gt;56068 Koblenz&lt;br&gt;Germany&lt;br&gt;mail: <a href="mailto:liebenstein@bafg.de">liebenstein@bafg.de</a></td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hans Sommer</td>
<td>Water and Shipping Office Koblenz&lt;br&gt;Developer of waterway projects along the Mosel river&lt;br&gt;Tel: 49/261-98193411,&lt;br&gt;mail: <a href="mailto:h.sommer@wsa-ko.wsv.de">h.sommer@wsa-ko.wsv.de</a>&lt;br&gt;Wasser- und Schifffahrtsamt Koblenz, Schartwiesenweg 4,&lt;br&gt;56070 Koblenz, Germany</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Volker Steege</td>
<td>Water and Shipping Office Bremerhaven&lt;br&gt;Tel: 49/471-4835327&lt;br&gt;mail: <a href="mailto:steege@bhv.wsdnw.de">steege@bhv.wsdnw.de</a>&lt;br&gt;Wasser- und Schifffahrtsamt Bremerhaven, Am Alten Vorhafen 1, 27568 Bremerhaven, Germany&lt;br&gt;Developer of waterway projects along Weser estuary</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>organisation</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Detlef Wahl</td>
<td>BfG, Maintenance plans along the river Elbe</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Am Mainzer Tor 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56068 Koblenz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Wahl@bafg.de">Wahl@bafg.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alexandru Serban Cucu</td>
<td>Ministry of Transport, Construction and Tourism</td>
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