

**EU Water Framework Directive Navigation Task Group  
Extraordinary Meeting at PIANC Offices, Brussels  
1230 hours, Friday 15<sup>th</sup> March 2019**

**Summary of meeting**

**I. Welcome, introductions, apologies**

The following attended the meeting:

- Jan Brooke, PIANC, Chair of WFD NAVI Task Group
- Nik Delmeire, Inland Waterways Transport Platform
- Nikola Kutin, EFIP
- Erik Mink, for EuDA
- Cynthia Pauwels, Port of Antwerp, for ESPO
- Sotiris Raptis, ESPO
- Volker Steege, BMVI, for CEDA
- Sonja Wild-Metzko, Hamburg Port Authority, for CEDA
- Albert Willemsen, for ICOMIA
- Keir McAndrew, Wood, consultants to COM (part)

Apologies were recorded from Marc Eisma (Port of Rotterdam, for ESPO); Phil Horton (EBA); Karin de Schepper (INE) and Peter Birch (Canal and River Trust, for CEDA).

JB welcomed participants to the meeting and a round of introductions took place.

**2. EU Water Framework Directive Fitness Check: Public Questionnaire responses, key issues (see Annex A)**

Prior to beginning the discussions with COM's consultants, the Group identified a number of new issues or variations on the issues already identified. These were added to Annex A below (N.B. List below is expanded from the pre-meeting version).

**3. Fitness Check: Discussion with COM's consultant**

Keir McAndrew explained that he and colleagues in Wood are providing consultancy services to COM on the Fitness Check. He advised that the public consultation phase is now closed. In excess of 380,000 responses were received, the vast majority of which resulted from a NGO campaign designed to avoid the Directive being 'opened up for revision'. These responses have been highlighted using algorithms.

Around 700 responses were from organisations not associated with the campaign.

The next steps involve:

- a series of targeted questionnaires with a deadline of 29<sup>th</sup> March **Action: all to review and complete for NAVI TG based on submissions from members received by 26<sup>th</sup> March**
- individual interviews **Action: SW-M to organise an interview; JB willing to participate on behalf of the sector if useful**
- three workshops – floods (with the CIS Floods WG); costs and benefits (with specialist water economists); and groundwater. SW-M and JB highlighted the need for this to consider the costs of inaction (e.g. downstream) if exemptions are used as well as quantifying the benefits at water body level
- April stakeholder workshop: an interim workshop presenting the Fitness Check initial findings; NAVI TG should get an invite. **Action: JB to chase**
- summer workshop (June 2019) presenting the Fitness Check findings; this will be live streamed.

JB went through the Group's list of issues with contributions as appropriate from other members. An overview of the points raised is presented in Annex A below.

Post meeting note: the following comment was received from CCNR with regard to the discussion on policy coherence between the WFD and the MSFD, specifically with regard to underwater noise:

The CCNR Secretariat objects to mentioning underwater noise in the context of inland waterways and inland navigation. The CCNR Secretariat has no knowledge of studies in regard to underwater noise of inland navigation vessels. Hence, we should avoid bringing this topic actively forward.

Post meeting note (2): CRT (PB) suggests adding a water resource / flow standard for the GEP of artificial water bodies (AWB): while there is focus on reinstating “near natural” water resources for natural and heavily modified water bodies, there is no such protection for maintaining the water resource regimes for AWBs, but these are surely just as important for maintaining the water quality (especially in ecological terms) of these water bodies? The standard should be to maintain current / historical regimes, not to achieve a reference natural condition (which could actually result in an adverse change in the ecology).

#### 4. Way forward including completion of Expert Questionnaires; individual interviews, etc.

COM's consultant advised that NAVI TG member associations/organisations should all respond to the more detailed questionnaires as far as practicable, but that it is also acceptable to e-mail Wood directly setting out the issues and attaching supporting information ([keir.mcandrew@woodplc.com](mailto:keir.mcandrew@woodplc.com)).

**Action: all**

COM's consultant stressed the importance of providing supporting information, documents, studies, etc. to back up the points raised. Actions in this regard should include:

- ICOMIA will send the outcomes of the Berlin meeting (end 2017) and other documents I possible illustrating the various policy coherence issues with IED, REACH, waste framework, etc. **Action: AW**
- HPA will forward copies of their legal opinion, etc. **Action: SW-M**
- HPA also have a tool to help identify the most cost-effective combination of measures **Action: SW-M to share with Wood**
- Port of Rotterdam will provide evidence of diffuse groundwater pollution issues on the port estate. **Action: ME**
- Several organisations (SedNet via Port of Antwerp, VS for CEDA, EM (Po)) will provide (to KMcA and to JB) concrete examples of where a sediment deficit is causing problems either for navigation or ecological status. **Action: SedNet via CP, CEDA via VS, Po via EM, others**

It was further confirmed that:

- Task Group associations should respond to relevant questions in relevant surveys, copying their responses to JB by 26<sup>th</sup> March **Action: All to JB**
- JB to prepare a Group response, likely on 27<sup>th</sup> March

There was no time to review the notes of the last meeting or the SCG meeting (etc.). It was therefore agreed (i) that a next meeting will be held in Sept/Oct 2019 unless urgent matters require a meeting in the meantime and (ii) that JB will review the notes of previous meetings to ensure there is nothing therein requiring immediate attention. **Action: JB**