

# Heavily Modified Water Bodies

Common Implementation Strategy Workshop  
12 - 13 March 2009, Brussels

---

## Working Group II

## Navigation & Ports

### Rapporteurs:

David Corbelli, UK & NN

### Chair:

Volker Mohaupt, DE



Federal Ministry for the  
Environment, Nature Conservation  
and Nuclear Safety



SCOTTISH EXECUTIVE

**defra**

Department for Environment  
Food and Rural Affairs



**eco  
logic**

# Key issues on HMWB designation

- **Consistent interpretation of water body identification & designation**
  - How big should a port be before it is a separate WB
  - Still and issue (port in A/HMWB vs natural WB)
  - Better env options – other means (e.g. railway)
- **Rules do not exist for Article 4(3) a&b**
  - Leads to expert judgment (transparency is key!)
  - Clarity on definitions required which impacts on consistency on application
  - Key issues 1 Current versus historic structures / modification
    - E.g. Disused Jetty, Groyne
    - They may have gained ecological value
- **Designation is a signal to users that USE will be protected**
  - GEP could be the same as GES

# Key issues on GEP definition

- **GEP** = *Best you can do for ecology given the use*
- **Assessment according to guidance number 4: *part compliant***
  - Absence of reference (BE), Large Rivers (not applicable) (D)
- **Can we compare biological versus Prague approaches**
  - Comparison of methods not results (Not Intercalibration)
  - WB / site specificity is key (e.g. Clear water)
  - GEP could only be slightly less than GES – mean result (NL)
- **Real versus perceived impacts (dealing with uncertainty)**
  - Dredging as an example
  - Transparency again is key
  - Commitment to improving evidence base

# Key issues on objective setting & measures

- **Use of alternative objectives**

- Heavy use of alternative objectives, time derogation (Art 4.4) (1<sup>st</sup> cycle)
- Less stringent (Art 4.5) could be used for 2027

- **Proposal 1: Collate checklists of mitigation measures**

- Effectiveness
- Practicality
- Examples (use, do / do not work)
- Frequency / Application in first River Basin Cycle

- **Proposal 2: Ecological functionality of measures**

- Limited use and should link into above point
- Fish habitat example
- Overall ecosystem health