

**Joint Mission of the Expert Team of the  
European Commission and International Conventions  
to the “Bystroe project” in the Ukrainian part of the  
Danube Delta (6-8 October 2004)**

**MISSION REPORT OF THE EXPERT TEAM  
17 NOVEMBER 2004**

## MISSION REPORT

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF VISIT

Following the invitation by Mr. Motsyk, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine, to Catherine Day, Director-General for Environment in the European Commission, a joint mission to Ukraine took place on 6-8 October 2004. The members of the delegation included representatives of the European Commission and representatives of several international institutions/organisations including the Secretariats or other experts from the Bern Convention<sup>1</sup>, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR), Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar), Aarhus Convention<sup>2</sup> and Espoo Convention<sup>3</sup> (the "Expert Team", the list of members is enclosed in Annex I).

The following purpose of the fact-finding mission was agreed:

- To discuss the information already provided by the Ukrainian authorities regarding potential environmental impacts of the Bystroe project.
- To identify possible monitoring, mitigation and compensatory measures for the environmental impacts caused by the project.
- To investigate any future Ukrainian plans related to this project and to request additional information where needed.
- To recommend to Ukraine not to pursue the works until a comprehensive EIA of Phase II of the project has been carried out.

It was agreed that the Expert Team would produce a joint mission report reflecting the preliminary scrutiny of the studied documents and the findings of the mission. A list of relevant documents available to the Expert Team is enclosed (Annex II).

### 2. PROCESS AND PREPARATION OF THE VISIT

At the end of 2003, the international community expressed concerns regarding the Ukrainian plans for the Bystroe project, a reconstruction of a deep-water navigation channel from the Black Sea to the Danube River through the Danube Delta. Various international conventions had identified the project as touching upon their competences and potentially creating a conflict with these international agreements (e.g. Ramsar (2003), ICPDR (2003) and the "Bern Convention Report"). In April and May 2004, the European Commission received a number of letters and reports

---

<sup>1</sup> Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats under the Council of Europe

<sup>2</sup> UNECE Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)

<sup>3</sup> UNECE Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention)

from environmental NGOs and other interested parties expressing serious doubts about the sustainability of the project and its possible negative transboundary effects. In response to this, Commissioner Wallström sent a first letter to Ukraine dated 11 May 2004. At the beginning of May 2004, it was reported that Ukraine had actually authorised the project's first phase and that construction was about to commence. In a letter from Catherine Day (dated 26 May 2004), in her capacity as President of the ICPDR, Ukraine was requested to halt the construction of the project until information about the project and its possible transboundary effects was provided and the open questions clarified. This position was re-iterated on the EU-Ukraine Summit of 8 July 2004.

Thereafter, a number of meetings and an exchange of letters took place between Ukraine and the European Commission. A second letter from Commissioner Wallström to Ukraine including a detailed list of questions about the project and assessments of environmental impacts was sent in July 2004 (Annex III). A reply providing some material and information was sent to the European Commission at the end of August 2004, by Mr. Anatoliy Gritsenko, Deputy Minister of Environment (Annex IV).

Further to this additional information, the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs invited Catherine Day (during a bilateral meeting with Deputy Foreign Minister Motsyk on 3 September 2004) to visit the project site in the Danube Delta and to meet the Ukrainian experts responsible for the EIA, to discuss some of the open questions directly.

The European Commission decided to assemble an international Expert Team consisting of experts from the European Commission and those international conventions that might be affected by the project (see above). The idea was launched and the preliminary details of a "mission purpose" were discussed during the "Informal International Consultation Meeting on the Bystroe Canal" held in Geneva on 21 September 2004. It was agreed that the above-mentioned second letter sent by Commissioner Wallström to the Ukrainian authorities could serve as a structure for defining the key issues to be addressed during the Mission. Based on the above, a set of questions was produced by the Expert Team and sent to the Ukrainian administration in advance of the Mission (Annex V). This document was then used as the basis for the Expert Team's investigations.

### **3. VISIT PROGRAMME**

The programme, and the Mission logistics, were prepared by the Ukrainian hosts (Annex VI). In addition, the Expert Team met representatives of national NGOs and interested groups, and the European Commission arranged for a de-briefing of Member States' ambassadors in the premises of the Commission Delegation in Kiev, both in the afternoon of the third day.

Key parts of the visit were the boat trip from Izmail to Vilkovo on the second day, including a visit to the construction site at the mouth of the Bystroe waterway itself. Unfortunately, the ongoing construction works on the protective seawall could only be viewed from a distance due to the weather conditions. The boat ride featured several presentations (including project descriptions, information on the environmental impact assessments conducted, details of past and planned

monitoring) from the Ukrainian delegation followed by questions from the Expert Team. Further presentations and discussions took place on return to Vilково.

There, the Expert Team was also shown the control room for monitoring of the movements of ships in the coastal region of the Black Sea, the Bystroe waterway, and along the lower Danube River.

On the third day of the official programme featured a plenary session in the premises of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine involving high-level representatives from Ukrainian governmental bodies including the Deputy Minister of Transport. Final discussions on aspects of the three-day-mission were held and the commitments made on both sides were agreed upon. During this session, the presumably complete version of the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) for Phase I of the Bystroe project was handed over by Delta Lotsman (the project developer) together with diskettes containing the same text.

Thereafter, a press conference was held in which Soledad Blanco, the head of the Expert Team, and the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Dolgov, summed up and reiterated the main conclusions of the visit. The joint press statement of the Expert Team and the statement of the Ukrainian side are enclosed (Annexes VII and VIII).

Finally, a short meeting with a number of representatives of national NGOs provided the Expert Team with the NGOs views and findings regarding the Bystroe project. A resolution prepared by these NGOs was handed over (Annex IX).

#### **4. BRIEF GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Bystroe arm is located close to the small town of Vilково on the left bank of the Chilia arm of the Danube River, in the active part of the Danube Delta. The site is in the heart of the Danube Delta transboundary biosphere reserve, within the Kiliyskie Ramsar site designated by Ukraine in 1995 and the Dunaskyskiy nature reserve created in 1998.

The Bystroe project aims to improve the economical situation of the Vilково region which has suffered heavily during recent years from the degradation of the local economy by creating a navigation route from the Black Sea to the Danube within Ukrainian territory. The creation of around 4.000 – 5.000 jobs directly or indirectly linked to the navigation is expected from the project.

A general description of the project has been provided by the Ukrainian authorities in various documents (see Ukraine (2004a) and Ukraine (2004b)). Further details and illustrations on the project are available in the "Bern Convention Report" (see reference list, Annex II).

Although these documents contain a general description of the project, a concise written project description with details of the components in each step is still not available and this has caused some difficulty for the Expert Team in assessing the project. In the absence of official documentation stating the project components, and the phase in which they will be carried out, a written description and table summarizing the understanding of the Expert Team on the elements and sequence of

the project components is presented below. The project is expected to be completed in two complementary phases:

- Phase I, which is now being completed, consists of the dredging of an entrance channel for ships into the natural Bystroe waterway, in order to attract part of the shipping activities between the Black Sea and the Danube River. A shipping channel through the Bystroe estuary has been dredged to a depth of 7.65 meters to allow vessels with a draught of 5.85 metres to pass. In addition, a first part of a long protective seawall has been built in the sea, at the mouth of the channel, to protect the shipping route against the dominant winds and currents and to prevent the shipping channel being blocked by the natural deposit of sediments. The consolidation of the slopes of this channel will be done during the coming weeks and this will, according to oral information provided by Ukraine on the Mission, finalise Phase I by the end of 2004. During Phase I it was not intended that dredging along the Bystroe arm and Chilia arm of the Danube would be carried out.
- Phase II works consist of deepening of the channel entering the Bystroe waterway to a depth of 8.32 meters (though this was completed in Phase I) to allow vessels with a draught of 7.2 metres to pass. In addition, dredging in selected locations along the Bystroe and Chilia arms, in a dozen localities between the Black Sea and the port of Reni, will take place in order to make them deeper and facilitate the access of larger ships to the ports situated upstream on the lower Danube. The Phase II works had not been authorised by the Government of Ukraine at the time of the drafting of this report and the EIA of this phase is still in process.

**Table 1: Description of the key elements of the project in Phase I and II according to the current understanding of the Expert Team**

Phase I	Phase II
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction of initial seawall (approx. 1.2 km in length)</li> <li>▪ Off-shore dredging, approx. 9 m in depth (i.e. planned Phase II work also completed)</li> <li>▪ Off-shore dumping of dredged material</li> <li>▪ Stabilisation of banks at entrance/exit to Bystroe Channel, as necessary</li> <li>▪ Navigation management facility in Vilково</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Possible extension of seawall to shallows (approx. 1.5 km additional length)</li> <li>▪ Deepening of channel entrance</li> <li>▪ Dredging of Chilia Arm of Danube Delta up to Reni at approx. 12 points</li> <li>▪ On-shore dumping of dredged material at approx. 5 points</li> <li>▪ Stabilisation of banks at entrance/exit to Bystroe Channel, as necessary</li> </ul>

The project description provided here reflects the basic understanding that all Mission members had of the project and the different stages of the works.

## 5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The objective of the joint mission of the international Expert Team was to establish the facts and collect first hand information regarding the various questions arising from the project. In addition, the visit to the project site in the Danube Delta should provide a better picture and understanding on the ongoing work and the affected area. It was neither the purpose nor the mandate of the Expert Team to endorse or reject either Phase I or Phase II of the project.

With this report, the Expert Team tries to establish whether there is sufficient clarity and information to enable the international bodies concerned to assess the conformity or the breach of international law. In addition, this report is intended to provide other international bodies with useful information to enable them to draw their own conclusions in the respective forums or decision-making bodies. Thus, this report does not represent the views of the European Commission nor any of the international organisations that members of the Expert Team were from.

Some of the key findings are presented in the following paragraphs. There were, however, a considerable number of additional, more detailed, findings of the Expert Team, on some aspects, which are presented in Annexes X to XII.

Overall, it was possible for the Expert Team to gather a considerable amount of additional information and to clarify some open points that improved their understanding of the project, the decision-making processes and questions related to the assessment of the potential environmental impacts. It should be noted that, at the time of the mission, neither the official environmental impact assessment for Phase I or phase to were available to the Expert Team.

On some aspects of the project, the Expert Team concludes that the information provided, gathered and available, appears to be complete and conclusive. These areas are, in particular, the decision-making and public consultation process with regard to Phase I of the project, the additional monitoring, the designation of the protection zones in the Delta, and the availability of the EIA studies. It should be emphasised that this does not mean that the Expert Team agrees that these aspects have been dealt with in a satisfactory manner or agrees with the conclusions reached by the Ukrainian authorities on these matters. In fact, the Expert Team has identified a number of shortcomings in these areas.

Of particular concern for the Mission is that a certain confusion exists, based on the written documentation and verbal statements provided, about the full extent of the project and the extent to which particular activities related to the project were included in Phase I, Phase II or some future project phase. The current understanding of the Expert Team was presented above (section 4).

It is very difficult to assess environmental impacts related to the project without a clear definition of what elements belong to the project and in which phases they will be built or carried out. Of particular importance in discussing environmental consequences, is the status of plans to build an extension towards the shore of the protective seawall. Some documentation examined included the protective seawall extension as part of the project but verbal communication indicated that a decision had been made not to undertake this part of the project.

Clarification of the project elements and timetable are essential for assessment of environmental effects and in particular their transboundary implications. A clear and concise statement of the project and its elements (for the purposes of carrying out all legal assessments and approvals) is still needed.

Examples of other shortcomings are that the **public consultation** was very limited and restricted, and has not been able to inform adequately and consult some interested Ukrainian NGOs, as well as some international bodies (such as, e.g. the ICPDR). The Expert Team believes that relevant information that is available from various sources is now sufficient to enable the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee to proceed with the review of the process that took place from the point of view of compliance with the obligations under this convention.

The Expert Team would like to emphasise that any decision-making with regard to Phase II of the project should provide for extensive public consultation process on the national level. In particular, it is advisable to involve actively, among others, groups that have previously expressed interest in the process, as well as local residents and the administration of the Biosphere Reserve. The process should provide sufficient time for public consultation and allow access to, among other documentation, the environmental impact statement, the full environmental impact assessment (EIA), as well as any other documentation used in or for the decision-making within the State Environmental Expertise, including, where possible, through the Internet. Any decision taken with regard to the Phase II of the project should clearly establish how comments provided (if any) were taken into account. The State Environmental Expertise should be published.

An overview of the **decision-making process** is enclosed in a flowchart (Annex XI). The Expert Team believes that the transparency of the process could be further improved and the role and importance of the EIA could be further strengthened. The commitments made by Ukraine regarding public consultation on the EIA for Phase II provide an opportunity to do so (cf. chapter 6).

**Additional monitoring** on the effects of the construction of Phase I is highly appreciated by the Expert Team. An overview of the monitoring approach (Annex XIII) and the terms of references for that monitoring programme were handed over during the visit. However, some aspects, such as the monitoring of the hydraulic dynamics and the sediment transport and deposition in the coastal area around the Bystroe arm, are not included in the current monitoring regime. Such data are essential in order to enable the validation and development of the existing modelling results. Some concern exists on the part of the Expert Team about the baseline information available for monitoring changes. Furthermore, the monitoring should be targeted more towards identifying the potential transboundary impacts. The Expert Team welcomes the establishment of a monitoring expert group and the invitation to the international community to join this group, which would be an opportunity to address these open points. Several international bodies, in particular the ICPDR, would need to assess whether the additional monitoring would be sufficient to address the respective obligations in these conventions.

Finally, the designations of the **protection zones** in the Delta under the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme have been discussed. It should be noted that a number of rare and endangered fauna and flora species, strictly protected under the

Bern Convention, are present in these protected areas (see "Bern Convention Report"). Modification of the zoning and accompanying changes in the level of protection has occurred in connection with the project. On the one hand, the banks of the Bystroe arm were "downgraded" to a buffer zone. On the other hand, the overall area of protection has been increased and additional protected zones have been designated. The modifications have now been completed and will be submitted to UNESCO Man and Biosphere International Coordination Council in Paris. At the time of the visit, Ukraine indicated that this would happen in the coming days. It will be up to the UNESCO to evaluate whether these changes in comparison to the previous designation are acceptable in the context of the Programme<sup>4</sup>. The Expert Team believes, however, that the consultation of UNESCO of changing the protection status and zones should have been sought in advance of the construction of Phase I.

In other areas, the situation is not conclusive despite the additional information provided to the Expert Team. These include, in particular, the choice between the different options, the expected environmental impacts, and the compensation and mitigation measures as already asked for in the Ramsar Advisory Mission report of October 2003.

The choice between the **different options** to (re-)open navigation from the Black Sea to the Danube on Ukrainian territory has been subject to intensive debate. Unfortunately, the Expert Team has not been able to validate whether the opening of the Bystroe arm is the most sustainable option. Other organisations have raised serious and justified doubts regarding the statements that the Bystroe option is the most environmental friendly option (see Ramsar (2003 and "Bern Convention Report"). It is even suggested that this option is not even the most economic choice and that, from a sustainable view point, at least two other options might be favourable. The Expert Team believes that until the decision-making process and the relevant information and facts on which such a decision was based have been disclosed, it will not be possible to make these doubts disappear. The Expert Team calls upon Ukraine to disclose all this information and to compare their own assessment with investigations done by other national and international bodies. The Expert Team believes that there is still an opportunity to change the decision regarding the options in order to avoid potential long-term problems, both economic and environmental.

The potential or anticipated **environmental impacts** are assessed in the EIA reports. Unfortunately, the Expert Team did not have the opportunity to scrutinize the EIA for Phase I and II for the drafting of this report<sup>5</sup>. In previous documents, and in the discussions during the joint mission, Ukraine acknowledges that certain impacts may occur such as, e.g., the reduction of fish migration, the disturbance of nesting birds, the change in sediment transport in the coastal area, and the disposal

---

<sup>4</sup> In the meantime, the International Co-ordinating Council of the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) Programme has discussed the issue on its meeting of 25 - 29 October 2004. During this meeting the UNESCO MAB Bureau has raised similar concerns as the Expert Team above.

<sup>5</sup> Note that the EIA for phase I was handed over to the Expert Team at the end of the visit but it was not considered for the drafting of this report since it was only available in Russian.



of contaminated sediments (Annex XIV). However, Ukraine claims that these impacts are not significant and not transboundary. The Expert Team could not confirm these statements because the information provided is not conclusive. However, from the available information, the Expert Team has the impression that the potential impacts have been underestimated. The Expert Team is also aware that the quantification of such potential environmental impacts is complex and time consuming.

One particular aspect of the project raising environmental concerns is the **sediment management**. The dredged sediment during the construction of the project (4.765 million m<sup>3</sup>) is deposited on the banks of the river or dumped offshore for final disposal. It has been acknowledged that this sediment is polluted with heavy metals, pesticides and other hazardous substances. Although some monitoring data exist, apparently no risk assessment (exposure and effect evaluation) has been carried out, neither for storage on land nor for dumping in the sea. No clear information on the safety measures during the sediment management was obtained. Therefore, the Expert Team is not in the position to assess whether environmental impacts are occurring or will occur from the sediment management.

In response to the letter of Commissioner Wallström, Ukraine informed that a number of **compensation and mitigation measures** will be taken, including some monetary compensation for possible damages (Annex XV). This in itself validates the above-mentioned statement that Ukraine acknowledges certain environmental impacts. No complete and conclusive list of such compensation and mitigation measures was obtained but Ukrainian experts described some of the proposed actions during the visit. There are restrictions for shipping including, e.g., a ban of navigation of certain vessels at night, and speed, noise and bad weather restrictions (see temporary order of vessel' movement). Furthermore, it should be mentioned that a modern and effective control centre for the monitoring of ship movements has been established in Izmail. This will enable, amongst other benefits, to react quickly to crisis and accident situations. Whilst these actions are highly appreciated by the Expert Team, other planned compensation measures are more questionable such as the building of fish farms to compensate for the anticipated losses in the sturgeon fisheries sector. Such fish farms may cause additional environmental pollution and cannot be considered as a compensation or mitigation measure to protect the ecosystem of the wild sturgeon which is protected under the Bern Convention. Such measures to protect the wild sturgeon population should be included in the EIA of Phase II.

In summary, the Expert Team was able to engage in an open and constructive dialogue with Ukrainian experts on a wide number of relevant issues. The various aspects of the project become much clearer. However, the Expert Team found a number of shortcomings and open questions that, if some material that is available to the Ukrainian authorities or the project developers would have been disclosed at an earlier stage, they might have been clarified and settled by now. In other areas, there is a clear need to gather additional data and evidence, for example the monitoring of the sediment dynamics in the coastal area following the finalisation of Phase I in order to allow modelling of the potential effects of the construction of the extension of the protective seawall in Phase II. The Expert Team is confident that the findings of this report will help addressing these issues in a targeted manner.

## **6. COMMITMENTS MADE BY UKRAINE**

During the meeting, Ukraine handed over a number of documents (see enclosed list), in particular the EIA for the Phase I of the project. In addition, promises were made that the EIA for Phase II of the project, which had just been completed, would be provided to the Expert Team shortly.

Moreover, Ukraine made a commitment to carry out a public consultation on the EIA of Phase II at national and international levels, before the continuation of the project is authorised. While welcoming the initiative of the Ukrainian authorities and the project proponent to organize a scientific conference later in 2004, the Expert Team would like to emphasize that such an event cannot be a substitute for a proper public consultation process. The Expert Team would suggest holding (a) meeting(s) specifically designed for public and stakeholder consultation.

Ukraine also repeatedly confirmed that no new infrastructure (e.g. new harbours and roads) is planned as part of the project or at any future stage. Only existing infrastructure would be used, presumably following refurbishment.

Finally, the Expert Team welcomes the intention of Ukraine to notify Romania of Phase II of the project under the Espoo Convention. If, as one might expect, Romania responds positively to the possibility to participate in the EIA procedure, we would encourage Ukraine to enter the consultations with a willingness to share all necessary information and to discuss all elements of the project, not restricting consultations to the proposed works in the Chilia Arm, but to consider the project as a whole as required by the Espoo Convention. The consultations may relate to possible alternatives to the project, among other matters (Article 5). The decision on whether to proceed with Phase II shall take due account of the results of consultation (Article 6, paragraph 1, of the Convention), i.e. such a decision should not be taken before the consultations have been concluded.

## **7. CONCLUSIONS**

The Expert Team was able to gather considerable additional information that enabled a better understanding of the project and its environmental consequences. However, there are several aspects where the situation is still unclear and it was not possible for the Expert Team to understand the reasoning for some of the decisions taken by Ukraine. In particular, the information policy for Phase I of the project was inadequate and the decision-making opaque. The Expert Team regrets that Ukraine only established a serious dialogue with the international community after the construction of Phase I of the project was largely completed.

It is now up to the different international conventions to establish whether or not their requirements are affected and met. There is an opportunity to learn from the controversial debates in the past and to organise a proper public consultation process before the decision is taken to continue with Phase II. In this regard, the Expert Team highly appreciates the commitments made by Ukraine and encourages the responsible authorities to engage in a serious and open dialogue with interested national and international groups.

Further to the scrutiny of the available information, the Expert Team recommends to Ukraine to allow for a debate that may even lead to the reversal of the decision and to the selection of another option if it turns out that the other option is more sustainable, in economic, social and environmental terms. At least, the Expert Team believes that Phase II of the project should only be built if sufficient evidence from the additional monitoring programme is gathered. Such evidence should allow establishing whether the extension of the protective seawall and other planned measures would not create undesirable, long-term, and/or transboundary effects on the health of that part of the Danube Delta. Such a monitoring period should extend over at least one year before the decision on the continuation is made. The Expert Team believes that such a step is also justified from an economic point of view. First, because navigation is already possible and the economic development of the region can already commence. Second, a decision to extend the project through Phase II is only sound if it is ensured that it is sustainable, i.e. that the long-term financing of the maintenance is ensured and the livelihood of the Delta ecosystem is maintained to enable other sources of income for the region such as fisheries and eco-tourism.

Finally, the Expert Team would like to re-iterate that it is the legitimate right of Ukraine to develop this economically poor region through navigation. However, such an effort can only succeed if it is sustainable. This means that the development of navigation will certainly not be enough to increase prosperity of the region. It has to be put into the context of a wider sustainable development strategy for the whole Danube Delta. The unique value of the Danube Delta ecosystem should be regarded as an asset for the future not an obstacle for economic development. In this regard, the Expert Team would find it regrettable if the choice of the Bystroe project threatens that long-term goal and calls upon Ukraine to take account of the findings of this report, which the Expert Team hopes will be a constructive contribution to this process.

## **8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

The Expert Team acknowledges the openness and efforts to assist the experts made by the Ukrainian national, regional and local authorities, and their experts, during the visit and thanks the organisers for the excellent arrangements and their hospitality. Furthermore, the Expert Team wishes to highlight the importance of the contributions from the international community and especially the national civil society representatives. Their information was a valuable source of information in the preparation of the visit and in targeting the key open questions.

The Expert Team was grateful for the input and open discussions with all sides.

## 9. LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex I: List of participants (Expert Team)
- Annex II: List of reference of relevant documents
- Annex III: Second letter from Commissioner Wallström to Ukraine of 22 July 2004
- Annex IV: Reply letter including annexes by Mr. Anatoliy Gritsenko, Deputy Minister of Environment of Ukraine, to the European Commission, of 6 August 2004
- Annex V: List of questions in preparation of the joint fact-finding mission (30 September 2004)
- Annex VI: Programme of the visit in Ukraine 6-8 October 2004 as prepared by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Annex VII: Press release of the Expert Team on the Joint Fact-finding Mission of the European Commission and the International Conventions to the "Bystroe Canal", 8 October 2004
- Annex VIII: Quote of the Spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the canal reconstruction, 12 October 2004
- Annex IX: Resolution of the Forum of the NGOs from the Danube River Basin "LET'S SAVE THE DANUBE BIOSPHERE RESERVE" approved 6 October 2004, Odessa, Ukraine
- Annex X: Detailed findings of Expert Team on Decision Making Process in Ukraine Regarding the Project
- Annex XI: Simplified figure of decision-making process
- Annex XII: Monitoring systems
- Annex XIII: Scheme of complex ecological monitoring
- Annex XIV: Complex evaluation of the influence of the deep-sea navigation channel during its construction and operation
- Annex XV: Preliminary evaluation of pecuniary compensation amount of irreparable damage to natural environment at the first stage of the DNC creation