



STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP COLLECTING THE QUESTIONS AND THEIR ANSWERS FROM THE WORKSHOP

DELIVERABLE 3.5.1



Project title

Sediment-quality Information, Monitoring and Assessment System to support transnational cooperation for joint Danube Basin water management

Acronym

SIMONA

Project duration

1st June 2018 to 30th November 2021, 42 months

Date of preparation

30/11/2021

Compiled by Anca-Marina Vijdea (RO-IGR)

Responsible(s) of the deliverable: Anca-Marina Vijdea (RO-IGR)

Co-responsible(s) of the deliverable: Gyozo Jordan (HU-MATE)

Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION	4
2.	WORKSHOP AGENDA	5
3.	QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS.....	6
	LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....	11

1. INTRODUCTION

Deliverable D.3.5.1 is part of activity 3.5 of SIMONA project “Stakeholder workshop at Upper Tisa”. This workshop was organized on the 10th of November in Upper Tisa Test Area, at Baia Mare, in Romania, after the “Scientific Conference” organized by WP2 Communication and the field trip demonstration with the JDS sedimentation box showed by the Romanian team of the Technical University Cluj Napoca from Romania, Baia Mare branch.

Initially the workshop was planned as on-site event, the organizer being the Technical University Cluj Napoca, but finally it had to be done online, due to sanitary imposed conditions in Romania for that period.

This report contains all the comments, discussions, questions and answers of the session that followed the presentations of the three Case Studies of the Test Areas (Drava, Upper Tisa and South Danube) of SIMONA project and the Case Study of the Danube Region Basin (DRB) Baseline Network (BN) of national stations for sediment monitoring in the DTP countries.

Terminology, conditions for the sampling tools, depth of sampling, especially for floodplain sediments, the necessity of links between geochemistry scientists and soil scientists, monitoring time interval, best moment of sampling, the necessity to publish the results in scientific papers to promote the project and possible follow-up of the project have been discussed during the session of Q/A that followed the “Stakeholder Workskop”.

2. WORKSHOP AGENDA

The agenda of the “Stakeholder Workshop” is shown in Table 2.1. After the four presentations of Case Studies, which combined the testing phase of SIMONA project at local scale (Test Areas of Drava, Upper Tisa and South Danube), with the verification at regional scale in the Case Study of the Danube Region Basin (DRB) baseline network of national stations for sediment monitoring in DTP countries, there was a session dedicated to discussions, questions and answers, moderated by the leader of the project (Meta Dobnikar – SI-GEOZS), scientific coordinator (Gyozo Jordan – HUMANATE) and by Daniel Năsui on behalf of the organizers (RO-TUCN).

The presentations of the Case Studies are included in Output O.3.5 “40 experts trained at Stakeholder Workshop”. The session of discussion was followed by the presentation of the SIMONA promotional film.

The list of participants which took part in the event can be found at the end of this report.

Table 2.1 Agenda of SIMONA Stakeholder Workshop on 10th November 2021







10 NOVEMBER, Wednesday (EEST TIME ZONE)	
Scientific Conference and Stakeholder Workshop	
<i>Conference title: Sediment Quality Monitoring – Sampling, Analysis, Evaluation: Methods and Applications</i>	
SESSION 3: Stakeholder Workshop and Case Studies	
15:20 – 15:30	Case Study 1 (Drava) – Zsofia Kovacs
15:30 – 15:40	Case Study 2 (Upper Tissa) – Daniel Nasui
15:40 – 15:50	Case Study 3 (South Danube) – Irena Peytcheva
15:50 – 16:00	Case Study 4 (DRB Baseline) – Anca Vijdea
16:00 - 16:30	Discussion Q/A – moderators: Gyozo Jordan, Daniel Nasui and Meta Dobnikar
16:30– 16:40	End of Conference: SIMONA Project VIDEO show





3. QUESTIONS, ANSWERS AND COMMENTS





After the four case studies presentations listed in the agenda, the moderators started the session of questions, answers and comments, presented in Table 3.1.





Table 3.1 Interventions of speakers at the session Q/A, comments

Speaker	Intervention
 <p>Chairman Gheorghe Damian</p>	<p>We continue with the next points for today, questions and discussions, moderators: Meta Dobnikar, Gyozo Jordan and Daniel Năsui. Mister Demetriades, please.</p>
 <p>Alecos Demetriades</p>	<p>Just some comments. First of all about terminology. People have used pollutants, pollutions and some contaminations, contaminants etc. We have to be very careful: “pollutants” and “pollutions” must be used only when we have verified and have absolute evidence that there is harm to humans and the environment. Otherwise, we just use contaminants and contamination. The other thing is that we no longer use the “heavy metals” term; we better use potential toxic elements. Also, I have noticed that there was some rust on some of the equipment that was used in the sampling. It is important that this rust must be removed by sand blasting before the equipment is used in the sampling campaigns. There is also the need when you have multinational projects to standardize your equipment as well. For example, I have seen color packets and containers being used for water sampling. All equipment must be white, white plastic should be used. Because with color equipment we don’t know what sort of color agents have been used. In the new manual that we are using, the floodplain sediments interval is 0 to 20 cm. It is not much difference, but we are trying to link with the soil scientists, who use as floodplain sediments the “alluvial soil” and they use the interval 0 to 20 cm for the top sample. That is, thank you very much.</p>
 <p>Moderator Gyozo Jordan</p>	<p>Thank you, Alecos. Yes, all your comments are taken into consideration and will be included in the upgraded manual. We shall be privileged if you could give a final check and read the final document and, of course, you will be fully acknowledged in this document. The upper 5 cm came up as a compromise; I know that the FOREGS in the Blue Book recommended sampling at bigger depths. However, we want to keep the floodplain sediments harmonized with the bottom sediments of 5 cm depth. This is not a geology knowledge-oriented approach, these are just numbers in order to reach harmonization among these countries and in the small places. There were a lot of debates about these issues, by the way. Remember, this is regular monitoring of the suspended sediments, because during the high floods there might be 1 cm depth of recent sediments that could be caught in some places. In other places there might be 20 cm of fresh deposits after a big flood of the Danube River. So, there are a lot of debates for this issue. But then trans-border harmonization was prioritized, and that will also be in the coming years. So, after an</p>

	<p>original experience is being developed, when we decided to speak about centimeters because of the reproducibility of the sample collection at this stage of the work, this is more important. And we can compare. So that is the logic. But, of course, also the Protocols were written: “this is what you should collect”.</p> <p>I mean for the monitoring, but it is always allowed to collect more samples, as it is also suggested in the Sampling Protocol. Ajka Sorsa who also was a contributor to our former joint FOREGES and GEMAS project allowed in the Protocol to collect extra, additional samples as well.</p> <p>For FOREGS, the sampling depth is twenty- or twenty-five centimeters depth as well. So, we can always collect and we shall always encourage to collect deeper sediments, especially in the first 6 years and then the methods will be developed, the harmonization will be improved and then everybody in his/her country gets enough knowledge understanding what the sediment condition is in the site.</p> <p>So, this is what I can call “make a compromise”: allow for optional, extra sample collection.</p>
 <p>Alec Demetriades</p>	<p>So, I agree with you; even a smaller sampling depth may be better. But it was one presentation that mentioned 0 to 25 centimeters, the FOREGS sampling. I am just saying that it is reduced now to 0 to 20 centimeters for the IUGS sampling standards just to be aligned with the soil scientists.</p>
 <p>Moderator Gyoza Jordan</p>	<p>I see, you are talking about the global, new standard.</p>
 <p>Alec Demetriades</p>	<p>Yes!</p>
 <p>Moderator Gyoza Jordan</p>	<p>I got it! We should consider this.</p> <p>Actually, we are also revising the Protocol based on your comments.</p>
 <p>Alec Demetriades</p>	<p>You see, we are revising that because the soil scientists are using floodplain sediments that they call “alluvial soil” and they use 0 to 20 cm. So, we got to apply it now.</p>
 <p>Ajka Šorša</p>	<p>Thank you, Alec for your valuable comments and Gyoza answered already, but actually about floodplain sediments we have had a lot of discussions. Actually, it is our recommendations for sampling like that. But we have been thinking about floodplain sediments, active floodplain sediments that are regularly flooded.</p> <p>We have the Drava River as a test area, it is a natural habitat and it is one nice example for large floodplains.</p> <p>The second thing, it was very hard to write such a protocol, because we have different types of rivers from Austria to Romania and so on. And it is a first and general document.</p> <p>We had to establish the protocol as a basis for testing and harmonization. However, we have to use sampling methods that fit the special conditions of the monitoring site. For every monitoring site some “added rules” according to the site-specific conditions.</p> <p>We have different situations and different sampling sites in the Danube Basin.</p>

	<p>Our young colleague Daniel gave a presentation about the Protocols yesterday and I would like to take this opportunity to say thank you to all the partners for their contribution.</p> <p>We have debated the Protocols. I think, I received maybe 500 emails from partners on the Protocols during their development. We were very active in the summer of 2019 and it was really a pleasure.</p> <p>INTERREG projects are not scientific mostly, but we had really lots of discussions about all segments of these Protocols.</p> <p>So, thank you very much.</p> <p>Thank you, Gyozo and thank you, Meta.</p>
 <p>Moderator Gyozo Jordan</p>	<p>There is a highly relevant comment at this point, dear Alecos.</p> <p>As Ajka has pointed out, this is not a single geochemical survey, but we are carrying out regular monitoring.</p> <p>The challenge is to adopt our well-established IUGS Blue Book and FOREGS Green Book geochemical survey methodologies to the Water Framework Directive requirements regarding the sampling methods for regular monitoring.</p> <p>As far as sampling depth is regarded, it is suggested in accordance with the legal requirements of the Directive, that you should make a deeper (e.g. 1-3m deep) drilling in the overbank (floodplain) area, for example, only once when you established the monitoring site, and repeat it every 10 years. Its objective is to establish the past trend of contamination of the site and possible to capture the natural geochemical background</p> <p>For the spade system (standard soil sample collection method), you sample the upper 5 and the lower 40-50 centimeters. The upper 5 cm may represent the sediment of the recent flooding, so it should be sampled at least once a year or, preferably, after each flooding event. They proposed tool for the regular sampling of the overbank sediment is the 'cake soil sampler'. Sampling the 40-50cm depth which may capture the geochemical background uses the standard soil sample collection method of digging with the 'spade system' to this deeper horizon. The sample collection of this depth should be done every six years.</p> <p>This is how you can consider the different tools used for the different time scales of monitoring.</p> <p>This is how we could adopt our FOREGS methodology to regular monitoring. It was a real challenge.</p>
 <p>Alecos Demetriades</p>	<p>Gyozo, I definitely agree with you that it will be ideal. After every flood event really collect the uppermost 5 centimeters, even thinner ones, I would say. But 5 centimeters will be fine.</p>
 <p>Moderator Gyozo Jordan</p>	<p>We have been arguing a lot about the 'floodplain' issue. What is floodplain sediment? Actually, the floodplain sediment is the suspended sediment deposited during high flood.</p> <p>Ajka didn't touch on all of these issues now and I do not want to ignite the fire again about the difference between 'floodplain' and 'overbank'.</p>
 <p>Alecos Demetriades</p>	<p>The only difference in the Blue Book is that they try to separate the small tarnish basin of the overbank sediments from the large plain overbank sediments.</p> <p>So, they differentiate like that: the second order stream is overbank and third or higher streams are floodplains. That's the difference.</p> <p>Let's say, the deposition is the same.</p> <p>You need a flood for the overbank sediments, the floodplain sediments.</p>

	<p>Moderator Gyoza Jordan</p>	<p>Exactly, Alecos.</p> <p>And this was the final result of our heavy debates, the very frequent discussions in the project.</p> <p>Eventually it was agreed that we have to consider ‘floodplain sediment’ for sediment quality monitoring in the SIMONA project.</p> <p>Floodplain sediment is actually suspended sediment coming from the whole catchment after heavy rains. We have known for 50 years in the field of applied geochemistry that floodplain sediment better represents the whole upstream catchment area than bottom sediment.</p> <p>So basically, what you have to catch is the suspended sediment during the flooding.</p> <p>But during flooding it is very dangerous, or actually technically impossible to go there to the site and pickup the suspended sediment sample.</p> <p>For the Danube River, entering the stream during flooding is life dangerous actually. To pickup the actual sediments is important because then you can catch those sediments still in suspension over the floodplain area.</p> <p>If the suspended sediment is collected during the actual flood event then there is no question about the right sampling depth if it the uppermost 1 cm or 5 cm after the flood water has gone and the flood sediment has been deposited on the floodplain.</p> <p>And that’s why we suggested to put a passive sediment trap box on the floodplain for catching the actual floodplain sediment while it is still suspended before deposition. Because the sediment box would catch only the sediment that was carried by the actual flood water. On the other hand, if the ‘floodplain’ flood-event suspended sediment is collected with the sediment box, you don’t have to be there during flooding because the box is there. So the flood goes away, you just go there and take the sample from the sediment captured by the box.</p> <p>The flood plain sediment is actually a high flow suspended sediment.</p> <p>But this took two years for us to develop this concept and the proper sampling methods. But this is real wonderful in a project like this.</p>
	<p>Moderator Meta Dobnikar</p>	<p>Irina, please go on.</p>
	<p>Irena Peycheva</p>	<p>Thank you for this discussion.</p> <p>Maybe I have to explain that even though we presented now the SIMONA Test Area results, they were sampled in the beginning of the project. So, we tested the Protocol in the Test Areas firstly and this is why we followed strictly sometimes the Protocol.</p> <p>Just to see the positive and negative aspects. And so, it is fine to hear that it is better to reduce the recommended depth of sampling of the floodplain sediments.</p> <p>And I guess that with our scientific coordinator and maybe with Ajka we have to discuss and really leave in the final version of the Protocol less sampling depth for floodplain sediment sampling.</p>
	<p>Moderator Meta Dobnikar</p>	<p>Thank you, Irena.</p> <p>Are there any other questions, or remarks or comments?</p> <p>We have really approached the end of the stakeholders meeting. Ajka?</p>

	<p>Ajka Šorša Actually, it is very interesting that we finish our project with the discussion about floodplain.</p>
	<p>Moderator Meta Dobnikar So Gyozo, will you like to give us some final remarks? Then we will say good bye, but I will invite you to stay to see the SIMONA promotional video at the end this session.</p>
	<p>Moderator Gyozo Jordan Yes, a few words only. Thank you, Meta.</p> <p>This is an open conference, I understand, but my message focuses towards the project, just a few technicalities. We have the final conference now but we still have quite some job to do.</p> <p>We will have plenty of materials in the SIMONA project, so, dear all colleagues, you will receive a lot of materials in the close future and please read and check them and feed back in order to make sure that the reader of the final reports receive high quality ones.</p> <p>Also for the publication, we had good publication strategy in the GEMAS project which was quite successful (Alecoc can confirm), and we can do the same in the SIMONA project.</p> <p>So, not in November or December, but in January and February I will initiate a list of potential scientific publications with our data and then anybody can sign up for developing specific papers and, of course, the whole SIMONA Team will be co-author. We should publish our good results in scientific papers. That's my second note.</p> <p>The third topic is what Prvoslav mentioned during the project meeting: the issue of possible follow-up project on sediment quality such as a 'SIMONA-2' project. We still have a lot of important and promising topics that we could not squeeze into the project such as sediment sampling from boat. We had a good experience in Serbia, Romania, also in Barcs in Hungary. We had good examples and very good case studies, as Anca had shown and also Prvoslav, and it is something that we could still elaborate. Another important topic is using remote sensing and GIS techniques for monitoring the monitoring sites which is Anca's, our Romanian colleague's, speciality, for example. There is room to improve and to further promote our project. It is our intention to have a follow up project proposal in further application calls. You will be informed about it.</p> <p>And now, allow me a private, personal comment. I was honoured and privileged to work with such outstanding people, both as scientist and humans throughout this project. And I would like to say thank you to all of you.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>
	<p>Moderator Meta Dobnikar Thank you very much, Gyozo, for these final concluding remarks. The technical aspects, I strongly agree with, I also agree with the others' opinions and thank you for an insight into our possible future. At this point, I would like to thank again to the organizers of these two days events and, of course, to the whole SIMONA Team. Thank you for very good cooperation and excellent work and, of course, to the speakers at the events and also to our guests that I see here with us in quite a numerous number.</p> <p>I'm really sorry that we could not meet in Baia Mare in person, so thank you to the organizers who gave us a bit of the field work through the online video broadcast that was really excelent. I would like to thank to all of you, say "good bye", and I hope to see you in the future. Now I invite you to enjoy the SIMONA promotional video.</p>

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

No.	Name		E-mail	Organisation
1.	Adela	Pasca	pasca.an7@gmail.com	UASVM Cluj Napoca
2.	Adrienne	Clement	clement.adrienne@emk.bme.hu	BME
3.	Ahmedin	Salčinović	ahmedin.salcinovic@fzap.gov.ba	Agropedological Institute of Federation of BiH
4.	Ajka	Šorša	asorsa@hgi-cgs.hr	Croatian Geological Survey
5.	Ana	Čaić Janković	acaic@hgi-cgs.hr	Croatian Geological Survey (HGI-CGS)
6.	Anca	Vijdea	ingamvir@gmail.com	Geological Institute of Romania
7.	András	Székács	szekacs.andras@uni-mate.hu	MATE-HU
8.	Atanas	Hikov	ahikov@geology.bas.bg	Geological Institute, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
9.	Balazs	Horvath	horvath.balazs@ovf.hu	EU Strategy for the Danube Region, Priority Area 4 "Water Quality"
10.	Barbara	Simić	Barbara.simic@geo-zs.si	Geological survey of Slovenia
11.	Barbara	Kéri	keri.barbara@emk.bme.hu	BME
12.	Barbara	Träxler	barbara.traexler@geologie.ac.at	Geological Survey of Austria
13.	Bese	Pál	bese.pal@geonardo.com	Geonardo Ltd.
14.	Boglarka	Toth	toth.boglarka@uni-mate.hu	MATE
15.	Boštjan	Križanec	bostjan.krizanec@nlzoh.si	NLZOH
16.	Carmen	Casado	carmen.casado@centrecotox.ch	Swiss Centre for Applied Ecotoxicology
17.	Cornel	Pricop		OSPA Baia Mare
18.	Dan Lucian	Ciurte	ciurtedanlucian@gmail.com	Romanian Waters - ASP
19.	Daniel	Nasui	nasui.daniel@gmail.com	RO-TUCN
20.	Danijel	Ivanišević	divanisevic@hgi-cgs.hr	Hrvatski geološki institut
21.	Dijana	Oskoruš	oskorus@cirus.dhz.hr	Meteorological and Hydrological Service of the Republic Croatia
22.	Đorđa	Medić	dmedic@voda.hr	Hrvatske vode/Croatian Waters
23.	Dragica	Vulic	dragica.vulic@jcerni.rs	Jaroslav Cerni Water Institute
24.	Dumitru	Drumea	ddrumea559@gmail.com	Institute of Ecology and Geography
25.	Dženan	Vukotić	dzenan.vukotic@fzap.gov.ba	Agropedological Institute of Federation BiH
26.	Emina	Hadžić	eminahd@gmail.com	University of Sarajevo
27.	Eszter	Takács	takacs.eszter84@uni-mate.hu	MATE-HU
28.	Franko	Humer	franko.humer@umweltbundesamt.at	Environment Agency Austria
29.	Gheorghe	Iepure	iepureg@cunbm.utcluj.ro	ROTUCN
30.	Gheorghe	Damian	gdamian_geo@yahoo.com	RO_TUCN
31.	Gusztáv	Csomor	gusztav.csomor@interreg-danube.eu	DTP MA/JS
32.	Gyozo	Jordan	gyozojordan@gmail.com	HU-SZIE
33.	Hanna	Kolos	h.kolos@ukrgeol.com	SE UGC
34.	Heinz	Reitner	heinz.reitner@geologie.ac.at	Geological Survey of Austria
35.	Igor	Liska	igor.liska@icpdr.org	ICPDR
36.	Igor	Ljumovic	igor.ljumovic@jcerni.rs	Jaroslav Cerni Water Institute
37.	Igor	Stríček	igor.stricek@geology.sk	SK-SGIDS
38.	Ioan	Beres	ioan.beres@yahoo.com	Mineralogy Museum
39.	Ioan	Denut	ioandenut@yahoo.com	Mineralogy Museum
40.	Irena	Peytcheva	peytcheva@erdw.ethz.ch	BG-GI-BAS
41.	Ismir	Hajdarević	ismirhajdarevic@yahoo.com	Geological survey of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
42.	Jasmina	Antolić	jasmina.antolic@voda.hr	Hrvatske vode
43.	Jos	Brils	jos.brils@deltares.nl	SedNet
44.	Jovana	Rašeta Bastić	jraseta@savacommission.org	ISRBC
45.	Jozef	Kordík	jozef.kordik@geology.sk	SK-SGIDS,

46.	Katalin Mária	Dudás	kata.9.dudas@gmail.com	HU-MATE
47.	Katinka	Virág	virag.katinka@edu.bme.hu	Budapest University of Technology and Economics
48.	Klemen	Teran	klemen.teran@geo-zs.si	Geological Survey of Slovenia
49.	Kristina	Šarić	kristina.saric@rgf.bg.ac.rs	University of Belgrade - Faculty of Mining and Geology
50.	Kristina	Koret	kristina.koret@geo-zs.si	Geological Survey of Slovenia
51.	Libor	Mikl	libor.mikl@chmi.cz	CHMI
52.	Lidia – Lenuta	Balan	lidia_balan@yahoo.com	Geological Institute of Romania
53.	Luca	Ecaterina	ecaterina.luca@ymail.com	National Institute of Hydrology and Water Management
54.	Manfred	Sengl	manfred.sengl@lfu.bayern.de	Bavarian Environment Agency (Bayerisches Landesamt für Umwelt)
55.	Mária	Mörtl	mortl.maria@uni-mate.hu	MATE-HU
56.	Marko	Marjanovic	marko.marjanovic@jcerni.rs	Jaroslav Cerni Water Institute
57.	Máté	Kardos	kardos.mate@emk.bme.hu	Budapest University of Technology and Economics
58.	Matej	Draksler	matej.draksler@geo-zs.si	Geological Survey of Slovenia
59.	Matej	Fabok	matej.fabok@vuvh.sk	Water Research Institute, Slovakia
60.	Meta	Dobnikar	meta.dobnikar@geo-zs.si	Geological Survey of Slovenia
61.	Michal	Jankulár	michal.jankular@geology.sk	SK-SGIDS
62.	Milena	Vetseva	millena_vetseva@abv.bg	GI-BAS
63.	Mojca	Dobnikar Tehovnik	mojca.dobnikar-tehovnik@gov.si	Slovenian Environment Agency
64.	Natalia	Osadcha	nosad@uhmi.org.ua	Ukrainian Hydrometeorological Institute
65.	Neda	Devic	nedad28@gmail.com	GSM
66.	Neven	Bujas	neven.bujas@voda.hr	Hrvatske vode/Croatian Waters
67.	Nikolaus	Weber	nikolaus.weber@tuwien.ac.at	TU Wien
68.	Ottavia	Zoboli	ozoboli@iwag.tuwien.ac.at	TU Wien
69.	Paul	Kinner	paul.kinner@ait.ac.at	AT-AIT
70.	Pavel	Hucko	huckopav@gmail.com	
71.	Péter	Szabó	szbpeet@gmail.com	Eötvös Loránd University
72.	Petyo	Filipov	p_philipov@geology.bas.bg	GI-BAS
73.	Prvoslav	Marjanovic	prvoslav.marjanovic@jcerni.rs	Jaroslav Cerni Water Institute
74.	Razvan Dan	Bogzianu	rabodan@yahoo.com	National Administration Romanian Waters
75.	Renata	Kaps	renata.kaps@tuwien.ac.at	TU Wien
76.	Samo	Grošelj	sgroselj@savacommission.org	International sava River Basin Commission
77.	Sándor	Baranya	baranya.sandor@emk.bme.hu	BME
78.	Snježana	Miletić	snjezana.miletic@geo-zs.si	Geological Survey of Slovenia
79.	Steffen	Kittlaus	skittlaus@iwag.tuwien.ac.at	TU Wien
80.	Stela	Ginin	stankova_stela@yahoo.com	Executive Environment Agency, Bulgaria
81.	Suzana	Erić	suzana.eric@rgf.bg.ac.rs	University of Belgrade - Faculty of Mining and Geology
82.	Szakacs	Zsolt	szakacszy@yahoo.com	Technical University of Cluj Napoca - NUC of Baia Mare
83.	Tatjana	Mitrovic	tatjana.mitrovic@jcerni.rs	Jaroslav Cerni Water Institute
84.	Teja	Čeru	teja.ceru@geo-zs.si	Geological Survey of Slovenia
85.	Toni	Nikolić	toni.nikolic@fzgg.gov.ba	Geological survey of Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina
86.	Trifu	Cristina	cris.trifu@hidro.ro	National Institute of Hydrology and Water Management
87.	Veronica Elena	Alexe	v_e_alexey@yahoo.com	Geological Institute of Romania

88.	Vesna	Meznaric	vesna.meznaric@bioinstitut.hr	Bioinstitut
89.	Vladica	Cvetković	vladica.cvetkovic@rgf.bg.ac.rs	University of Belgrade - Faculty of Mining and Geology
90.	Volodymyr	Klos	v.klos@ukrgeol.com	SE UGC
91.	Zlatka	Milakovska	zlatkam@geology.bas.bg	Geological Institute at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
92.	Zsófia	Kovács	zsofia.kovacs@outlook.com	General Directorate of Water Management (HU)