



# PIANC

The World Association for Waterborne  
Transport Infrastructure

## TECHNICAL-BIOLOGICAL BANK PROTECTIONS FOR INLAND WATERWAYS PART 3: DECISION SUPPORT ADVICE



InCom Working Group Report N° 128 part 3 – 2025

**PIANC REPORT N° 128 part 3**  
INLAND NAVIGATION COMMISSION

**TECHNICAL-BIOLOGICAL BANK  
PROTECTIONS FOR INLAND WATERWAYS  
PART 3: DECISION SUPPORT ADVICE**

7 January 2025

PIANC has Technical Commissions concerned with inland waterways and ports (InCom), coastal and ocean waterways (including ports and harbours) (MarCom), environmental aspects (EnviCom) and sport and pleasure navigation (RecCom).

This report has been produced by an international Working Group convened by the Inland Navigation Commission (InCom). Members of the Working Group represent several countries and are acknowledged experts in their profession.

The objective of this report is to provide information and recommendations on good practice. Conformity is not obligatory and engineering judgement should be used in its application, especially in special circumstances. This report should be seen as an expert guidance and state-of-the-art on this particular subject. PIANC disclaims all responsibility in the event that this report should be presented as an official standard.

**PIANC HQ**  
**Boulevard du Roi Albert II 20 B. 3**  
**1000 Brussels | Belgium**

<http://www.pianc.org>

VAT BE 408-287-945

ISBN 978-2-87223-047-1

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>REFERENCES USED IN PART 3</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>GLOSSARY (Copy from Part 1, shortened)</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS (Copy from Part 1, shortened)</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PART 3</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>29</b>
1.1 Structure of the Report and Contribution of Part 3 .....	29
1.2 Application Limits of the Best Practice Approach (BPA) .....	29
<b>2 Main CONCLUSIONS FROM relevant PUBLICATIONS</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>3 GENERAL DESIGN HINTS OF TECHNICAL-BIOLOGICAL BANK PROTECTION MEASURES (TBP)</b> .....	<b>34</b>
3.1 DEFINITION AND CATEGORIZATION OF TECHNICAL-BIOLOGICAL BANK PROTECTION MEASURES (TBPs) .....	34
3.2 Categorisation of Measures According to Functionality Demands and Construction Features .....	36
3.3 Application Ranges of TBP Types .....	38
<b>4 DETAILED VIEW ON DOCUMENTED MEASURES IN PART 2</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>5 PRESELECTION OF APPROPRIATE MEASURES</b> .....	<b>53</b>
5.1 Scope of the Approach.....	54
5.1.1 Additional Remarks Concerning Ecological Issues.....	57
5.1.2 Definitions and Terms - Design Case .....	59
5.1.3 Definitions and Terms - Analysis Case.....	59
5.1.4 Definitions and Terms - Feasibility .....	62
5.1.5 Definitions and Terms – Suitability .....	63
5.1.6 Definitions and Terms – Importance and Weights .....	65
5.1.7 Definitions and Terms – Degree of Fulfilment and Scores .....	66
5.1.8 Definitions and Terms – Overview of the Preselection Tables .....	67
5.2 Preselection: Outline and Application Steps .....	68
5.2.1 Outline Feasibility Check .....	68
5.2.2 Outline Suitability Check.....	76
5.3 Explanations of the Application Examples.....	83
5.3.1 Design Case Example: Weser River at Stolzenau, Germany.....	83
5.3.2 Analysis Case Example: Willow Brush Mattresses, Rhine, Worms .....	88
5.4 Feasibility Check .....	92
5.4.1 Technical Boundary Conditions in the Design Case .....	92
5.4.2 Ecological Boundary Conditions in the Design Case .....	104
5.4.3 Technical Boundary Conditions in the Analysis Case Including Projections .....	113
5.4.4 Ecological Boundary Conditions in the Analysis Case – Table AFE.....	120
5.5 Suitability Check .....	123
5.5.1 Demanded Technical Functionality Issues in the Design Case.....	123
5.5.2 Demanded Ecological Functionality Issues in the Design Case .....	133
5.5.3 Achieved Technical Functionality in the Analysis Case Including Projections .....	143
5.5.4 Achieved Ecological Functionality – Analysis Case Including Projections .....	151
5.6 Consideration of Other Criteria .....	157
5.7 Matching All Criteria.....	157
5.8 Instructions How to Use the Preselection Excel Sheets.....	158
5.8.1 Content of the Excel Files and How to Use It Step By Step .....	158

5.8.2	Screening Based on Overview Tables.....	158
5.8.3	Comprehensive Technical and Ecological Preselection.....	158
5.8.4	Preselection Based on AHP.....	167
<b>6</b>	<b>PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW TO PERFORM A DETAILED STUDY .....</b>	<b>170</b>
6.1	Design Procedure .....	170
6.2	Preparatory Works .....	176
6.2.1	Discuss Planner's Objectives in View of the Design .....	176
6.2.2	Discuss Local Boundary Conditions and Related Criteria for Design .....	191
6.2.3	Improve Data Basis Where Necessary .....	209
6.2.4	Basic Considerations to Select Appropriate Measures.....	212
6.2.5	Check and Plan Flanking Measures.....	212
6.2.6	Check Non-Engineering Measures .....	214
6.3	7 Steps Approach.....	215
6.3.1	Evaluation and Selection of Relevant Functionality Demands.....	215
6.3.2	Evaluation and Selection of Design-Relevant Boundary Conditions .....	217
6.3.3	Preselection of Measures According to Chapter 5, Including Application of Well-Known Approaches from the Literature .....	218
6.3.4	Guided View on the Collection of Measures in Part 2.....	232
6.3.5	Consideration of Knockout Criteria .....	233
6.3.6	Definition and Specification of Variants to be Considered in Detail, Especially Properties of the Measure, Possible Measure Combinations and Adaptions .....	237
6.3.7	Choose the Best Variant(s), Using AHP for Weighting and Corrections to the Preselection Results .....	240
6.3.8	Choose the Best Variant(s), Basing on Direct Variant Comparisons Using AHP for Weighting and Scoring .....	278
6.4	Final Check and Feedback to Decision Makers and Planners.....	280
<b>7</b>	<b>DISCUSSION OF THE APPROACH AND APPLICATION LIMITS .....</b>	<b>281</b>
	<b>APPENDIX A: WORKSHEETS for SPECIFYING DESIGN CRITERIA.....</b>	<b>283</b>
A.1	EXPLANATIONS CONCERNING THE CONTENT OF THE WORKSHEETS .....	283
A.2	WORKSHEETS USED FOR SCREENING.....	284
A.3	WORKSHEETS USED FOR PRESELECTION .....	292
A.4	BLANK WORKSHEETS FOR SELECTING MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA.....	298
A.4.1	Blank Sheets Concerning Relevant Demands .....	298
A.4.2	Blank Sheets Concerning Relevant Boundary Conditions .....	307
	<b>APPENDIX B: DWA-M 519 Bioengineering Approach.....</b>	<b>322</b>
B.1	PRESELECTION TABLES USING LOCAL BOUNDARY CONDITIONS.....	322
B.2	SHIP-INDUCED LOADS for the DWA-M-519- 'Bioengineering-Approach' .....	324
	<b>APPENDIX C: BRITISH WATERWAY MANAGEMENT GUIDE with Adaptions to WG 128 Approach.....</b>	<b>337</b>
C.1	ADAPTED WATERWAY MANAGEMENT DESIGN APPROACH.....	337
C.1.1	General Remarks on the Approach and its Applicability.....	337
C.1.2	Operational Procedure for Bank Erosion Control .....	338
C.1.3	Concrete Design Rules .....	352
C.1.3.1	Non-Engineering Measures (Also for 7 Steps).....	353
C.1.3.2	Engineering Measures .....	364
C.1.3.3	Other Measures.....	369
C.2	Impact Scores and Equivalent Flow Velocities.....	370

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Structure and links between Parts 1-3 of the report and hints for selective reading and applying .....	17
Figure 2: Structure of the preselection scheme with its links to the AHP approach .....	19
Figure 3: Groups and subgroups of the AHP approach.....	20
Figure 4: Simplified application steps of the preselection scheme (left) and the detailed design (right) .	22
Figure 5: Visualisation of ranking lists (first-named three measures each) of all four categories (left and right columns) and corresponding matched results (middle column) for our standard-DC (Weser, Stolzenau). Abbreviations: DFT = Design Case, feasibility check, technical aspects), DFE = Design Case, feasibility, check, ecological aspects, DST = Design Case, suitability check, technical aspects, DSE = Design Case, suitability check, ecological aspects. AFT, AFE, AST, ASE = the same as above, but concerning the Analysis Case. ....	23
Figure 6: Example of the design charts in the UK-Guide – here concerning bioengineering methods, applied to the Weser Design Case (from Part 3, Appendix C). ....	24
Figure 7: Selected results from preselection tools, applied to the Weser DC (ranked from left to right) ...	25
Figure 8: Extract from Part 2 concerning the Basic Type (BT) 'Life willows on toe and bank' .....	25
Figure 9: Extract from the large list of knockout criteria (relevance for DC Weser marked in blue letters)	26
Figure 10: Examples (variants) chosen to explain the design approach in the report .....	27
Figure 5-1: Flow chart of the preselection approach (left) with important features, corresponding chapter- and table-names (TABs) in the big Excel file and major links to Detailed-Design-Recommendations (right) .....	53
Figure 5.2: Main features of the feasibility check, especially concerning the importance of possibly different boundary conditions at planner's site (Design Case DC) and at the site of realised measures (Analysis Case AC) for preselection purposes .....	70
Figure 5.3: Visualisation of the scoring rules for the feasibility check (for each criterion separately) for 'realised' measures – both for technical and ecological issues) .....	72
Figure 5.4: Visualisation of the scoring rules for the technical feasibility check (for each criterion separately) for 'projections' – tackling the scores for the upper and lower BCs, together with those of the realised measure .....	73
Figure 5.5: Visualisation of the scoring rules for the technical feasibility check (for each criterion separately) for the 'in range' option.....	74
Figure 5.6: Extracts from Tables DFE and DSE showing the way how to assess the potential ecological output by using the 'Boundary Condition Influence Matrix' .....	76
Figure 5.7: Definition sketch showing the main features of the suitability check for balancing the demands at planner's site (Design Case DC) with the offers/properties of realised measures (Analysis Case AC) for preselection purposes .....	77
Figure 5.8: Visualisation of the scoring rules for the suitability check (for each criterion separately) for 'realised' measures and 'projections' – both for technical and ecological issues .....	80
Figure 5.9: Flow chart how to apply the preselection approach step by step – technical issues .....	81
Figure 5.10: Flow chart how to apply the preselection approach step by step – ecological issues.....	82
Figure 5.11: DC site at the right bank, looking downstream the impounded Weser River with grazing cows (camera location ≈ 300 m upstream of the town of Stolzenau at Field 10, where willow plantings were realised. On the left, the upper fringe of the former rip rap protection can be seen (photo taken in August 1988). ....	85
Figure 5.12: Weser cross section close to field 10 with drilling graph (sandy gravel and humus-rich topsoil) .....	86
Figure 5.13: Top view of the Stolzenau test stretch with the chosen DC-site (field 10) .....	87

Figure 5.14: Field 10 of the Weser test section with willow bushes from brush mattresses and sparse undergrowth (reed canary grass). Photo showing the shoreline at low water ( $\approx 0.15$ m below MW) in September 2006. ....	88
Figure 5.15: Top view showing the location of the willow brush mattresses in Test Fields 2 and 3 on the right bank of the free-flowing Rhine River close to Worms Town (from the corresponding Case Study 4.3.3) .....	90
Figure 5.16: Statistic analysis of ship induced waves in two sections (the first from upstream corresponds to the location with willow brush mattresses) of the Worms test field.....	91
Figure 5.17: Cross section showing construction details of the test field with willow brush mattresses on the free-flowing Rhine River close to Worms (from the corresponding Case Study) .....	91
Figure 5.18: Willow brush mattresses on the free-flowing Rhine River close to Worms at different stages: Left photo just after the construction in 2011, 2 <sup>nd</sup> photo in summer 2012 and right photo 2018.....	91
Figure 5.19: State of the willow brush mattresses on the free-flowing Rhine River close to Worms in April 2016 with details concerning rooting depth and sparse undergrowth between the fastening hooks.....	92
Figure 5.20: Structure and content of TAB AFT in the Excel table.....	116
Figure 5.21: Structure and content of TAB AFE in the Excel table .....	121
Figure 5.22: Structure and content of TAB DST in the Excel table.....	124
Figure 5.23: Structure and content of TAB AST in the Excel table.....	149
Figure 6.1: Flow Chart of the recommended detailed design approach – related chapters.....	171
Figure 6.2: Overview on the recommended detailed design approach – aspects and criteria groups	173
Figure 6.3: Visualisation of the Overall suitability check (OSC), corresponding criteria groups, weights and scores of one selected variant. ....	174
Figure 6.4: Planner's objectives between the poles of ecology, technical issues, social benefits and legal framework. ....	177
Figure 6.5: Extract of the Overview Table concerning the Design Case: 'Existing rip rap protection at impounded Weser River at Stolzenau' (5 <sup>th</sup> line with 'crosses') and 9 of possible solutions, selected by using the first sorting option by setting 'arcs' in the lower part of line 5 and corresponding rankings from scores, which are set by using the '2 <sup>nd</sup> approach' (results shown in column 'BN'.....	219
Figure 6.6: Results of preselection in the form of ranking lists (screenshots from Excel tables, existing measures – designated by 'realised' – and optimised measures – designated by 'projection' – for the technical feasibility check in the upper graph and the technical suitability check in the graph below	223
Figure 6.7: Results of preselection in the form of ranking lists (screenshots from Excel tables Tabs R_T above and R_E below), using logical matching for combining results of feasibility and suitability – technical issues on top, ecological below .....	224
Figure 6.8: Results of preselection in the form of ranking lists (screenshot from Table.R_T+E_L) for existing measures and those including optimisations and adaptations (projections), using logical matching (marked yellow) for combining feasibility and suitability scores and using logical matching also for combining technical and ecological issues .....	225
Figure 6.9: Upper chart: Results of applying AHP to selected measures, using the projected scores derived from the preselection tools without adaptations ('proposals', Tab R_AHP_PROP). Lower chart: Comparison of preselection results (logical matching or combining feasibility and suitability and technical and ecological issues).....	230
Figure 6.10: Possible construction of Variant 3 for the Weser site (combination of measures 3.1.1.2 at Beauchastel, Rhone (pre-embankment dam protecting a shallow with helophyte plantings) and 4.3.3 at Rhine, Worms (willow brush mattresses) .....	240
Figure 6.11: Evaluation of weights in applying AHP for the Weser example .....	248
Figure 6.12: Example of proposed scores from preselection interpretation of realized measures and applying AHP (Tab R_AHP_PROP) for the Weser Design Case and the Analysis Cases BTs 2.1.8 and 2.2.3 .....	248

Figure 6.13: Applying AHP to direct variant comparisons concerning the S.3.3-score for assessing the functionality regarding habitats (screenshot from the R-R_S_3.3-TAB) .....	279
Figure 6.14: Collection of results from direct variant comparisons concerning all 9 AHP-criteria (screenshot from the R-R_S_AHP-TAB) .....	280

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1: Categorisation of measures according to main functionality issues and construction features with links to boundary conditions (it is assumed that all measures are combined with a conventional protection below MW where necessary) .....	37
Table 5-1: Overview of the technical preselection tables: Short Name in the report and the Excel files, check type (feasibility or suitability), criteria type, case (Design or Analysis Case), long name, table number in this report, reference chapters, main purpose and outcome .....	67
Table 5-2: Overview of the ecological preselection tables: Short Name in the report and the Excel files, check type (feasibility or suitability), criteria type, case (Design or Analysis Case), long name, table number in this report, reference chapters, main purpose and outcome .....	68
Table 5-3: Specification of criterion (A) in the DFT-table concerning ship-induced impacts and scoring rules .....	94
Table 5-4: Specification of criterion (B) in the DFT-table concerning the influence of average bank slope (non-cohesive soils, the numbers are bigger for cohesive soils) .....	94
Table 5-5: Specification of criterion (C) in the DFT-table concerning erosion resistance .....	95
Table 5-6: Specification of criterion (D) in the DFT-table concerning excess pore water pressure .....	96
Table 5-7: Specification of criterion (E) in the DFT-table concerning hinterland dimensions .....	96
Table 5-8: Specification of criterion (F) in the DFT-table concerning waterway type and water level fluctuations .....	97
Table 5-9: Specification of criterion (G) in the DFT-table concerning vegetation growth conditions .....	98
Table 5-10: Specification of criterion (H) in the DFT-table concerning ice-effects .....	99
Table 5-11: Preselection of appropriate measures – Table DFT – concerning the Boundary Conditions of the Design Case, technical issues, explained by the Weser example. Note that all numbers use a comma for the decimal point and that all numbers to be filled-in by an usual applier are marked in red colour .....	103
Table 5-12: Specification of criterion (A) in table DFE concerning space availability in the aquatic zone .....	105
Table 5-13: Specification of criterion (B) in table DFE concerning availability in the terrestrial zone .....	106
Table 5-14: Specification of criterion (C) in table DFE concerning surrounding land uses .....	107
Table 5-15: Tackling criteria (D) & (E) in Table DFE concerning hydrodynamic environment and vessel impact .....	107
Table 5-16: Specification of criterion (F) in the DFE-table concerning bank substrate .....	108
Table 5-17: Specification of criterion (G) in the DFE-table concerning water quality .....	108
Table 5-18: Specification of criterion (H) in the DFE-table concerning invasive species .....	109
Table 5-19: Table DFE for preselection: Ecological issues concerning feasibility – Design Case .....	112
Table 5-20: Hints for choosing the S <sub>AC</sub> -scores, including projections .....	115
Table 5-21: Scoring hints for applying Table AFT, explained by the Analysis Case: Willow brush mattresses on the free-flowing Rhine River, site Worms (see Chapter 5.3.2 and Part II, Case Study 'Living brush mattresses, installed in 2011 on the right bank of the river Rhine close to Worms, Germany') .....	117
Table 5-22: Preselection of appropriate measures – Table AFT – concerning Boundary Conditions at AC-Site (Analysis Case), technical issues. Scoring example Willow Brush Mattresses, Rhine, Worms, test section (measure Case Study 4.3.3, data from Table 4-1 in Part 2 - scores from Case Studies. The example was used in Table DFT. ....	119



Table 5-23: Extract with results for the example AC willow brush mattresses from the corresponding Table AFT in Part 2 (Table 4-1 in Part 2).....	120
Table 5-24: Table AFE for preselection: Ecological issues concerning Feasibility - Analysis Case.....	122
Table 5-25: Extract concerning the standard-AC willow brush mattresses from the corresponding Table AFE in Part 2 (called Table 4-2 there) .....	123
Table 5-26: General hints for choosing weights and scores when applying Table DST .....	128
Table 5-27: Explanation of weights and scores for applying Table DST concerning functionality demands for the Design Case: Bank stabilisation at test site 10 of the impounded Weser River at Stolzenau, see Chapter 5.3.1 .....	131
Table 5-28: Preselection of appropriate measures – Table DST – concerning the Functionality Demands of the Design Case, explained by example Weser, Stolzenau site, technical issues. ....	132
Table 5-29: Table DSE for preselection: Ecological issues concerning suitability - Design Case. ....	142
Table 5-30: Scoring hints concerning the achieved technical functionality of realised measures - Table AST.....	144
Table 5-31: Explanation of weights and scores for applying Table AST concerning achieved (and projected performance issues in square brackets) of the chosen Analysis Case example: Bank slope stabilization by Willow brush mattresses on the free-flowing Rhine River .....	147
Table 5-32: Preselection of appropriate measures – Table AST – concerning the Performance of realised measures at AC-site (Analysis Case), technical issues. Scoring example Willow Brush Mattresses, Rhine, Worms, test section. The example was used in Table DST. ....	150
Table 5-33: Example from Table AST-FFS concerning the performance of realised measures from selected FFs with pre-embankment components, technical issues, including projections (numbers in square brackets).....	151
Table 5-34: Scoring rules for all criteria in Table ASE.....	155
Table 5-35: Table ASE for preselection: Ecological issues concerning suitability – AnalysisCase. ....	156
Table 5-36: Example concerning the standard-AC willow brush mattresses from Tables ASE-FFs, collecting the scores for the suitability check, ecological issues .....	157
Table 5-37: Overview of input, check and output tabs of the comprehensive preselection.....	159
Table 5-38: User input (red-coloured cells) for technical applicability/feasibility (tab DFT show, TAB DST analogous).....	160
Table 5-39: AC criteria values for technical applicability/feasibility (TAB AFT shown, AST analogous) ....	161
Table 5-40: AC criteria calculated scores for technical applicability (TAB AFT shown, AST analogous) .	161
Table 5-41: Technical feasibility and suitability scores (left) and corresponding ranking lists (right) .....	162
Table 5-42: Technical scores for different combining options (weighted average, logical, and weighted logical) .....	164
Table 5-43: Ranking lists of technical scores for different combining options (only three top results shown) .....	164
Table 5-44: AC criteria values for ecological applicability/feasibility (TAB DFE shown, DSE analogous) .	165
Table 5-45: AC criteria calculated scores for ecological applicability (TAB AFT shown, AST analogous)	165
Table 5-46: Ranking lists of ecological scores for different combining options (only three top results shown) – Table R_E.....	165
Table 5-47: AHP input (crosses) for subgroup and group weights calculation .....	168
Table 5-48: AHP subgroup scores and weights, group weights and resulting total score and rank list....	168
Table 5-49: AHP corrected subgroup scores 'S <sub>CHOICE</sub> ' instead of the original scores 'S <sub>REAL</sub> ' for three variants (R_S_AHP-table, in the figure above split in two parts) .....	169
Table 6-1: Categorisation of planners objectives .....	177
Table 6-2: Collection of technical demands, used for screening (abbreviation SCR) and Preselection (PS), related to the AHP-criterion 1.2 (technical performance – stability and sustainability). The importance of decisive demands for all three variants and those criteria which allow differences in the variants to be worked out are marked by blue background.....	182

Table 6-3: Collection of selected technical demands, used for screening (abbreviation SCR) and Preselection (PS), related to the AHP-criterion 1.3 (avoiding efforts) – more information see Appendix A.4. ). The importance of decisive demands for all three variants and those criteria which allow differences in the variants to be worked out are marked by blue background. ....	184
Table 6-4: Collection of selected social demands for the AHP-criteria 2.1 (human), 2.2 (landscape and nature preservation) and 2.3 (legal) – more information see Appendix A.4. The importance of decisive demands for all three variants and those criteria which allow differences in the variants to be worked out are marked by blue background. ....	186
Table 6-5: Collection of ecological demands, used for screening (abbreviation SCR) and Preselection (PS), related to the AHP-criterion 3.2 (selected taxa). The importance of decisive demands for all three variants and those criteria which allow differences in the variants to be worked out are marked by blue background. ....	187
Table 6-6: Collection of ecological demands, used for screening (abbreviation SCR) and Preselection (PS), related to the AHP-criterion 3.3 (selected habitats). The importance of decisive demands all three variants and those criteria which allow differences in the variants to be worked out are marked by blue background. ....	190
Table 6-7: Collection of technical boundary conditions, used for screening (abbreviation SCR) and preselection (PS), related to the AHP-criterion 1.1 (degree of fit to site conditions and adaptability). The importance of decisive BCs for all three variants and those criteria which allow differences in the variants to be worked out are marked by blue background. ....	202
Table 6-8: Collection of ecological boundary conditions, used for screening (abbreviation SCR) and Preselection (PS), related to the AHP-criterion 3.1 (degree of fit to site conditions and adaptability) ....	208
Table 6-9: List of most important, design-relevant demands for the Weser example.....	216
Table 6-10: List of most important, design-relevant boundary conditions for the Weser example.....	218
Table 6-11: Matrices to assign different 'crosses' in the Overview Table to scores for comparing the DC and AC(s) .....	220
Table 6-12: Collection of generally appropriate measures from applying the screening, preselection, DWA-Bioengineering and UK approaches, including remarks concerning all relevant design criteria for the Weser example .....	229
Table 6-13: Collection of possible knockout criteria. Those which are relevant for the DC example at the Weser site are marked in blue letters.....	237
Table 6-14: Weighting and scoring for AHP with scoring hints (values are related to the well-known DC = Weser example and the usual AC-example of willow brush mattresses – more concrete measure 4.3.3), here called Variant 1 in Chapter 6.3.6 (red numbers come from preselection, realized measures – TAB R_AHP_PROP without modifications, blue numbers are corrected – TAB R_AHP_USER) .....	243
Table 6-15: Collection of relevant BCs and explanations for correcting the $S_{1,1}$ -score from preselection (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by a X with dark-blue background) .....	253
Table 6-16: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for correcting the $S_{1,2}$ -score from preselection (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by a X with dark-blue background) .....	258
Table 6-17: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for correcting the $S_{1,3}$ -score from preselection (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by a X with dark-blue background) .....	262
Table 6-18: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for assessing the $S_{2,1}$ -score (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by a X with dark-blue background) .....	265
Table 6-19: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for assessing the $S_{2,2}$ -score (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by a X with dark-blue background) .....	266
Table 6-20: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for assessing the $S_{2,3}$ -score (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by X with dark-a blue background) .....	268
Table 6-21: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for assessing the $S_{3,1}$ -score (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by X with dark-a blue background) .....	271

Table 6-22: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for assessing the S <sub>3.2</sub> -score (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by X with dark-a blue background) .....	273
Table 6-23: Collection of relevant criteria and explanations for assessing the S <sub>3.3</sub> -score (decisive criteria for all 3 variants are marked by X with dark-a blue background) .....	276
Table 6-24: Compilation of AHP results for the three chosen variants .....	277

## REFERENCES USED IN PART 3

BAW, BfG (2008): "Untersuchungen zu alternativen technisch-biologischen Ufersicherungen an Binnenwasserstraßen", Versuchsstrecke Stolzenau/Weser, km 241,550-242,300, Oktober 2008. (Translation: "Investigations Concerning Alternative Technical-Biological Bank Protections for Inland Waterways", Test section Stolzenau/Weser River, km 241,550-242,300, October 2008).

BAW (2016): "Driving Dynamics of Inland Vessels, Vessel Behaviour on European Inland Waterways and Waterway Infrastructure with Special Respect to German Waterways", Bundesanstalt für Wasserbau, Karlsruhe, 2013.

British Waterways (1999): "Waterway Bank Protection: A Guide to Erosion Assessment and Management", Environmental Agency, Almondsbury, England.

DWA (2016): "Technisch-biologische Ufersicherungen an großen und schiffbaren Gewässern", DWA-M 519, Deutsche Vereinigung für Wasserwirtschaft, Abwasser und Abfall e. V. (DWA), 2016. (Translation: "Technical-Biological Bank Protections for Large and Navigable Waters", DWA-M 519, German Association for Water, Waste Water and Waste (DWA)).

GBB (2010): "Grundlagen zur Bemessung von Böschungs- und Sohlensicherungen an Binnenwasserstraßen (GBB)", BAW Merkblatt. Ausgabe 2010. (Translation: BAW (2010): "Principles for the Design of Bank and Bottom Protection for Inland Waterways (GBB)", BAW Code of Practice, Federal Waterways Engineering and Research Institute, Germany).

PIANC InCom WG 99 (former WG 27) (2008): "Considerations to Reduce Environmental Impact of Vessels".

Fischenich, C. (2001): "Stability Thresholds for Stream Restoration Materials", USAE Research and Development Center, Environmental Laboratory, ERDC TN-EMRRPSR-29.

Gesing, C., Söhngen, B. and Kauppert, K. (2016): "Design of Bank Protection for Inland Waterways with GBBSoft+", International Symposium on River Sedimentation (ISRS), eBook ISBN 9781315623207.

Wolter, C. et al. (2009): "A Framework to Derive Most Efficient Restoration Measures for Human Modified Large Rivers", Science and information technologies for sustainable management of aquatic ecosystems: 7th International Symposium on Ecohydraulics. Concepcion, 2009, p.1-16.

PIANC InCom WG 141 (2019): "Design Guidelines for Inland Waterway Dimensions".