

**Convention on the Transboundary  
Effects of Industrial Accidents**

**Working Group on Implementation**

**Eighteenth meeting**  
Geneva (Switzerland),  
29–30 March 2012

**Minutes of the eighteenth meeting**

**Introduction**

1. The eighteenth meeting of the Working Group on Implementation was held in Geneva (Switzerland) at the premises of the Palais des Nations on 29–30 March 2012.
2. The following members of the Working Group attended the meeting: Mr. Gunnar Hem (Norway), Chairman; Ms. Anahit Aleksandryan (Armenia); Mr. Vadim Lozhechko (Belarus); Mr. Hrvoje Buljan (Croatia); Mr. Massimo Cozzone (Italy); Ms. Svetlana Stirbu (Republic of Moldova); Mr. Tomas Trcka (Slovakia); Ms. Ann-Sofie Eriksson (Sweden); and Ms. Sandra Ashcroft (United Kingdom). From the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) secretariat Mr. Nicholas Bonvoisin, Secretary to the Convention, Ms. Virginia Fusé, Programme Support Officer, and Ms. Claudia Kamke, Associate Expert, attended the meeting. Mr. Chris Dijkens, Chairperson of the Conference of the Parties, and Mr. Sergiusz Ludwiczak, Chief of the Transboundary Cooperation Section in the ECE Environment Division, participated in the opening of the meeting.
3. Mr. Francisc Senzaconi (Romania) informed the secretariat that he could not attend the meeting.

**I. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**

4. Mr. Gunnar Hem, Chairman of the Working Group, opened the eighteenth meeting and invited Mr. Ludwiczak to introduce the new staff members who had recently joined the secretariat: that is Mr. Bonvoisin, who was to start his new functions as Secretary to the Convention from 1 April 2012, and Ms. Kamke, Associate Expert. Mr. Ludwiczak also took the opportunity of thanking Mr. Lukasz Wyrowski for his work as Officer in Charge of the Convention in the previous years. Mr. Hem requested the other members of the Working Group to join him in welcoming Mr. Bonvoisin and Ms. Kamke and initiated a tour de table in which all the meeting participants introduced themselves.
5. The Working Group adopted the agenda for the meeting.

**II. Progress in reporting on implementation**

6. The Chair informed that the sixth reporting round on the Convention's implementation had been initiated with letters sent on 9 September 2011, accompanied by the reporting format and the guidelines in English, French or Russian. He also informed

that, at the request of the Conference of the Parties, the guidelines were reviewed in order to provide, where appropriate, reference to the indicators and criteria. The deadline for the submission of the national implementation reports had been set for 31 January 2012. The secretariat had sent several e-mail reminders to those Parties that had not met the deadline. At the time of the meeting, Greece and the Russian Federation had not provided their national implementation reports.

7. The Chair reminded the Working Group that those Parties that had not submitted the implementation report in the previous round, as well as of those Parties that had submitted a report containing insufficient information to allow for assessment<sup>1</sup>, had been requested through the letter to reply fully to all the questions in the current reporting round, while the other Parties were requested to provide information on updates or progress made in the previous biennium. Countries participating to the Assistance Programme, even if not Parties, received the same letter with the invitation to submit the implementation report, following their high-level commitment to the process in 2005.

8. National implementation reports were submitted from 37 out of 40 Parties (Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom). The European Union was not in a position to submit a national implementation report.

9. Of the six countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe not yet Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan), none had submitted the implementation report by the time of the meeting.

10. Implementation reports submitted in Russian and French had been translated into English.

11. The Working Group expressed its satisfaction that 37 Parties had made their reports available in time for the evaluation and that of the reporting countries, those having to provide a full report, had complied with the requirement.

12. The members expressed strong dissatisfaction and concern that the Russian Federation had not complied with the Convention's provision requiring reporting on implementation for three consecutive reporting rounds at the time of the meeting. The Working Group also expressed its concern that Greece had also failed to submit its report on implementation at the time of the meeting.

13. The Working Group also expressed its disappointment that it had not received reports from countries participating in the Assistance Programme, especially given that in this round of reporting the countries had been able to make use of the indicators and criteria to support the preparation of the implementation report.

### **III. Review of individual country implementation reports**

14. In preparation for the meeting, the members of the Working Group had agreed to analyse the national implementation reports on the basis of the following distribution of

---

<sup>1</sup> The Parties needing to reply fully to the questions of the implementation report were: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Portugal, the Russian Federation and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

work: Policy for implementation of the Convention – Ms. Ashcroft and Mr. Hem; Identification of hazardous activities – Mr. Cozzone and Mr. Lozhechko; Prevention of industrial accidents – Ms. Eriksson and Ms. Stirbu; Emergency Preparedness – Mr. Senzaconi and Mr. Buljan; Scientific and technological cooperation and exchange of information, as well as public participation– Ms. Aleksandryan and Mr. Trcka; and Decision-making on siting – Mr. Hem in consultation with the secretariat.

15. According to the agreed organization of work the members presented their evaluation of the respective parts of the national reports. Subsequently the Working Group presented and discussed a number of conclusions, which would be reflected in detail in the sixth report on implementation. In general terms, the Working Group was of the opinion that a high number of the Parties complied with the Convention and that the overall quality of reporting had improved in comparison with the previous reporting round, although in several cases it was evident that the guidelines had not been followed adequately.

16. The Working Group also identified some aspects that would need clarification or that would need to be reported to the Conference of the Parties. Some of those aspects related to:

- Practicalities for filling in the national implementation reports for countries having to provide only updates on progress achieved. It was noted that often it was difficult to understand the differences from the previous reporting round, if not well marked. The members of the Working Group agreed that it could be a good practice to copy and paste the old part of the report and to write in a different colour or font the new parts/updates. This suggestion could be inserted in the overall report on implementation and the Conference of the Parties could be invited to decide upon it;
- The possibility of re-introducing a section in the reports on response and on the Points of Contact;
- Some unclear replies from reporting Parties. For instance, from the reports by Hungary and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, it was not possible to understand in one case how many hazardous installations had been identified and in the other case whether the list had to be considered as final. The members of the Working Group would contact the countries for more information

#### **IV. Clustering of activities following workshops organized under the Convention: preparation of priority list for activities**

17. The Working Group was mandated by the Bureau at the joint meeting of the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation, held on 29 February – 1 March 2012, to examine the recommendations emanating from workshops and seminars under the Convention in view of (i) further prioritizing the recommendations, (ii) finding possible synergies with the work of other organizations and programmes, and (ii) making suggestions for specific activities to be considered for the 2013–14 workplan, while also taking into account the initiatives of partner organizations. The Working Group could work on the basis of a draft document clustering the recommendations from the workshops.

18. The Working Group agreed that each working team (see para. 14 above) would send, together with the summaries, their list of priority activities, created based on the outcome of the implementation reports. The secretariat would then further refine the document clustering the recommendations for the next Bureau meeting in June 2012.

## **V. Organization of further work**

19. The Working Group decided to prepare the advanced draft version of the sixth report on implementation for the Bureau meeting at the end of June 2012. The reporting format should be based on the one used for the fifth report on implementation, including the approach of highlighting good practices from countries, links and references to the Assistance Programme, and issues on which Parties had focused in their reporting. In addition to the previous overall report on implementation, the sixth one should also highlight the progress achieved by the countries in the biennium.

20. The members of the Working Group agreed to send to the Chairman and to the secretariat consolidated draft texts of their respective sections, which would also include conclusions on the sections assessed. On the basis of the contributions received, the Chairman with the support of the secretariat would compile a first draft of the overall report on implementation. When sending their written contributions, the members of the Working Group would also send the draft list of priority activities based on the conclusions that they drew from assessing their sections of the reports.

21. The Working Group agreed the following timetable:

- 1 May – submission by each team of contributions including a list of priority activities;
- 25 May – circulation of the preliminary first draft of the report for comments and submission of the provisional list of priority activities;
- 8 June – submission of comments to the preliminary first draft of the report by all the members to the secretariat and to the list of priority activities;
- 15 June – submission of the advanced draft to the Bureau, together with the list of priority activities.

22. The Group requested its chairman to report to the Bureau at its meeting preparatory for the Conference of the Parties on the main findings of the evaluation of the national implementation reports and to present the advanced draft of the sixth report on implementation.

## **VI. Closing of the meeting**

23. The Chairman summarized the findings of the meeting and expressed his satisfaction with the progress made in the preparation of the sixth report on implementation.

24. Mr. Hem thanked the secretariat for the support to the meeting and expressed, also on behalf of the Working Group, his gratitude for the professional, friendly and cooperative work of Mr. Wyrowski for the Convention.

25. The Chairman closed the meeting.

---