



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
16 September 2016

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

Ninth meeting

Ljubljana, 28–30 November 2016

Item 9 (b) of the provisional agenda

**Assistance to countries in the Caucasus, Central Asia and Eastern
and South-Eastern Europe: assessment of the Assistance
Programme's effectiveness and future development**

Effectiveness, results and options for the further development of the Assistance Programme

**Note by the Working Group on Implementation and the Bureau,
prepared in cooperation with the secretariat**

Summary

The Assistance Programme under the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, adopted at the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2004 (ECE/CP.TEIA/12, para. 39), aims to enhance efforts of countries with economies in transition in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe region to improve their levels of industrial safety, in particular through the implementation of the Convention.

At its eighth meeting (Geneva, 3–5 December 2014), the Conference of the Parties requested the Working Group on Implementation, with the support of the Bureau and the secretariat, to carry out an analytical review to determine whether there was sufficient information available to document and assess the Programme's effectiveness. In that context, it also requested the Working Group to assess whether there was a need for an independent external evaluation of the Programme, and to report its findings to the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting; (ECE/CP.TEIA/30, para. 14 (f)).

The present document responds to the above requests, and outlines a suggested way forward for discussion and possible endorsement by the Conference of the Parties.

GE.16-15996(E)



* 1 6 1 5 9 9 6 *

Please recycle



Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
I. Documenting and assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme	3
A. Deliberations of the Working Group on Implementation	3
B. Deliberations of the Bureau	6
II. Proposed way forward.....	8
A. Documenting and assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme.....	8
B. Improving the design and appeal of the Assistance Programme	9
C. Proposed next steps.....	10
Annex	
Quantitative indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme derived from available documentation	12

Introduction

1. At its third meeting (Budapest, 27–30 October 2004) the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (Industrial Accidents Convention) adopted an Assistance Programme to enhance efforts of countries with economies in transition in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) region to improve their levels of industrial safety, in particular by supporting their efforts to ratify or accede to and implement the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/12, para. 39). The Assistance Programme helps countries with economies in transition to address obstacles to accession or implementation, such as unstable institutional frameworks, limited administrative and expert capacities and scarce financial resources, which are often exacerbated by difficult overall political and economic situations. Through the support received, countries are better able to cope with industrial accident prevention, preparedness and response.

2. The present document examines the effectiveness of the Convention's Assistance Programme and options for its further development. Chapter I sets out the review of information on and an assessment of the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme undertaken by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation further to the request of the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting (ECE/CP.TEIA/30, para. 14 (f)). Chapter II reflects on the way forward and presents some proposals for the further development of the Assistance Programme.

I. Documenting and assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme

A. Deliberations of the Working Group on Implementation

3. At its eighth meeting (Geneva, 3–5 December 2014), the Conference of the Parties took note of the document “A decade of assistance to countries in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia: lessons learned and future prospects” (ECE/CP.TEIA/2014/5), prepared by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation in cooperation with the secretariat. The document set out the key milestones, achievements and impacts of the Assistance Programme, and proposed an approach to the delivery of assistance to the beneficiary countries in the future.

4. The Conference of the Parties recognized the progress achieved during the 10 years of the Assistance Programme and the continuing need to provide assistance to the countries in the target countries. It also highlighted the need to enhance the exchange of experience and good practices among Assistance Programme beneficiary countries and requested the secretariat to continue delivering activities under the Programme in a cost-efficient manner.

5. The Conference of the Parties also requested the Working Group, with the support of the Bureau and the secretariat, to carry out an analytical review to determine whether the information available was sufficient to document and assess the Programme's effectiveness. In that context, it also requested the Working Group to assess whether there was a need for an independent external evaluation of the Programme and to report its findings to the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting (ECE/CP.TEIA/30, para. 14 (f)).

6. The Working Group discussed the issue at its twenty-seventh to thirty-first meetings, inclusive, held over the course of 2015 and 2016.¹ The Chair of the Working Group reported the results of the discussions and presented the Working Group's recommendations to the Bureau.

7. During its meetings, the Working Group on Implementation discussed and identified several quantitative indicators that could be used to evaluate the progress of the Assistance Programme beneficiary countries towards the implementation of the Convention. The Working Group requested the secretariat to compile the information on these indicators for all Assistance Programme countries. Tables 1–7 in the annex to the present document contain this compilation of indicators, based on the information available to the secretariat as of 31 July 2016. The Working Group's analysis of these indicators revealed the following:

(a) The number of the Parties to the Convention has risen over the years, while the number of Assistance Programme beneficiary countries has remained constant;²

(b) The types of assistance activities have evolved since the inception of the Assistance Programme from national to more often multilateral activities;

(c) Beneficiary countries still face challenges in the implementation of the Convention, notably with regard to transboundary cooperation, for example in the area of identification and notification of hazardous activities to affected countries;

(d) The number of the beneficiary countries that have exchanged information on off-site emergency plans or have drafted joint off-site emergency plans is growing;

(e) The number of beneficiary countries that have bilateral or multilateral agreements in the area of industrial accidents prevention, preparedness, response and mutual assistance is also increasing;

(f) National implementation reports have been submitted regularly within the evaluation period 2004–2015 by three out of five beneficiary countries from South-Eastern Europe (Albania, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia),³ two out of three countries in Eastern Europe (Belarus and the Republic of Moldova), two out of three countries in the Caucasus (Armenia and Azerbaijan) and one of the five Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan);

(g) The adoption of the commitment declaration at the High-level Commitment Meeting (Geneva, 14–15 December 2005) seems to have had a positive impact on the submission of implementation reports by beneficiary countries under the Assistance Programme, especially from non-Parties;

¹ Reports of these meetings are available, respectively, from www.unece.org/index.php?id=36733, www.unece.org/index.php?id=36746, www.unece.org/index.php?id=40456, www.unece.org/index.php?id=41753 and www.unece.org/index.php?id=42753.

² Although the total number of beneficiary countries remained relatively stable over the years, there were some changes with regard to countries that joined the Assistance Programme later (Albania and Montenegro) and some that left the Programme with their accession to the European Union (Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania).

³ This excludes Bulgaria, Croatia and Romania which, since their accession to the European Union, are no longer beneficiary countries under the Assistance Programme and have regularly submitted national implementation reports in the period reviewed.

(h) Of the 15 countries currently benefiting from the Assistance Programme,⁴ 11 (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan)⁵ submitted self-assessments, of which 7 self-assessments were updated after comments from the Working Group (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Uzbekistan), 3 did not cover all working areas as listed in the document on the benchmarks and criteria for the implementation of the Convention⁶ (Georgia, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine) and 1 has been assessed by the Working Group as needing further improvement (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia);

(i) Of the 11 countries that submitted self-assessments, 7 followed up with the submission of action plans to the secretariat (Albania, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Uzbekistan),⁷ whereas 4 have yet to do so (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine);

(j) Four countries have not submitted a self-assessment and action plan (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Montenegro and Tajikistan);

(k) For Central Asia there seems to be generally less information available than for all other subregions;

(l) Some indicators identified by the Working Group provide more substantive information than others and thus seem to have more explanatory value. Further indicators might be relevant for the analysis, such as the impact of the use of ECE safety guidelines and checklists.

8. The Working Group also agreed to test the usefulness of these indicators by looking at four case studies (Armenia, Belarus, Kyrgyzstan and Serbia) in more detail, based on information available in the related national implementation reports, self-assessments, action plans and reports from assistance activities containing conclusions, recommendations and agreed follow-up actions. The Working Group concluded the following:

(a) There is some quantitative information available that has been compiled in a short time with limited effort;

(b) There is also some qualitative information available contained in national implementation reports, self-assessments and action plans as well as the conclusions, results and follow-up actions contained in workshop reports, exercise evaluation reports, inspections reports, progress and final project reports. This qualitative information has been compiled with much more effort;

(c) The amount of information available varies significantly per country, depending on the intensity of assistance provided to a country and the regularity with which implementation reports, self-assessments and action plans have been submitted;

⁴ The following countries are currently beneficiaries under the Assistance Programme: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

⁵ This excludes Croatia which also submitted a self-assessment in 2011.

⁶ Benchmarks for the implementation of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (ECE/CP.TEIA/2010/6) have been developed to complement the Assistance Programme's Strategic Approach. They comprise forms with criteria and indicators for countries' self-evaluation, to report on the progress achieved, and develop national action plans. They are available from: www.unece.org/env/teia/ap/tools.html

⁷ This excludes Croatia which also submitted an action plan in 2012.

(d) Based on the information available, it is difficult to assess the national progress made, and thus the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme, in each of the countries following the implementation of an assistance activity. Although information about national commitments and planned actions after assistance activities is available, it is not always clear whether they have been implemented or whether progress has been made and has had an effect on industrial safety;

(e) To allow a full assessment of the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme, there is a need to collect further qualitative and quantitative information on the progress made in the beneficiary countries after an assistance activity and the impact it has had;

(f) The progress made after the implementation of assistance activities was higher in countries where longer-term projects under the Assistance Programme were implemented, such as the Danube Delta project (involving the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) or the on-site inspection project (involving Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).

9. On the basis of its analytical review and with due regard to the mandate received from the Conference of the Parties, the Working Group concluded the following:

(a) A complete assessment of the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme would require quantitative and qualitative indicators. These qualitative indicators might show a causal effect between the implementation of an activity under the Assistance Programme and improvement in industrial safety in a beneficiary country;

(b) Although there is a lot of information available in the national implementation reports, self-assessments, action plans and reports of assistance activities, there are gaps for some countries and thus there is a need for additional quantitative and qualitative information from beneficiary countries to be identified and collected in order to be able to fully assess the Assistance Programme's effectiveness;

(c) As the Working Group believes that it will receive further information from beneficiary countries, and thus close the information gaps when pursuing a more rigorous approach to monitoring the implementation of the Convention and the Assistance Programme, as also reflected in its updated terms of reference, there is thus currently no need for an external evaluation of the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme.

B. Deliberations of the Bureau

10. The Chair of the Working Group on Implementation presented the results of the Working Group's analytical review to the Bureau at its thirty-first and thirty-second meetings (Geneva, 3–4 December 2015 and Ljubljana, 29–30 June 2016, respectively). The Bureau discussed the analysis carried out by the Working Group and considered the effectiveness and future of the Assistance Programme more generally.

11. The Bureau members recognized the close linkages between the current review of the information available to assess the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme and its future development. The Bureau members suggested keeping in mind also additional sources of information beyond those available under the Assistance Programme, for example: information on industrial accident prevention, preparedness and response submitted to the European Commission; national chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and explosive threats (CBRNE) action plans; and disaster risk reduction strategies and action plans.

12. On the basis of a secretariat note, the Bureau also identified additional factors that have influenced the implementation of the Assistance Programme, such as:

- (a) The design of the Assistance Programme and the adoption of the High-level Commitment Declaration, dating back to 2004 and 2005, respectively;
- (b) Changes that have occurred in the economic and political landscape of the ECE region over the past 12 years;
- (c) Major political changes in some of the beneficiary countries, leading to unstable institutions or weak institutional memory, which may, in turn, have affected their commitment;
- (d) Inadequate staffing and availability of resources in the beneficiary countries;
- (e) The implementation of the Strategic Approach being regarded as an administrative burden by the beneficiary countries, subject to complicated procedures of authorization by various competent authorities;
- (f) Competing claims on the human resources and capacity of the beneficiary countries between capacity-building activities organized to support accession to the European Union or association processes, on the one hand, and activities under the Convention's Assistance Programme, on the other. The European Union generally provides for large-scale funding for several years and, as such, the attention of the countries is increasingly geared towards implementing projects funded by the European Union;
- (g) Limited, unpredictable and irregular financial contributions for the Assistance Programme, preventing the sustainable planning of activities and placing a significant burden on the administrative capacity of the secretariat, which has to plan, implement and report on several small-scale activities and projects, as well as find potential donors to fund them;
- (h) The scope of the Assistance Programme, which is mainly targeted at assisting national and local authorities to meet the Convention's obligations, and thus not specifically including vital stakeholders, such as industry, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the public;
- (i) The low visibility of the Convention in beneficiary countries, where it is frequently regarded as "niche" legislation.

13. On this basis, the Bureau discussed the challenges faced by the Assistance Programme, namely:

- (a) The low rate of implementation of the Strategic Approach, with few action plans and no project proposals received;
- (b) Insufficient ownership of the Assistance Programme by many of the beneficiary countries;
- (c) The increasing burden on the secretariat and lead countries for implementing activities;
- (d) The limited and unpredictable financing of the Assistance Programme.

14. Bureau members then engaged in a broader reflection on the Assistance Programme, discussed its future and:

- (a) Recalled that the Programme, with its structured approach, was an asset to the Convention, highlighting its importance for enhancing industrial safety throughout the ECE region;
- (b) Recognized that the Strategic Approach, with its benchmarks, has not been used systematically by the countries, likely owing to the insufficient perception of these tools as beneficial to the countries;

(c) Discussed whether a simplified way of implementing the Strategic Approach could be suggested. The Chair of the Working Group on Implementation informed the Bureau that the Working Group had discussed such a way forward. It had also agreed to allow Georgia to prepare a project proposal on the basis of its national CBRNE threat reduction strategy and related action plan, rather than on the basis of an action plan under the Strategic Approach;

(d) Stressed the importance of co-financing (in cash or in kind) by the beneficiary countries of the projects being implemented, thus increasing their ownership, stimulating synergies and encouraging the identification of other stakeholders to be associated with the project;

(e) Considered the repositioning or rebranding of the Assistance Programme;

(f) Highlighted the importance of avoiding duplication of activities carried out in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and the need to consider synergies in implementing these, including with activities financed by the European Union and the development cooperation agencies of other Parties to the Convention;

(g) Stressed the need to make use of strategic partnerships and synergies with other multilateral environmental agreements, international and regional organizations and initiatives. Recent partnerships could be further strengthened or new ones developed with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Global Environment Facility, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe and national development cooperation agencies;

(h) Underscored the need for the continued involvement of experts from Parties to decrease the burden on the secretariat in implementing assistance activities;

(i) Recognized that sustainable and predictable financing for the Assistance Programme was key for the planning and implementation of activities. The Bureau discussed the economic viability of projects implemented under the Assistance Programme, considering that, for smaller-scale projects, the costs for overhead and staff were comparatively high. It also stressed the importance of finding a proper financing mechanism and gaining experience in using it. A longer-term project cycle — for example, three to five years — could be considered.

II. Proposed way forward

15. This chapter provides an overview of the proposals by the Working Group on Implementation and the Bureau for a way forward for documenting and assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme, as well as its further development. The Conference of the Parties is invited to consider these proposals.

A. Documenting and assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme

16. The analytical review conducted by the Working Group demonstrates that there is some quantitative and qualitative information available on the Assistance Programme. The Working Group considers that this compilation of information is very useful in order to identify trends, gaps and the need for further information in some areas and from certain countries. It concludes that the preliminary data confirms previous findings that the Assistance Programme has been generally successful. However, it is not possible to assess completely the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme without additional qualitative information from the beneficiary countries.

17. The Working Group on Implementation is of the opinion that most of the missing information from beneficiary countries can be collected when pursuing a more rigorous approach to monitoring the implementation of the Convention and the Assistance Programme in the future, in accordance with its updated terms of reference. An external evaluation of the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme is therefore not needed at this stage. The Working Group recommends that the issue be revisited, following the implementation of the first prolonged term of office of the next Working Group, which will be elected for four years, and that the focus be on engaging with countries to improve their implementation of the Convention.

18. Following the first prolonged term of the Working Group on Implementation, the Conference of the Parties may wish to reconsider the issue. If there is still a need for further information and an evaluation of the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme, an alternative approach could be to appoint an independent expert to design an evaluation plan, collect and analyse further quantitative and qualitative information and deliver a final report. This could be implemented through in-kind support by one or more Parties. The Working Group stresses that any possible future evaluation should not significantly impact the secretariat's human resources to service assistance activities or divert funds from other activities under the workplan. The evaluation should be targeted at improving future activities and the approach to be taken to implement them.

19. Nonetheless, the Working Group highlights the importance of evaluating different activities carried out under the Assistance Programme, whether separate projects, such as in the Danube Delta, or free-standing workshops. The Working Group considers it important to collect and present information with participants' feedback on activities carried out under the Assistance Programme. It recommends that this approach, pursued by the secretariat, be continued for future activities.

B. Improving the design and appeal of the Assistance Programme

20. In order to improve the design and appeal of the Assistance Programme for both beneficiary countries and donors, the Conference of the Parties may wish to consider the following proposals:

1. Simplification of the design of the Assistance Programme and the Strategic Approach to improve its implementation

21. Some of the possible steps that could facilitate the implementation of the Strategic Approach by the beneficiary countries include:

(a) Further encourage countries to use the user-friendly version of the benchmarks for the implementation of the Convention;

(b) Introduce simplified procedures for gathering and verifying information on the implementation of the Strategic Approach, for example, the use of other suitable and relevant documents developed by the countries (action plans, strategies, reports for other initiatives and policies making reference to the Convention) for the purposes of the Assistance Programme.

2. Improved funding and efficiency of the Assistance Programme

22. Some of the possible steps that could improve the funding and the efficiency of the Assistance Programme are:

(a) Development of larger-scale and longer-term project proposals by the Bureau and the secretariat, in cooperation with the Working Group on Implementation, including

for funding by programmes administered by the European Union and national development cooperation agencies. These could be developed in partnership with other relevant ECE multilateral environmental agreements and possibly other partners;

- (b) Engaging a broader base of donors;
- (c) Exploring and using Internet-based training and information tools, such as decision support systems for some technical aspects of the Convention (e.g., annex I), online training courses for topics that require continuous training and webinars;
- (d) Enhancing the cooperation with strategic partners and exploring the possibility of outsourcing certain activities to partners. The cooperation with the NGO Zoë Environment Network in implementing trainings on the user-friendly version of the benchmarks document in Albania and Azerbaijan in 2014 could serve as an example in this regard.

3. Improved visibility of the Convention and its Assistance Programme

23. Some of the steps that could improve the visibility of the Convention and its Assistance Programme are:

- (a) Clarification and advertisement of the linkages between the Convention and its Assistance Programme, on the one hand, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030, on the other. In addition, the role of the Convention in introducing common safety standards in the area of hazardous chemicals management, thus creating level playing field in the ECE region, could be highlighted;
- (b) Cooperation with NGOs and relevant stakeholders (e.g., the Regional Environmental Centre for Central and Eastern Europe) in defining the interlinkages between public information and participation and industrial security and safety;
- (c) Further development of and contribution to guidance and training materials regarding the implementation of different aspects of the Convention (e.g., prevention, preparedness and response), individually or with strategic partners;
- (d) Development of a marketing strategy for the Convention, including with regard to the Assistance Programme;
- (e) Enhanced cooperation with industry in areas of common interest (e.g., guidance notes, training and safety standards), in accordance with the United Nations rules and regulations;
- (f) Requesting high-level feedback from beneficiary countries of the Assistance Programme with regard to the progress made following the implementation of assistance activities and their specific future needs, for example, through sending official letters to ministers;
- (g) Organizing a high-level segment on the Assistance Programme during the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

C. Proposed next steps

24. In the light of the information presented above, the following steps are proposed:

- (a) **Step 1:** The Working Group on Implementation should pursue in its next term a more rigorous approach to monitoring the Assistance Programme, in accordance with its updated terms of reference, to collect further information on and improve the implementation of the Convention by beneficiary countries;

(b) **Step 2:** The Bureau, in cooperation with the Working Group, should request high-level feedback from beneficiary countries of the Assistance Programme with regard to their progress made and specific needs for future assistance. Based on this feedback and the conclusions and observations set out in the present document, the Bureau, in cooperation with the Working Group, should consider the further development of the Assistance Programme with regard to its design and appeal for both beneficiary countries and donors, including the possibility to organize a high-level meeting in the framework of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

(c) **Step 3:** Following the implementation of steps 2 and 3, the Conference of the Parties could revisit the issue at its eleventh meeting in autumn 2020.

25. The Conference of the Parties is invited to take note of the information presented and endorse the proposed next steps.

Annex

Quantitative indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the Assistance Programme derived from available documentation (as of 31 July 2016)

Table 1
Number of countries in the Assistance Programme since 2005

Number	Assistance Programme countries	2005 ^a	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
1	Albania ^b	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Armenia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3	Azerbaijan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Belarus	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6	Bulgaria ^c	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	Croatia ^c	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
8	Georgia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Kazakhstan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10	Kyrgyzstan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11	Montenegro ^b	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
12	Republic of Moldova	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	Romania ^c	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	Serbia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	Tajikistan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16	Turkmenistan ^b	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
17	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18	Ukraine	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19	Uzbekistan	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Total	15	15	13	13	15	15	15	15	14	15	15

^a The Assistance Programme was launched in 2004, but the first activities took place in 2005.

^b These countries did not sign the Commitment Declaration at the High-level Commitment Meeting in 2005 but were invited to join the Assistance Programme later (Albania and Montenegro) or benefit from capacity-building activities (Turkmenistan).

^c With the year of their accession to the European Union, these countries have been indicated as being no longer a beneficiary under the Assistance Programme.

Table 2
Number of beneficiary countries of the Assistance Programme that are Parties to the Convention

<i>Number</i>	<i>Assistance Programme countries</i>	<i>Parties in 2004</i>	<i>Parties in 2009</i>	<i>Parties in 2010</i>	<i>Parties in 2013</i>
1	Albania ^a	1	1	1	1
2	Armenia	1	1	1	1
3	Azerbaijan	1	1	1	1
4	Belarus	1	1	1	1
5	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	0	0	1
6	Bulgaria ^b	1	1	1	1
7	Croatia ^b	1	1	1	1
8	Georgia	0	0	0	0
9	Kazakhstan	1	1	1	1
10	Kyrgyzstan	0	0	0	0
11	Montenegro ^a	0	1	1	1
12	Republic of Moldova	1	1	1	1
13	Romania ^b	1	1	1	1
14	Serbia	0	1	1	1
15	Tajikistan	0	0	0	0
16	Turkmenistan ^a	0	0	0	0
17	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0	0	1	1
18	Ukraine	0	0	0	0
19	Uzbekistan	0	0	0	0
Total		9	11	12	13

^a These countries did not sign the Commitment Declaration at the High-level Commitment Meeting in 2005, but were invited later to join the Assistance Programme (Albania and Montenegro) or benefit from capacity-building activities (Turkmenistan).

^b Since their accession to the European Union, these countries are no longer beneficiaries under the Assistance Programme.

Table 3
Activities under the Assistance Programme from 2004 to 2015

<i>Year</i>	<i>Assistance Programme activity</i>	<i>Number of activities per year</i>
2004	(none)	—
2005	High-Level Commitment Meeting (Geneva, Switzerland, 14–15 December)	1
2006	Fact-finding mission to Tajikistan (Dushanbe, 10–12 May)	11
	Fact-finding mission to Belarus (Minsk, 15–17 May)	
	Fact-finding mission to Azerbaijan (Baku, 22–24 May)	
	Fact-finding mission to the Republic of Moldova (Chisinau, 29–31 May)	
	Awareness-raising mission to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Skopje, 29–30 May)	
	Fact-finding mission to Bulgaria (Sofia, 31 May–2 June)	
	Fact-finding mission to Romania (Bucharest, 12–14 June)	
	Fact-finding mission to Armenia (Yerevan, 27–29 June)	
	Fact-finding mission to Georgia (Tbilisi, 28 August–1 September)	
	Fact-finding mission to Kyrgyzstan (Bishkek, 12–15 September)	
	Fact-finding mission to Ukraine (Kyiv, 18–20 September)	
2007	Fact-finding mission to Kazakhstan (Astana, 17–20 April)	6
	Fact-finding mission to Serbia (Belgrade, 11–14 June)	
	Fact-finding mission to Uzbekistan (Tashkent, 9–12 July)	
	Fact-finding mission to Croatia (Zagreb, 20–22 August)	
	Workshop on capacity-building to further strengthen the legal and institutional frameworks under the Convention in the countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (Kyiv, 5–7 December)	
	Capacity-building workshop (Vadul-lui-Voda, Republic of Moldova, 13–14 December)	
2008	Hands-on training session on identification of hazardous activities (Minsk, 21–22 October)	1
2009	Training session on integrated approaches to major hazard prevention (Prague, 11–13 February)	7
	Kick-off meeting, Danube River project (Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia) (Bucharest, 17–18 March)	
	Awareness-raising mission to Albania (Tirana, 20–21 May)	
	Technical workshop, Danube River project (Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia) (Drobeta-Turnu Severin, Romania, 16–18 June)	
	Awareness-raising mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina (Sarajevo, 22–23 September)	
	Field exercise and evaluation workshop, Danube River project (Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia) (Negotin, Serbia, 24–25 September)	
	Final workshop, Danube River project (Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia) (Sofia, 17–18 November)	
2010	Training session for the evaluation of safety reports for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Belgrade, 8–9 February)	4

<i>Year</i>	<i>Assistance Programme activity</i>	<i>Number of activities per year</i>
	National training session for the Republic of Moldova on the identification of hazardous activities (Chisinau, 9–10 March)	
	National training session for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia on the identification of hazardous activities (Skopje, 23–24 March)	
	National training session for Azerbaijan on the identification of hazardous activities (Baku, 27–28 October)	
2011	Follow-up to the training session on evaluation of safety reports and joint inspection for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Zagreb, 29–31 March)	8
	Workshop on the use of indicators and criteria for the implementation of the Strategic Approach (Bratislava, 4–6 May)	
	Kick-off meeting, Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Kyiv, 11 May)	
	Workshop on hazard management, Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Chisinau, 12–13 July)	
	Joint visit to oil terminals, Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Galati, Romania, 27–29 September)	
	Regional training session on identification of hazardous activities for Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan (Bishkek, 22–23 November)	
	National training on the identification of hazardous activities for Uzbekistan (Tashkent, 6–7 December)	
	Workshop on crisis management, Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Chisinau, 13–14 December)	
2012	Training session on the evaluation of safety reports — on-site inspection for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Split, Croatia, 22–24 October)	1
2013	Workshop on safety guidelines and good industry practices for oil terminals in Odessa within the Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Odessa, Ukraine, 23–25 September)	5
	Capacity-building to enhance development and evaluation of safety reports (Zagreb, 28–29 October)	
	Workshop on the accession to and implementation of the Convention for Kyrgyzstan (Bishkek, 28–29 October)	
	High-level awareness-raising meeting and expert workshop for Georgia (Tbilisi, 5–8 November)	
	Training session on safety management system as part of safety reports (Belgrade, 13–14 November)	
2014	National training session on preparation and evaluation of safety reports (Skopje, 27–28 February)	6
	Implementation of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents in Montenegro (Podgorica, 15–16 April)	
	High-level meeting to promote the implementation of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (Sarajevo, 19 May)	
	Training session on the use of Indicators and Criteria under the Industrial Accidents Convention (Tirana, 8–9 October)	
	National workshop on the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (Ashgabat, 9–10 October)	

<i>Year</i>	<i>Assistance Programme activity</i>	<i>Number of activities per year</i>
	Training session on the use of Indicators and Criteria under the Industrial Accidents Convention (Baku, 30–31 October)	
2015	Hazard and Crisis Management Week, Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Chisinau, 23–26 March),	4
	Subregional workshop for Central Asia: Chemicals management, identification and notification of industrial hazardous activities and accidental water pollution (Astana, 26–28 May)	
	Field exercise in the Danube Delta between the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine (Giugiurlesti, Republic of Moldova, 1–3 September)	
	Final workshop, Danube Delta project (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) (Bucharest, 19–23 October)	
Total number of activities 2004–2015		54

Table 4
Summary of the indicators for the beneficiary countries from South-Eastern Europe

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Albania</i>	<i>Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	<i>Montenegro</i>	<i>Serbia</i>	<i>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>
Beneficiary country	Yes (2009)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2014)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)
Fact-finding and awareness-raising missions (year)	2009	2009, 2014	2014	2007	2006
Self-assessment (year)	2011, 2015	No	No	2011, 2015	2011
Action plan (year)	2012, 2016	No	No	2012, 2015	2012
Projects under the Assistance Programme	No	No	No	Danube River project (2009); On-site inspection project (2010–2013)	On-site inspection project (2010–2013)
Number of activities organized under the Assistance Programme ^a	3	4	1	13	8
Year of becoming Party	1994	2013	2009	2009	2010
Implementation reports submitted	2004–2005 to 2014–2015	2006–2007 ^b	2010–2011 to 2014–2015	2004–2005 to 2014–2015	2004–2005 to 2014–2015
Participation in meetings of the Conference of the Parties	1st–3rd, 7th, 8th	4th–8th	4th, 8th	4th–8th	5th–8th
Point of contact for mutual assistance (in the ECE Industrial Accident Notification System)	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Competent authority named	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hazardous activities identified	Yes (7)	Yes (4)	No	Yes (9)	Ongoing (19 preliminary)
Hazardous activities notified	No	No	No	No	No

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Albania</i>	<i>Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	<i>Montenegro</i>	<i>Serbia</i>	<i>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</i>
Internal (on-site) and external (off-site) contingency plans exist	Partially	—	No	Partially	No
Coordination between operators and authorities in preparing the plans	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes
Testing, reviewing or updating done in cooperation with neighbouring countries	No	—	Yes	No	Yes
Bilateral or multilateral agreements for mutual assistance	No	—	No	No	Yes
Bilateral or multilateral activities or programmes to exchange information, experiences and/or technology	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Public participation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Participation of the public from affected Parties possible	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Abbreviations and symbols: “—” means no information available in the national implementation report, if submitted to the secretariat.

^a Subregional activities for more than one country are counted as one activity per country involved. The sum of the activities of all countries might thus be higher than the total number of activities implemented.

^b Although Bosnia and Herzegovina became a Party only in 2013, it signed the High-level Commitment Declaration in 2005 and thus committed to regularly submit a national implementation report.

Table 5

Summary of the indicators for the beneficiary countries from Eastern Europe and the Caucasus

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Eastern Europe</i>			<i>Caucasus</i>		
	<i>Belarus</i>	<i>Republic of Moldova</i>	<i>Ukraine</i>	<i>Armenia</i>	<i>Azerbaijan</i>	<i>Georgia</i>
Beneficiary country	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)
Fact-finding and awareness-raising missions (year)	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006	2006, 2013
Self-assessment (year)	2011, 2012	2011, 2013	2011 (incomplete)	2011, 2015	2012, 2016	2011 (incomplete)
Action plan (year)	2012, 2013	2013	No	No	No	2015
Projects under the Assistance Programme	No	Danube Delta project (2011–2015)	Danube Delta project (2011–2015)	No	No	No
Number of activities organized under the Assistance Programme ^a	4	13	14	5	7	7
Party (year)	2003	1994	No	1997	2004	No
Implementation reports submitted	2002–2003 to 2014–2015	2002–2003 to 2014–2015	2002–2003 to 2008–2009, and 2012–2013 ^b	2001–2002 to 2014–2015	2002–2003 to 2014–2015	2004–2005 to 2008–2009, and 2012–2013 ^b
Participation in meetings of the Conference of the Parties	1st–8th	1st–8th	1st–8th	1st–4th, 6th–8th	1st–4th, 6th–8th	2nd–8th
Point of contact for mutual assistance (in the ECE Industrial Accident Notification System)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Competent authority named	Yes	Yes	Yes ^c	Yes	Yes	Yes ^c
Hazardous activities identified	Yes (8)	Yes (8)	9,311 (not only transboundary)	Yes (1)	Yes (10)	No
Hazardous activities notified	Yes	Partly (2)	No	No	No	No

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Eastern Europe</i>			<i>Caucasus</i>		
	<i>Belarus</i>	<i>Republic of Moldova</i>	<i>Ukraine</i>	<i>Armenia</i>	<i>Azerbaijan</i>	<i>Georgia</i>
Internal (on-site) and external (off-site) contingency plans exist	Yes	Partially	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Coordination between operators and authorities in preparing the plans	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Testing, reviewing or updating done in cooperation with neighbouring countries	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Bilateral or multilateral agreements for mutual assistance	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bilateral or multilateral activities or programmes to exchange information, experiences and/or technology	Yes	Yes	—	Yes	Yes	Yes
Public participation	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Participation of the public from affected Parties possible	Yes	No	—	Yes	Yes	No

Abbreviations and symbols: “—” means no information available in the national implementation report, if submitted to the secretariat.

^a Subregional activities for more than one country are counted as one activity per country involved. The sum of the activities of all countries might thus be higher than the total number of activities implemented.

^b Although not a Party, the country signed the High-level Commitment Declaration in 2005 and thus committed to regularly submit a national implementation report.

^c Although not a Party, the country has nominated a competent authority under the Convention.

Table 6
Summary of the indicators for the beneficiary countries from Central Asia

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Kazakhstan</i>	<i>Kyrgyzstan</i>	<i>Tajikistan</i>	<i>Turkmenistan^a</i>	<i>Uzbekistan</i>
Beneficiary country	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)	Yes (2005)	No	Yes
Fact-finding and awareness-raising missions (year)	2007	2006	2006	2014	2007
Self-assessment (year)	No	2011(incomplete)	No	No	2013, 2014
Action plan (year)	No	No	No	No	2013
Projects under the Assistance Programme	No	No	No	No	No
Number of activities organized under the Assistance Programme ^b	5	5	3	2	3
Party	2001	No	No	No	No
Implementation reports submitted	2000–2001 and 2004–2005 to 2014–2015	2004–2005, 2006–2007 ^c	2004–2005 ^c	n/a	2004–2005 to 2006–2007, and 2014–2015 ^c
Participation in meetings of the Conference of the Parties	2nd, 4th, 5th,7th,8th	1st–8th	1st, 3rd,4th, 6th	No	1st–4th, 6th, 8th
Point of contact for mutual assistance (in the ECE Industrial Accident Notification System)	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Competent authority named	Yes	Yes ^d	n/a	—	Yes ^d
Hazardous activities identified	11,908 (not only transboundary)	—	—	—	—
Hazardous activities notified	No	—	—	—	—
Internal (on-site) and external (off-site) contingency plans exist	Yes	—	—	—	—

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Kazakhstan</i>	<i>Kyrgyzstan</i>	<i>Tajikistan</i>	<i>Turkmenistan^a</i>	<i>Uzbekistan</i>
Coordination between operators and authorities in preparing the plans	Yes	—	—	—	—
Testing, reviewing and updating done in cooperation with neighbouring countries	No	—	—	—	—
Bilateral or multilateral agreements for mutual assistance	No	—	—	—	—
Bilateral or multilateral activities or programmes to exchange information, experiences and/or technology	—	—	—	—	—
Public participation	Yes	—	—	—	—
Participation of the public from affected Parties possible	Yes	—	—	—	—

Abbreviations and symbols: “—” means no information available in the national implementation report, if submitted to the secretariat; n/a = not applicable.

^a Turkmenistan did not sign the Commitment Declaration at the High-level Commitment Meeting in 2005 and is thus not a committed country. Following the interest shown by the country in the Convention, the Conference of the Parties at its seventh meeting (Stockholm, 14–16 November 2012) decided to invite the country to join the Assistance Programme.

^b Subregional activities for more than one country are counted as one activity per country involved. The sum of the activities of all countries might thus be higher than the total number of activities implemented.

^c Although not a Party, the country signed the High-level Commitment Declaration in 2005 and thus committed to regularly submit a national implementation report.

^d Although not a Party, the country has nominated a competent authority under the Convention.

Table 7
Summary of the indicators for previous beneficiary countries

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Bulgaria</i>	<i>Croatia</i>	<i>Romania</i>
Beneficiary country until	end 2006	mid-2013	end 2006
Fact-finding and awareness-raising missions(year)	2006	2007	2006
Self-assessment (year)	n/a	2011	n/a
Action plan (year)	n/a	2012	n/a
Projects under the Assistance Programme	Danube River project (2009)	On-site inspection project (2010–2013)	Danube River project (2009); Danube Delta project (2011–2015)
Number of activities organized under the Assistance Programme ^a	2 ^b	6 ^b	1 ^b
Party (year)	1995	2000	2003
Implementation reports submitted	2000–2001 to 2014–2015	2000–2001 to 2014–2015	2004–2005 to 2014–2015
Participation in meetings of the Conference of the Parties	3rd–8th	1st, 3rd–5th, 7th–8th	1st–7th
Point of contact for mutual assistance (in the ECE Industrial Accident Notification System)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Competent authority named	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hazardous activities identified	No hazardous activities	Yes (2)	Yes (7)
Hazardous activities notified	n/a	Yes	Yes
Internal (on-site) and external (off-site) contingency plans exist	Yes	Yes	Yes
Coordination between operators and authorities in preparing the plans	Yes	Yes	Yes
Testing, reviewing and updating done in cooperation with neighbouring countries	Yes	Yes	No

<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Bulgaria</i>	<i>Croatia</i>	<i>Romania</i>
Bilateral or multilateral agreements for mutual assistance	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bilateral or multilateral activities or programmes to exchange information, experiences and/or technology	No	Yes	Yes
Public participation	Yes	Yes	Yes
Participation of the public from affected Parties possible	Yes	No	Yes

Abbreviations and symbols: n/a = not applicable.

^a Subregional activities for more than one country are counted as one activity per country involved. The sum of the activities of all countries might thus be higher than the total number of activities implemented.

^b More activities may have subsequently been implemented in these countries following their accession to the European Union, but they are not counted as being part of the Assistance Programme.