



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/2  
20 May 2005

Original: ENGLISH

---

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

Meeting of the Parties to the  
Convention on Access to Information,  
Public Participation in Decision-making and  
Access to Justice in Environmental Matters

Working Group on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers  
(Second meeting, Geneva 13-15 April 2005)

**REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING**

1. The second meeting of the Working Group on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from 13 to 15 April 2005.
2. The meeting was attended by delegations from the Governments of Armenia, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Montenegro, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America and Uzbekistan. The Commission of the European Communities was also represented.
3. Also represented at the meeting were: the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); the Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC); the following non-governmental organizations: GLOBE Europe and, within the framework of the European ECO Forum, Environmental Management and Law Association (Hungary), European Public Health Alliance (Belgium), Georgian Environmental and Biological Monitoring Association (Georgia) and 'Greenwomen' Public Association (Kazakhstan); Society for Sustainable Living (Czech Republic); and the following consultancies: TNO Environment and Geosciences (Netherlands) and Milieu Ltd. (Belgium).
4. The meeting was opened by the Chairman, Mr. Karel Blaha (Czech Republic).

## **I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

5. Ms. Nino Tkhilava (Georgia) was elected to serve as a second Vice-Chair.

## **II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

6. The agenda for the meeting (ECE.MP.PP/AC.1/2005/1) was adopted.

## **III. RELEVANT DEVELOPMENTS AND ACTIVITIES SINCE THE ADOPTION OF THE PROTOCOL**

7. The secretariat informed the Working Group that no instrument of ratification had so far been deposited.
8. Mr. Michel Amand (Belgium) reported on the status of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) PRTR Co-ordinating Group, which held its twelfth meeting in Paris in November 2004. Responding to a request from the Inter-Organization Coordinating Committee (IOCC) to justify the continuation of the Co-ordinating Group under the auspices of the IOMC, the Group agreed it should continue with or without IOCC support. Subsequently, the IOCC had agreed that this group should be discontinued as an IOMC entity and considered that this co-ordinating group could continue more efficiently under other auspices. The IOCC noted that the Co-ordinating Group would meet one more time (in the margins of the June 2005 OECD Joint Meeting) and that this last meeting would provide an opportunity for the group to fold up its work as an IOMC entity. Following the IOCC decision the next meeting of the Co-ordinating Group will take place in June 2005 and will discuss how the work will be taken forward.
9. Both OECD and UNECE had suggested they could be willing to provide possible sponsorship and/or secretariat support to any future meetings of the PRTR Co-ordinating Group. The secretariat noted that support for the group could come in mainly two forms, either through preparation of agenda, invitations and reports for the meetings, or through hosting and providing support for the meeting, i.e. conference services, and that these services need not necessarily be provided by the same organization. Co-sponsorship of the group could demonstrate international support for the group and help it attract broad participation from a wider range of countries, including from countries with economies in transition and from international organizations.
10. The Working Group discussed the continuation of the PRTR Co-ordinating Group as an independent international forum not falling under the auspices any particular agency and for the holding of back-to-back meetings with other relevant meetings.
11. The European Commission reported on launch of the European Pollution Emission Register (EPER) and its website in February 2004. More than 250,000 visitors had attended the site during its first year of operation. The Chairman congratulated the European Commission and the European Environment Agency on winning an award for best new electronic information

source produced at European level for the publication of the EPER in 2004.

#### **IV. NATIONAL AND REGIONAL PREPARATIONS FOR RATIFICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL**

12. Several countries reported on their activities toward ratification of the Protocol. One country, which had recently initiated facility-level reporting, indicated that financial and technical assistance is needed to implement the Protocol.

13. The European Commission reported that an upgraded register, the European PRTR, should replace the present one, EPER. The Commission had proposed a Regulation establishing the European PRTR as well as a proposal for a Council Decision to ratify the Protocol. It is expected that the first reporting year for the European PRTR will be 2007.

#### **V. PREPARATIONS FOR THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE PROTOCOL AND THE FIRST SESSION OF ITS MEETING OF THE PARTIES**

14. The secretariat presented two papers providing analyses of options for rules of procedure (ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/3) and a compliance mechanism (ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/4) under the Protocol, prepared at request of the Working Group. The papers analysed advantages and disadvantages of three main options for each of these, identified by the Working Group at its previous meeting (MP.PP/AC.1/2004/2, para. 44): direct application of the Aarhus Convention's rules of procedure and compliance mechanism, with or without a separate Bureau and a separate compliance review body; development of separate rules of procedure and a separate compliance review mechanism using those adopted under the Convention as a model; and development of separate rules of procedure and a separate compliance mechanism based on analysis of such rules and mechanisms existing under various multilateral environmental agreements, i.e. without necessarily reflecting the approach taken in the Convention's rules of procedure and compliance mechanism.

15. The delegation of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, expressed a preference for the development of separate rules of procedure and a separate compliance review mechanism for the Protocol using the Convention's rules of procedure and compliance mechanism as a starting point. This approach would entail establishment of a separate bureau and a separate compliance committee for the Protocol, taking into account the particular expertise that might be required because of the technical nature of the Protocol.

16. With regard to rules of procedure, several delegations emphasized that the rules of procedure of the Convention should be used as a basis or a model. With regard to the compliance mechanism, there was a general agreement that a separate mechanism, involving a separate committee, would have to be developed for the Protocol. Many felt that the Convention's mechanism could provide a good basis for its development.

17. Several delegations noted that further clarity was needed on the terms used to define non-governmental organizations, and, in particular, the distinction between the environmental civil society organizations and associations of industry. Many delegations believed that, as one of the

main stakeholders under the Protocol, industry had a special role in the processes under it. However, there were differing views on the extent to which industry should have a role in bodies such as the Bureau or a compliance review body. For example, some believed that if industrial associations could nominate candidates to a compliance review body, this could lead to conflicts of interest. NGOs, in particular, strongly disagreed to involve private interest organisations in the governing structures especially in the compliance committee of the Protocol. It was agreed that the matter would need further consideration. The secretariat was requested to study the cost implications of having a separate bureau and compliance committee to the Protocol.

18. The Working Group agreed that draft decisions establishing separate rules of procedure and a separate compliance review mechanism for the Protocol should be prepared in advance of its third meeting. The rules of procedure for the Protocol should use the Aarhus Convention rules of procedure as a point of departure and account should be taken of the open character of the Protocol. The compliance review mechanism should be close to the Convention's mechanism in many aspects without prejudice to its final form. Because of the technical nature of the Protocol, its rules of procedure and compliance mechanism should provide for a separate bureau and compliance committee respectively. Otherwise, the drafts should reflect the range of views presented through alternative options or the use of square brackets.

19. The Working Group agreed on the following process for development of the two draft decisions:

(a) Signatories to the Protocol as well as interested States and other observers were invited to make written submissions with regard to the rules of procedure and the compliance mechanism. The submissions should be made through the secretariat by 1 September 2005 at the latest and would be available on the 'virtual classroom' website.

(b) A facilitator, appointed by the Working Group, will develop the first drafts of both documents on the basis of the rules of procedure and compliance mechanism of the Aarhus Convention, taking into account the issues raised in the written submissions as well as other relevant information. He/she should be encouraged to consult with the chairman of the Compliance Committee.

(c) The drafts prepared by the facilitator will be submitted through the secretariat to the "virtual classroom" and prepared as official documents in the three languages in time for discussion at the third meeting of the Working Group.

20. Following the discussion on the first drafts, the Working Group, at its third meeting, will establish a contact group, chaired by the facilitator, to further elaborate the rules of procedure and the compliance review mechanism and present it at the fourth meeting of the Working Group.

21. The Working Group agreed to appoint Mr. Jolyon Thomson (United Kingdom) to serve as the facilitator in this process.

22. The secretariat presented a proposed calendar of meetings and key documents forecast in preparation for the first Meeting of the Parties. The schedule of meetings had been premised upon the entry into force of the Protocol in early or late 2008. It is envisaged that analytical papers would be prepared on financial arrangements, subsidiary bodies, a programme of work, a reporting mechanism and a technical assistance mechanism and would provide the basis for the development of a draft decision on these topics, along with a draft decision on rules of procedure and a compliance mechanism, would be presented for review and possible adoption at the first

Meeting. The following indicative work plan was adopted.

Table 1: Calendar of meetings and key documents in preparation for the first MOP

<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Draft decision 1st reading</b>	<b>Draft decision 2nd reading</b>	<b>MOP review and adoption or possible adoption</b>
<b>WG-3</b>	May or June 2006	Financial arrangements (FA), Subsidiary bodies (SB)	Rules of Procedure (ROP), Compliance mechanism (CM)		
<b>WG-4</b>	Spring 2007	Programme of work (POW), Reporting mechanism (RM), Technical assistance mechanism (TM)	FA, SB	ROP, CM	
<b>WG-5</b>	Autumn 2007 or Spring 2008		POW, RM, TM	FA, SB	FA, SB
<b>MOP-1</b>	2008				ROP <sup>1</sup> , CM <sup>2</sup> , FA, SB, POW, RM, TM

**Notes to table 1:**

<sup>1</sup>Article 17, paragraph 2 (g)

<sup>2</sup>Article 22

## **VI. NEEDS AND PROSPECTS FOR CAPACITY-BUILDING, TECHNICAL SUPPORT, GUIDANCE AND INFORMATION EXCHANGE**

23. The secretariat reported that the informal paper on the needs and prospects for capacity-building, technical support and information exchange in PRTR development, that it had prepared in consultation with UNEP and UNITAR, had been revised and posted to the Working Group's web page, along with an updated version of the capacity-building matrix developed at the request of the first session.

24. The secretariat, working with the UNECE Economic Analysis Division, reported that it had initiated a study, "Implementation costs of the Aarhus Convention Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers." The study aimed to cost implementation of the PRTR Protocol for its 36 UNECE signatories, as well as for other prospective Parties to the instrument. It would build on a previous study (CEP/WG.5/AC.2/2002/4) but was more refined in its scope and was meant to assist countries with developing realistic cost forecasts of PRTR implementation in countries. It would use a country-by-country approach which would differentiate countries in terms of their levels of development. This would allow for a comprehensive assessment of countries' existing legal, regulatory, institutional, administrative and technical infrastructure relevant to PRTRs, thereby overcoming the difficulty of defining a valid, generic 'baseline' - in terms of the pre-existing regulatory framework - for all countries. A theoretical spreadsheet model had been developed under the study in early 2005. A flowchart diagram representing the full stream of

reporting alternatives under the Protocol was also produced and circulated at the session. It illustrated details of the reporting requirements under different systems, such as the employee or capacity threshold systems and pollutant- or waste-specific reporting of transfers. The Working Group agreed that the flowchart would be incorporated into the UNECE PRTR guidance document.

25. The representative of REC updated the Working Group about the outcomes of two capacity-building projects that it implemented with the financial support of the Governments of the Netherlands and Norway in several of the EU and accession countries. The first resulted in the development of an educational concept, the organization of a web design seminar and development of websites, for the Integrated Pollution Register in the Czech Republic as well as a study tour to the Netherlands for officials involved in operating the Register. The second resulted in workshops and publications in Slovakia and Bulgaria on the PRTR Protocol organized in cooperation with the Ministries of Environment and a legal assessment and workshop in Hungary for agencies, industry and users, including NGOs, on the possible steps towards the PRTR Protocol in line with the current and proposed EU requirements.

26. UNITAR reported on recent experience with the 'virtual classroom'. Two discussion forums had been conducted in late 2004 and early 2005 on the draft PRTR guidance document, with the facilitation of the secretariat. A forum contributing to PRTR awareness-raising had been initiated in February 2005 with the facilitation of Greenwomen (Kazakhstan) and was conducted in the Russian language. The secretariat noted differences in the design and functionality served by the virtual classroom and the Aarhus Convention's clearing house. The former, it noted, allows for exchange of information and experience between registered participants and captured the flow of such information; furthermore it allowed documents to be posted and retrieved from its site, which was considered useful for development of technical materials. The design of the clearing house, by contrast, allowed national content managers to upload their information onto its web pages.

27. Some delegations proposed that a capacity-building project be launched in EECCA and South Eastern Europe and include subregional workshops on national preparations for legal implementation of the Protocol, the draft guidance document and a pilot cost analysis for facilities and competent authorities. One delegation presented a list of concrete elements of such a project.

28. The representatives of NGOs noted the slow pace of implementation of the Protocol and called for a survey on the national implementation processes of Signatories in order to have a clear picture of activities undertaken by different countries towards the ratification of the Protocol. They also called for higher attention to the need for capacity building and dialogue with potential users of PRTRs in the current phase of preparation for Protocol implementation. NGOs proposed a number of projects geared towards the training of users, use of electronic tools and assessment of capacities in EECCA region that donor countries and Signatories should support. The Working Group asked the secretariat to make more effort to ensure that representatives of the private sector were duly invited and encouraged to participate in its meetings and activities.

## **VII. DRAFT PRTR GUIDANCE DOCUMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROTOCOL**

29. The Working Group reviewed the draft guidance documentation prepared by the secretariat as 10 documents (ECE/MP.AC.1/2005/5-14). The Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the

European Community and its member States, found the draft guidance very clear and useful for both countries with PRTRs and in place and those without systems, and believed that the draft reflected the non-legally binding nature of such guidance. It also noted that the guidance document in some of its parts goes beyond the scope of the Protocol and should therefore be amended.

30. The meeting then discussed the ten guidance papers in detail and made a number of amendments to the draft documents, with the aim of keeping its contents within the parameters set by the Protocol. The majority of delegations noted the benefit to be gained by sticking strictly to the provisions of the Protocol, especially for countries just beginning to develop PRTRs, while allowing that inclusion of examples of good practice in countries that go beyond these requirements could provide useful information as well. Some delegations were of a different opinion.

31. Many delegations expressed the view that it would be useful to produce the guidance as an official UNECE publication by the end of 2005 for use by countries seeking to prepare for national implementation of the Protocol. It was agreed to review a revised version of the guidance, which would be prepared by the secretariat and circulated electronically three weeks after the meeting, based on the comments received during the session. These comments and amendments are annexed to this report and will be made available in the three official languages. Delegations are requested to review and comment on the revised version by the end of June 2005 and the secretariat is requested to incorporate and further revise the document by the beginning of September 2005. The document would then be opened for a final round of comments until the end of October 2005, at which time the secretariat and Bureau would finalize the guidance document for publication.

#### **VIII. PROGRESS REPORT TO THE SECOND MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION**

32. The Chairman will report to the Parties to the Aarhus Convention at their second meeting, to take place in Almaty, Kazakhstan, 25-27 May 2005, on the Working Group's progress, including steps taken to prepare technical guidance, draft rules of procedure for the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol and a compliance mechanism for the Protocol. The Working Group agreed on the outline content of the progress report.

#### **IX. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT AND CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

33. The Working Group adopted its report on the understanding that the Chairman and the secretariat would finalize the text and that the French- and Russian-speaking delegations would reserve their positions until the report was available in French and Russian as well.

34. The Chairman thanked the delegates for the substantial progress they had made and then closed the meeting.

## Annex

### Revisions made by the Working Group

#### I. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/5

1. Page 4, footnote 2, line 3

Add [http://www.olis.oecd.org/olis/1996doc.nsf/LinkTo/ocde-gd\(96\)32](http://www.olis.oecd.org/olis/1996doc.nsf/LinkTo/ocde-gd(96)32)

#### II. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/6

2. Page 5, box 3

Add a new paragraph at the end reading Dissemination of information and training (arts. 11 and 15, para. 2)

3. Page 5, paragraph 16, line 5

For one national read a

4. Page 5 and 6, paragraph 18

This paragraph should read Another option might be to split the responsibilities for the validation of data among different competent authorities according to their competences, as in Spain, whose autonomous communities and river basin authorities validate the data within the area of their competence. However, in systems where these institutions are centralized, it might be wise to ensure that validation is still carried out regionally or locally.

5. Page 6, paragraph 20, line 4

Delete national

6. Page 6, paragraph 22, line 3

At the end of the first sentence, add (see chap. ..., sec. ...)

7. Page 9, paragraph 29

This paragraph should read In the United Kingdom, regulators have a duty to maintain public registers of specified information regarding pollution of the environment by “prescribed processes.” The modalities and requirements of public registers are set out in regulations. The United Kingdom’s pollution control legislation also enables regulators to require operators to submit to them specified information and to compile information on emissions, energy consumption, waste and the destination of such waste, and to provide such information in the manner specified.

8. Page 10, heading 3

The heading should read Adapting PRTRs to national needs

9. Page 10

After paragraph 38 insert a new paragraph reading In using the thresholds to select facilities, a Party needs to assess whether the thresholds are not too high to cover its priority pollution sources. A Party may consider lowering the thresholds if needed.

and renumber the remaining paragraphs

10. Page 12, box 8

The text below the title should read

- To ensure appropriate opportunities for public participation (art. 13, para. 1);
- To ensure that the public has access to information on the proposed measures in a timely manner (art. 13, para. 3);
- To provide the opportunity for access to information (art. 13, para. 2);
- To take due account of the public input (art. 13, para. 4).

11. Page 12, paragraph 46, lines 1-3

The first three sentences should read There is a legal right to participate granted to the general public. It would not be sufficient to implement the requirements by practice or by developing codes of conduct. A legal instrument is recommended to secure these rights.

12. Page 13, box 9

The box should read In the United Kingdom, the majority of legislative proposals are subject to public consultation in accordance with the Cabinet Office Code of Practice on public consultation. The Code sets out a series of points that must be taken into account during the consultation process. Criterion 4 is dedicated to feedback regarding the responses received and the way in which the consultation process influences policy. Each consultation is published on the internet, and hard copies are also sent to stakeholders and made available to the public. Generally, the consultation will be open for 12 weeks, after which time the responses will be considered.

13. Page 15, paragraph 60

In line 2, for Parties read Non-Parties

In line 5, for B read G

14. Page 16, paragraph 63

In line 1, for The most important issue read One of the issues

15. Page 16, paragraph 64

This paragraph should read The regional economic integration organization has an international responsibility to comply with the Protocol within the area of its competence. The distribution of competence between the regional economic integration organization and its member States will depend upon the specific rules governing the organization.

16. Page 16, box 12

Delete the box

**III. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/7**

17. Page 2, table 1, column 2

Delete Oil and gas refineries

18. Page 2, paragraph 7, lines 2 and 3

Delete However, in many cases there is no release threshold. Similarly,

19. Page 6, paragraph 23

Delete (“North American”) and delete (“EU”)

20. Page 6, paragraph 24

Add cross-reference to other relevant sections

21. Page 7, paragraph 25

In line 4, add cross-reference to other relevant sections

22. Page 7, paragraph 28

In lines 2 and 3, delete and, therefore, does not facilitate an integrated approach to the facility's reporting

23. Page 7, paragraph 29 bis

Denmark will provide new paragraph

#### IV. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/8

24. Page 3, box

After paragraph 3, add a box

**Diffuse sources**

- Reporting on diffuse sources is a core element of PRTRs under the Protocol (Art. 4 (b)).
- “Each Party shall present on its register, in an adequate spatial disaggregation, information on releases of pollutants from diffuse sources for which that Party determines that data are being collected by the relevant authorities and can be practicably included. Where the Party determines that no such data exist, it shall take measures to initiate reporting on releases of relevant pollutants from one or more diffuse sources in accordance with its national priorities” (art. 7, para. 7).
- “The information referred to in paragraph 7 shall include information on the type of methodology used to derive the information” (art. 7, para. 8).

Box ...: Article 7, paragraphs 7 and 8

25. Page 6

Delete paragraph 14 and renumber the remaining paragraphs

26. Page 7, paragraph 16

After (ISIC) insert or NACE

**V. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/9**

27. Pages 8-11, table 3

This table should be updated and corrected by the contractor

28. Page 13, paragraph 19, subparagraph (b)

Include text noting that the use of other measurement methods is not precluded, but that Parties should ensure that the analytical performance of alternatives is at least as good as that of the standardized methods

29. Page 14, table 6

Delete Main economic activity

30. Page 14, table 6

The last cell in the left column should read

Pollutant 1 / waste 1  
name and numerical identifier  
“

Pollutant N/ waste N

The last two cells in the right column should read

Name and address of recoverer or disposer of each pollutant of transboundary and hazardous waste  
Name and address of the actual recovery or disposal site of each transboundary and hazardous pollutant / waste

## VI. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/10

31. Page 1

Delete box 1 and renumber the remaining boxes

32. Page 2, paragraph 3

The first sentence should read The inclusion of diffuse sources is a core element of a PRTR, since the Protocol accommodates reporting on diffuse sources, given that emissions data in many countries show these can constitute the most important sources of releases for key pollutants.

33. Page 3, table 1

Delete and replace it with text which includes information regarding emissions to water

34. Page 6

Delete box 4

**VII. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/11**

35. Page 6, box 6

At the end, add (www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

36. Page 8, paragraph 27

Add a reference to waiver

37. Page 10, paragraph 37

This paragraph should read The PRTR Protocol mentions the chemical name as an example of information that could be kept confidential.

38. Pages 11 and 12

Delete subsection 2 (box 11 and paras. 47 and 48)

39. Page 15, box 15, line 5

For pollutant inventory read Pollutant Inventory

40. Page 15, paragraph 57

Add an NGO list as well as a reference to companies as suggested by the United Kingdom

### VIII. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/12

41. Page 2, header A

Delete and public awareness raising

42. Page 2, paragraph 4

Add (f) Strengthening public interest NGOs' and other users' human and technical capacity to effectively use data

43. Page 2, paragraph 5

A proposal on mechanisms for participation will be submitted later

44. Page 3

After paragraph 3, insert a new subsection reading

#### **3. Capacity-building of PRTR users**

From the beginning of the process of designing a national PRTR system design, the capacity-building of the PRTR users should be based on education and financial assistance especially for NGOs. Examples of activities would include: financing NGO pilot projects; launching and maintaining special NGO websites and databases, organizing NGO seminars; and training courses extending capacity to carry out awareness-raising campaigns concerning health and environment for workers and citizens, and especially vulnerable populations.

Capacity-building of PRTR users should strengthen cooperation of NGOs with State agencies, professional and international organizations.

Environment and health hazard and risk assessment, management methods and modelling with the PRTR data should be part of the capacity building of users.

and renumber the remaining paragraphs

45. Page 5, paragraph 15

Subparagraph (a) should read Environmental and health NGOs;

Subparagraph (d) should read Public health institutions and groups and health professionals (e.g. toxicologists);

46. Page 7

After paragraph 24, insert a new paragraph reading The Nordic PRTR group of the Nordic Council is a cooperative body between PRTR experts from Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden.

47. Page 11

Footnote a/ to table 1 refers to water only, while footnotes b/ and c/ refer to both air and water

**IX. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/13**

48. Page 4, paragraph 9

Insert two new subparagraphs reading

- (e) Publishing the PRTR data on a publicly accessible website; and
- (f) Response on public feedback.

49. Page 4, paragraph 10

Delete the heading and the introductory line and incorporate subparagraphs (a) and (b) into paragraph 9

50. Page 7, paragraph 21

This paragraph should read Validation by the Party focuses on whether or not guidance has been applied correctly. This does not exclude that further sources of information (such as “ground truthing”), while important, are not part of a data collection and dissemination process of a PRTR (see fig. 3) but can be used for an error-management procedure.

51. Page 7, figure 3

Delete validation and verification

52. Page 7, figure 3

The caption should read Quality assessment of PRTR data on release and transfer of pollutants and public feedback

53. Page 8, paragraph 26

Move this paragraph to a place yet to be decided and renumber paragraphs

54. Page 9, paragraph 28

In line 1, delete must

55. Page 9, box 4

The first two sentences should read The Environment Agency's website "What's in Your Backyard" is an example of a PRTR with spatial disaggregation. The website gives online access to the Environment Agency's data for England and Wales and access to the Pollution Inventory.

56. Page 9, subsection D

The United Kingdom will provide best-practice examples

57. Page 10, paragraph 32

This paragraph should read Nevertheless, for the second cycle, the PRTR allows that the second reporting year may be the second calendar year following the first reporting year.

**X. ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2005/14**

58. Page 1, Abbreviations, a

For Technology read Technique

59. Page 2

Add NACE: Nomenclature of Economic Activities

60. Page 2, Definitions

Add a sentence on the purpose of these definitions, define Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) and explain its work on PRTRs

61. Page 5, paragraph 1

Add Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe (REC) recommendations; OECD; OECD references