



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
27 August 2010

Original: English

---

## Economic Commission for Europe

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

#### Sixth meeting

The Hague, 8–10 November 2010

Agenda item 7 (a)

**Assistance Programme: progress report on the activities  
carried out within the Programme's preparatory and  
implementation phases**

## Progress report on the Assistance Programme

### Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction .....	1–4	2
I. Preparatory phase in 2009–2010 .....	5–18	2
A. Guidance on implementing the basic tasks .....	6–15	2
B. Results of the preparatory phase .....	16–18	4
II. Implementation phase in 2009–2010 .....	19–63	4
A. Needs-driven capacity-building activities .....	20–54	4
B. Indicators and criteria for the implementation of the Strategic Approach for the Assistance Programme .....	55–57	9
C. Results of the implementation phase .....	58–63	9
Annex		
Resources of the Assistance Programme in 2009–2010 .....		11

## Introduction

1. The present document contains the progress report by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation (WGI) on the activities under the Assistance Programme in 2009–2010, as requested by the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting in 2008 (ECE/CP.TEIA/19 paras. 50 (d) and 78 (i)).
2. The Assistance Programme was adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting (Budapest, 27–30 October 2004 (ECE/CP.TEIA/2004/2)). The Programme was launched with the aim of assisting countries from South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia to address the challenges in implementing the Convention, and in particular to support the establishment of necessary policies under the Convention.
3. The Assistance Programme is composed of two phases: a preparatory and an implementation phase. During the preparatory phase, countries need to implement basic tasks and to report on their implementation when receiving fact-finding missions. During the implementation phase, countries having successfully implemented the basic tasks, can participate in assistance activities aimed at implementing more complex tasks under the Convention.<sup>1</sup>
4. At the beginning of 2009, 10 countries had been accepted to the implementation phase: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Republic of Moldova, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. Six countries, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, were not ready at that time to demonstrate the implementation of the basic tasks.

### I. Preparatory phase in 2009–2010

5. The activities aimed at providing guidance for the implementation of the basic tasks continued in 2009–2010. The activities organized were of two kinds: awareness-raising missions, requested by Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; and high-level visits, made to Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.

#### A. Guidance on implementing the basic tasks

##### 1. Awareness-raising missions

6. Awareness-raising missions were organized, respectively, on 20 and 21 May 2009 in Albania and on 22 and 23 September 2009 in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
7. The teams, led by Ms. Jasmina Karba (Slovenia), met with representatives of authorities at the national and local levels dealing with aspects related to the Convention. Members of the teams highlighted the basic provisions of the Convention and what was needed to implement them. In addition, they presented examples from their own countries together with good practices on how to implement the Convention.
8. Guidance for the preparation of documents to be presented to the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties was also provided, including the need to describe the up-to-date

---

<sup>1</sup> For more background information, please see the report on the results of the preparatory phase of the Assistance Programme (ECE/CP.TEIA/2006/3) and the Progress report on the Assistance Programme (ECE/CP.TEIA/2008/4).

status of the implementation of the basic tasks under the Convention (the report) and what actions needed to be taken by each country to implement the tasks that remained to be implemented (the action plan). It was also explained to the country representatives that the two documents would be the basis for the Bureau's decision whether to accept those countries to the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme.

9 Albania submitted a detailed report and an action plan, which were positively assessed by the Bureau, and resulted in the acceptance of Albania to the implementation phase.

10. Bosnia and Herzegovina submitted only a general action plan. The Bureau reviewed it and concluded that it did not contain enough information on whether the country had implemented all the basic tasks, and requested further details. (That information has not been received as of the time of writing of this report.) At the same time, the Bureau took note of the very complex organization in the country, and the consequently difficult institutional framework and decision-making process, which hampered the smooth organization of different activities. In addition, it noted that the fact that there was only a relatively small number of officers in the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations responsible for the activities under the Convention, which could also be an obstacle to producing all the requested outcomes. The Bureau therefore decided to monitor the situation and to provide assistance when needed.

## **2. High-level visits to Central Asia**

11. The Bureau decided to organize high-level visits to Kyrgyzstan (18 February 2010), Tajikistan (16 February 2010) and Uzbekistan (18–19 January 2010).

12. In order to continue the commitment of these countries to implement the Convention, the visits were aimed at reaching a mutual understanding between the representatives of the countries and the representatives of the bodies under the Convention on the reciprocal needs and on possible steps forward for the countries. The visits also provided the opportunity for the representatives of Points of Contact to be trained on the use of the Web-based application of the UNECE Industrial Accidents Notification (IAN) System.

13. The teams, led by Mr. Chris Dijkens (Netherlands), the Chair of the Conference of the Parties, met representatives of the following authorities: in Uzbekistan, the Ministry of Emergency Situations; in Kyrgyzstan, the Ministry of Natural Resources and its Inspectorate on Industrial Safety and the Ministry of Emergency Situations; in Tajikistan, the Committee on Emergency Situations and Civil Defence.

14. Representatives of Uzbekistan and Tajikistan committed themselves to work on strengthening the implementation of the Convention and reiterated their interest in joining the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme. Both countries demonstrated that they had implemented the remaining basic tasks: to designate an authority responsible for the notification of hazardous activities to neighbouring countries and to implement the UNECE IAN System. The country representatives were to send formal letters indicating the implementation of the basic tasks. At the time of preparation of the present document, the secretariat has only received the letter from Uzbekistan. Following a positive review of the letter from Uzbekistan by the Bureau, the country has been accepted to the implementation phase.

15. The representatives of Kyrgyzstan, while expressing interest in the Assistance Programme, were unable to demonstrate to the visiting team that the basic task that they needed to implement — i.e., that the IAN System had been implemented — had been accomplished. It was agreed that a letter containing the relevant information would be

submitted to the Bureau. Unfortunately, the political turmoil in Kyrgyzstan has slowed down the contacts with the authorities and no letter has as yet been received.

## **B. Results of the preparatory phase**

16. Given the smaller number of countries in the preparatory phase of the Assistance Programme, the biennium 2009–2010 saw a natural decrease in the speed of countries completing the preparatory and entering into the implementation phase. Two countries, Albania and Uzbekistan, joined the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme following the completion of the basic tasks. Three other countries — Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan — have yet to demonstrate the completion of their basic tasks before being accepted to the implementation phase.

17. It is expected that Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan will be able shortly to inform the Bureau that they have implemented the remaining basic tasks, which would allow for them to be accepted in the implementation phase. The secretariat, following the request from the Bureau, will monitor the situation in the three countries and stands ready to assist them, if necessary.

18. As of August 2010, 14 countries have been accepted to the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme.

## **II. Implementation phase in 2009–2010**

19. The work in the implementation phase in 2009–2010 has focused on: (a) the organization of needs-driven capacity-building activities, as requested by participating countries and approved by the Bureau and WGI; and (b) the elaboration of indicators and criteria for the implementation of The Strategic Approach (presented for adoption to the Conference of the Parties in the document “Benchmarks for the Implementation of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents” (ECE/CP.TEIA/2010/6)).

### **A. Needs-driven capacity-building activities<sup>2</sup>**

20. While in 2007–2008 assistance activities had been organized following the needs identified during the fact-finding missions, in 2009–2010 the areas for assistance were identified by the requesting countries.

21. In 2009–2010, five needs-driven capacity-building activities have been organized by countries so far: (i) a training session on integrated approaches to major hazard prevention; (ii) a project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia on the joint management of transboundary emergencies from spills of hazardous substances into the Danube River; (iii) a training session on the evaluation of safety reports; (iv) a national training session on the identification of hazardous activities in the Republic of Moldova; and (v) a national training session on the identification of hazardous activities in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

---

<sup>2</sup> For more detailed information on the activities reported in the present document, please refer to the minutes of the activities that have been posted in the relevant pages of the Convention’s internet site. The minutes will also be circulated during the meeting of the Conference of the Parties as “Conference Room Papers”.

## **1. Training session on integrated approaches to major hazard prevention**

22. The request to organize a training session on integrated approaches to major hazard prevention came from the Republic of Moldova, following the “Workshop on strengthening the safety measures at hazardous activities” (Vadul-lui-Voda, Republic of Moldova, 13–14 December 2007). The training session was organized in Prague, Czech Republic, from 11 to 13 February 2009, under the lead of the Czech Republic with the additional financial support from the Netherlands.

23. The aim was to discuss and brainstorm possible improvements to administrative approaches in countries of South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia with respect to major hazard prevention and crisis management, in particular in view of the experience of Czech Republic in that regard.

24. The training session was attended by representatives of different authorities from Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, the Republic of Moldova, Serbia, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine. The training was facilitated by experts from the Czech Republic, with the support of experts from Poland and Germany.

25. Participants learned about potential challenges when ensuring safety at hazardous installations. They also benefited from the experience of the Czech Republic and saw the solution that they had adopted: an integrated approach to major hazards.

26. It was clear for the participants that legislation was a key element for the implementation of an effective system for major hazards prevention. Therefore legislation needed to be reviewed in order to enhance cooperation between different actors involved and to avoid overlapping responsibilities.

27. Participants also acknowledged the importance of a safety culture as an element of industrial accident prevention. They also became more aware of the challenges in introducing such a culture in their countries and among operators of hazardous activities.

28. On a transboundary level, attention was brought to the fact that international cooperation was indeed very useful, together with the sharing of good practices, especially to improve joint management of transboundary emergencies. In that respect, countries expressed their interest in organizing exercises to test transboundary response systems and indicated that they might need to be supported in doing so.

29. On the other hand, countries were ready to take actions by themselves to harmonize the work between authorities or to start discussions at the national level on which authority would take the lead in coordinating major hazards prevention.

30. Participants also expressed the need for assistance in other areas, such as drafting effective legislation; review of current legislation and/or operational procedures; activities to strengthen a safety culture; and for encouraging cross-border cooperation. In addition, representatives of the participating countries wished to have benchmarks for assessing their level of implementation of the Convention.

## **2. Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia on joint management of transboundary emergencies from spills of hazardous substances into the Danube River**

31. A pilot project was organized at the request of Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia to improve their emergency preparedness for and to strengthen their abilities to jointly respond to a potential emergency in a transboundary context on the Danube River. The Italian Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea supported the project on joint management of emergencies from spills of hazardous substances into the Danube River. The project consisted of four phases:

(a) A kick-off meeting (Bucharest, 17–18 March 2009) to discuss the implementation of the project and the sharing of responsibilities among the partners;

(b) A technical workshop (Drobeta Turnu-Severin, Romania, 16–18 June 2009) to discuss the organization of crisis management in the partner countries together with experience and good practices from other countries, as well as the organization of a field exercise by agreeing on a general scenario;

(c) A field exercise followed by an evaluation workshop (Prahovo, Serbia, 24–25 September 2009) to test the crisis management procedures of the partner countries and to analyse the results of the exercise during an evaluation workshop;<sup>3</sup> and

(d) A final workshop (Sofia, Bulgaria, 17–18 November 2009), to discuss the experience gained in the various phases of the project and to share it with representatives from other countries participating in the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme.

32. The Project was supported by ICARO, a consultancy company, and by the following institutions: the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR); the Dutch Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and Environment; the Polish State Fire Service; and the Croatian National Protection and Rescue Directorate.

33. In this project the countries were, among others, to take decisions on (a) national staff capacities in operating notification systems; (b) the selection of the location for the response actions; and (c) communication between the response forces and the crisis management staff.

34. The three countries concluded that, even if their national response systems within each country and emergency management proved to be effective in the event of an accident, the coordination and cooperation across borders needed improvement.

35. The three countries agreed on short- and longer-term actions, which would allow them, inter alia, to further improve cooperation between the representatives of the different ministries within the countries, as well as between the local and regional authorities.

36. The Project and the field exercise also allowed participants to gain valuable experience and information on the basis of which they could determine the best way to divide the Danube into sectors of responsibility for improved response.

37. The Project also allowed countries to assess their effectiveness in operating the UNECE IAN System and the Principal International Alert Centres (PIAC) system of ICPDR. All three countries found difficulties and shortcomings with both systems. Therefore they decided to prepare conclusions to be presented to the Consultation for Points of Contact on possible changes to the IAN System. Countries also agreed to regularly organize notification exercises.

38. In the last stage of the project, other countries accepted in the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme participated. This allowed them to learn from the results of Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia and to compare those results with their own practices.

### **3. Training session on evaluation of safety reports**

39. The training session on the evaluation of safety reports, held in Belgrade, Serbia, from 8 to 10 February 2010, was organized at the request of Croatia and Serbia. Following

---

<sup>3</sup> The partner countries identified a petroleum storage located on the bank of the Danube River in Prahovo, Serbia, as a possible source for causing transboundary effects in the event of an accident. The installation accepted to participate to the exercise.

the training session in Prague on an integrated approach to major hazard prevention, the two countries identified the need for training on the evaluation of safety reports as a component of safety regimes. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia was also invited to join the project. Germany was the main donor and supporting country.

40. The major objective of the project was to increase the knowledge of public authorities of the participating countries in the evaluation of safety reports as part of a safety regime.

41. The participants, with the support of consultants, discussed the content of a safety regime, as well as the approaches, the content and methodologies for the evaluation of safety reports. They developed a checklist for safety reports and discussed how it could be developed into guidance for the operators of hazardous activities in preparing such reports.

42. Participants welcomed the elaboration of a checklist, since it would allow the personnel in the relevant authorities to better understand and assess the content of safety reports. Developing the checklist also allowed participants to realize that more training on risk assessment could be useful.

43. The participants also appreciated the presentation on what a safety regime should contain and the need for full implementation, and they highlighted some difficulties they might encounter in implementing it.

44. The representatives of the three countries also agreed that the checklist would be additionally elaborated in each country to tailor it to national legislation to improve the safety regime. In addition, it was agreed that operators would also need to receive training on the preparation of safety reports.

45. The countries also expressed a wish, since the enforcement of safety regimes covered both the evaluation of safety reports as well as on-site inspection, that there would be a follow-up to the project focused on using the checklist methodology during an on-site inspection. The participants could then consider how to adapt the checklist methodology for on-site inspections as well.

#### **4. National training sessions on the identification of hazardous activities in the Republic of Moldova and in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>4</sup>**

46. The experts of the Republic of Moldova, following the training session on identification of hazardous activities (Minsk, Belarus, 21–22 October 2008), identified the need to organize a national training session for their country. Similarly, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which had only been accepted to the implementation phase in November 2008 and, therefore had been unable to participate in the training session in Minsk, similarly expressed a wish for such a training.

47. The two countries subsequently requested the Bureau to organize national training sessions for the identification of hazardous activities. The training sessions took place, respectively, on 9 and 10 March 2009 for Moldavian experts in Chisinau, and on 23 and 24 March for Macedonian experts in Skopje, and were facilitated by consultants.

48. The objectives of both training sessions were to build up the knowledge of national experts and inspectors in the identification of hazardous activities and to enable the countries to create a sustainable mechanism for the identification of such activities.

49. The participants of the training session obtained knowledge in:

---

<sup>4</sup> The two national training sessions are treated together in this document, even though they took place independently.

- (a) How to apply the Convention's annex I and the guidelines on location criteria in identification of hazardous activities;
- (b) The differences between annex I to the Convention and annex I to the Seveso II Directive;<sup>5</sup>
- (c) Good practices and experience of other countries concerning the identification of hazardous activities;
- (d) Useful information, e.g., on the tools for obtaining necessary information through the Internet.

50. The national training sessions also allowed national authorities and operators participating in the activities to improve exchange information on the needs and rationale for a proper identification of hazardous activities, which could be a good starting point for future cooperation.

51. Both countries concluded that primary legislation for the identification of hazardous activities was already in place, while secondary legislation needed to be developed and/or enforced.

52. In addition, in both cases experts concluded that the different relevant authorities would need to work together within each country. The ideal outcome would be establishing a legal framework allowing for an integrated approach, with a harmonized mechanism for collecting information, for inspections and for issuing permits, and one which would avoid overlapping competencies and responsibilities among the authorities. External support for that would be needed.

53. The countries also agreed to prepare national guidelines for the identification of hazardous activities under the Convention. These guidelines, which the countries committed to prepare by September 2010, would constitute the basis for the creation of a sustainable mechanism for the identification of hazardous activities.

## **5. Future activities under preparation**

54. The following activities were under preparation at the time of submission of the present document:

(a) Project on developing legislation for Georgia. The expected result of the project is to assess the existing national legislation on prevention of industrial accidents; to identify gaps; and to draw up an action plan to eliminate them. The project is planned to start in the second half of 2010;

(b) National training session on identification of hazardous activities for Azerbaijan. The training session was requested by Azerbaijan following the training session on identification of hazardous activities carried out in 2008 in Minsk. The expected result is to enable national experts and inspectors to train colleagues in the identification of hazardous activities and to create a sustainable mechanism for the identification of hazardous activities. The Bureau approved the training session, which is planned to take place at the end of October 2010;

(c) Second phase of the project on evaluation of safety reports. Following the request of Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia, the Bureau approved the organization of a second phase of the project. The expected outcome of this

---

<sup>5</sup> Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9 December 1996 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances, as amended by Directive 2003/105/EC.

second phase is the discussion and preparation of inspection schemes to be used by countries for organizing inspections to hazardous activities. The schemes will be based on the evaluation of a safety report and using the checklist finalized after the first phase of the project. The implementation of this phase is scheduled to take place at the beginning of 2011;

(d) Project to help countries in applying indicators and criteria for a self-evaluation of the implementation of the Convention. The project will be implemented at the beginning of 2011;

(e) Danube Delta Project. After participating in the final workshop of the project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia on the joint management of transboundary emergencies from spills of hazardous substances into the Danube River, the experts from the Republic of Moldova identified a need for a similar project in cooperation with neighbouring Romania and Ukraine. The expected results of the project, among others, are to: (i) identify needs for enhancing and possible harmonization of procedures for hazard management; (ii) review and, possibly, revise safety standards at major hazardous facilities; (iii) draft safety guidelines for oil terminals; (iv) prepare for establishing bi- or trilateral agreements related to hazard and crisis management; (v) review and, possibly, revise the compatibility of off-site emergency plans; (vi) draft blueprints for improving crisis management for the project countries; and (vii) enhance cooperation between competent authorities and operators of major industrial facilities.

## **B. Indicators and criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach for the Assistance Programme**

55. The Strategic Approach for the Assistance Programme (ECE/CP.TEIA/2008/5) was adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Conference of the Parties entrusted the Bureau to elaborate indicators and criteria for self-measurement of progress made by countries participating in the Assistance Programme and to elaborate a form for participating countries for collecting data within the stepwise/cyclic mechanism of the strategic approach (ECE/CP.TEIA/19, para. 50 (c)).

56. The Bureau, with the assistance of the WGI, elaborated indicators and criteria for the implementation of the Strategic Approach according to the areas of work, as well as a form for countries for collecting data and to identify areas where assistance was needed (i.e., Benchmarks for the implementation of the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/2010/6), mentioned previously).

57. Should the indicators and criteria, as presented by the Bureau, be adopted by the Conference of the Parties, their use by the countries participating in the Assistance Programme would be mandatory. The Benchmarks could also be a useful tool for all Parties when reporting on the implementation of the Convention.

## **C. Results of the implementation phase**

58. As already mentioned, the 2009–2010 biennium marked a difference from the previous one in the organization of activities within the implementation phase which were organized based on requests from countries. The only exception to this new trend was the training session on an integrated approach to major hazard prevention.

59. The needs for assistance were identified, on many occasions, thanks to the participation to previous assistance activities.

60. The sharing of results and experiences is an integral part of the Assistance Programme, as illustrated by the final workshop of the project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia on joint management of transboundary emergencies from spills of hazardous substances into the Danube River, to which other countries were invited.

**The number of activities requested under the Assistance Programme, 2009–2010**

<i>Country</i>	<i>Number of requested activities</i>
Croatia	2
Republic of Moldova	2
Serbia	2
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	2
Azerbaijan*	1
Bulgaria	1
Georgia	1
Romania	1

\* The activity for Azerbaijan remained to be organized at the moment of preparation of the present document.

61. As a result of the assistance activities, countries participating in the Assistance Programme were able to strengthen their capacities in the fields of prevention and preparedness for industrial accidents with possible transboundary consequences. The projects also assisted countries in setting the framework for work in the national context.

62. The assistance activities were varied and allowed for different results to be achieved. On the one hand, they provided concrete information and tools that countries could use immediately — e.g., national guidelines for the identification of hazardous activities or the checklist for the evaluation of safety reports. On the other hand, they provided a basis for follow-up actions to be undertaken by the countries allowing for the identification of obstacles to the implementation of a given provision of the Convention — e.g., identification of the need for more transboundary cooperation between the neighbouring countries participating in the Danube River project.

63. The Guidelines for the use of Benchmarks, if adopted, would be a useful instrument for self-monitoring and reviewing the progress of implementation of the Convention, as well as an instrument to identify further needs for assistance according to the strategic approach. Therefore, with an easier methodology for identifying needs for assistance it is expected that more countries will request activities than has so far been the case.

## Annex

### Resources of the Assistance Programme in 2009–2010

1. The implementation of the activities in the preparatory and the implementation phases required human and financial resources, which were provided from the United Nations regular budget and from extrabudgetary resources provided by Central and Western European Parties to the Convention, as well as from in-kind contributions.

#### A. Financial and in-kind contributions in the biennium 2009–2010

Table 1  
Financial and in-kind contributions in 2009–2010

<i>Donor Country or organization</i>	<i>Financial contribution (in U.S. dollars)</i>	<i>In-kind contributions</i>
Bulgaria		– Arrangements for the organization of: (a) the final workshop for the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia; (b) the pre-meeting for the training session on evaluation of safety reports.
Croatia		– Expert services and travel expenses for the field exercise of the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia.
Czech Republic		– Hosted the training on major hazard prevention and provided expert services.
Germany	60 241	Expert services and travel expenses for: (a) the training on major hazard prevention; (b) the training session on evaluation of safety reports; (c) the visits to Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine to discuss the organization of the Danube Delta Project.
Hungary		– Expert services for the awareness-raising mission to Albania.
Italy	136 054	Expert services and travel expenses for: (a) awareness-raising missions in Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina; (b) missions to Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan; and (c) meetings of the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia.
Netherlands	63 939	Expert services and travel expenses for: (a) mission to Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan; (b) field exercise of the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia; and (c) the visits to Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine to discuss the organization of the Danube Delta Project.
Norway	16 102	

<i>Donor Country or organization</i>	<i>Financial contribution (in U.S. dollars)</i>	<i>In-kind contributions</i>
Poland		– Expert services and travel expenses for: (a) the training session on major hazard prevention; (b) the in-field exercise in the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia.
Romania		– Arrangements for the organization of: (a) the kick-off meeting for the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia; (b) the technical workshop for the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia (financial support was provided for meeting services).
Republic of Moldova		– Arrangements for the organization of the national training session on identification of hazardous activities (financial support was provided for meeting services).
Serbia		– Arrangements for the organization of: (a) the in-field exercise and workshop in the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia; (b) the training session on evaluation of safety reports (financial support was provided for meeting services).
Slovenia		– Expert services and travel expenses for: awareness-raising missions in Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina.
Switzerland	68 681	Resources provided to cover the costs of Zoi Environment Network for the work in Central Asia and expert services and travel expenses for the mission to Uzbekistan.
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		– Arrangements for the organization of the national training session on identification of hazardous activities (financial support was provided for meeting services).
United Kingdom		– Expert services and travel expenses for the awareness-raising mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina.
ICPDR		– Expert services and travel expenses for the technical workshop and the field exercise in the Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia.

## **B. Costs under the Assistance Programme in the biennium 2009–2010**

2. The expenditures from the trust fund for the activities in the preparatory phase carried out in the biennium 2009–2010 involved the organization of awareness-raising missions.

Table 2  
**Costs of activities carried out in the preparatory phase of the Assistance Programme in 2009–2010**

(in United States dollars)

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Organizational costs</i>
Awareness-raising mission to Albania	3 415
Awareness-raising mission to Bosnia and Herzegovina	2 077
<b>Total</b>	<b>5 492</b>

3. The cost of the implementation phase in 2009–2010 involved the organization of assistance activities, which included: (a) renting the necessary services (meeting rooms, interpretation, etc.); (b) financial support for participants from the countries of South-Eastern and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia in the activities (when not provided as in-kind contributions); (c) hiring experts for the activities organized (when not provided as in-kind contributions). Resources were also used for the preparatory phase, for the elaboration of the new report of implementation, for the elaboration of the long-term strategy for the Convention and for the elaboration of indicators and criteria for the implementation of The Strategic Approach.

Table 3  
**Costs of the activities carried out in the implementation phase of the Programme**

(in United States dollars)

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Organizational costs</i>
Training session on integrated approach to major hazard prevention	57 245
Project for Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia	119 434
Training session on the evaluation of safety reports	60 629
National training session on identification of hazardous activities for Rep. of Moldova	12 087
National training session on identification of hazardous activities for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	11 674
<b>Total</b>	<b>261 069</b>

4. The Programme management costs were provided through the United Nations regular budget. The Programme support costs from January 2009 through August 2010 (amounting to approximately US\$ 188 896) were covered from the Convention trust fund.