



## Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
3 September 2012

Original: English

---

### Economic Commission for Europe

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

##### **Seventh meeting**

Stockholm, 14–16 November 2012

Item 9 (a) of the provisional agenda

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

### **Progress Report on the Assistance Programme**

#### **Note by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation**

##### *Summary*

The Assistance Programme of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents was adopted at the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2004. It aims at enhancing efforts of countries with economies in transition in the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) region to raise industrial safety through the implementation of the Convention.

This document informs the Conference of the Parties on the activities carried out under the Assistance Programme and the progress achieved, as per its request made at its sixth meeting (ECE/CP.TEIA/22, para. 33 (d)).

## Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction.....	1–2	3
I. Implementation of the strategic approach in 2011–2012 .....	3–26	3
A. Workshop on the use of indicators and criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach .....	6–13	3
B. First round of submission of self-assessments and action plans .....	14–22	5
C. Organizational arrangements for the implementation of the strategic approach .....	23–26	6
II. Implementation phase in 2011–2012 .....	27–64	7
A. Assistance activities organized in 2011–2012 .....	28–58	7
B. Future activities under preparation .....	59–64	12
III. Preparatory phase in 2011–2012 .....	65–71	13
Annexes		
I. Template for the submission of project proposals under the Assistance Programme .....		14
II. In-kind contributions to the Assistance Programme in 2011–2012.....		16

## **Introduction**

1. The Assistance Programme (ECE/CP.TEIA/2004/2), adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (Industrial Accidents Convention) at its third meeting (Budapest, 27–30 October 2004), is composed of two phases: a preparatory phase and an implementation phase. The preparatory phase comprises activities aiming to verify that countries have implemented basic tasks under the Convention, or to support countries in understanding what implementing the basic tasks would require. The implementation phase seeks to provide needs-driven assistance activities to implement more complex tasks in countries that have successfully implemented the basic tasks.

2. The present document is structured as follows. First, there is a description of the progress in the implementation of the strategic approach for the Assistance Programme (ECE/CP.TEIA/2008/5), adopted at the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Geneva, 25–27 November 2008). Then there is a description of the progress in implementing the preparatory and implementation phase, with the order of these two inverted. The activities under the implementation phase are presented first, to reflect the higher relevance that they have, since almost all the countries in the Assistance Programme have been invited to be part of the implementation phase. The second part provides an overview of the activities carried out or planned under the preparatory phase.

### **I. Implementation of the strategic approach in 2011–2012**

3. The Conference of the Parties at its sixth meeting adopted the instruments for applying the cyclic mechanism of the strategic approach (ECE/CP.TEIA/2010/6) and obliged the Assistance Programme beneficiary countries to apply the indicators and criteria, the key instrument for the mechanism.

4. The Conference of the Parties also requested the beneficiary countries to provide a self-assessment of progress in implementing the Convention for each of the Convention's working areas by September 2011 and to continuously update it thereafter. They should also each provide a national action plan based on the results of their initial self-assessment not later than February 2012 and subsequently, when relevant, to update it. In case a country planned to submit a project proposal before February 2012, then, together with the project proposal, it should also submit the self-assessment and the action plan for the working area concerned by the project proposal.

5. The Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation were requested to ensure that the strategic approach was implemented. They therefore decided to organize a workshop to explain to all the beneficiary countries, whether in the preparatory or the implementation phase, the functioning of the indicators and criteria to implement the strategic approach. The two bodies also decided to create a mechanism to provide support and feedback to the countries submitting the self-assessments and the action plans.

## **A. Workshop on the use of indicators and criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach**

6. Indicators and criteria are mandatory instruments under the Assistance Programme used to identify and address implementation challenges and subsequently to measure the progress achieved under the Convention.

7. A workshop on the use of indicators and criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach was held in Bratislava from 4 to 6 May 2011. It was funded through the Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC). The workshop mainly concentrated on the first step of the strategic approach, which is the analysis and examination of the level of implementation and the identification of shortcomings and challenges. The second and third steps (definition of the steps to be undertaken and the time frame to eliminate shortcomings, development of an action plan and its implementation; and assessment of the results achieved) can only be effective if carried out after a clear and complete self-assessment.

8. The task force that designed the workshop took particular care to ensure the highlighting of the benefits of the use of each country's self-assessment. In addition to its use for the implementation of the Convention, the task force also highlighted the benefit for its use for requesting assistance activities to be organized under the Assistance Programme.

9. At the end of the workshop the participants formulated the following conclusions on the indicators and criteria:

(a) They constitute a clear, understandable and manageable mechanism that enables a feasible self-assessment;

(b) They create a framework according to which issues identified by countries after the self-assessment can be used for requesting assistance not only under the Convention, but also beyond its context, in programmes of other regional bodies or organizations, such as the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), or within ENVSEC;

(c) The elements linked to the implementation of the Convention and detailed in the indicators and criteria constitute also a good mechanism to support the progress of countries in the preparatory phase and to guide them to implement the basic tasks.

10. Some important elements concerning the use of the indicators and criteria that emerged from the workshop were:

(a) A group of experts representing the different authorities dealing with the different areas of work needs to be involved in the self-assessment, to ensure that it fully reflects the situation in a country;

(b) It is important that the members of the group pay attention to some preconditions for the use of the indicators and criteria:

(i) A good understanding of the Convention;

(ii) Good knowledge of the situation in the country;

(iii) Involvement of all relevant stakeholders in the country.

11. It was also highlighted that the self-assessment should not be considered by countries as an external tool imposed on them, but rather as a way to measure their own level of implementation and consider it as a stimulus for progress.

12. The participants were invited to start the self-assessment in their countries on the basis of the knowledge gained during the workshop. They were also invited to record the

results in an evaluation table as presented in the workshop and they were reminded to send the recorded results to the secretariat by the end of September 2011.

13. The Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation subsequently committed to study a mechanism to provide feedback to the self-assessments submitted to the secretariat. The two bodies would also consider the provision of further support in the implementation phase of the strategic approach, should the need arise.

## **B. First round of submission of self-assessments and action plans**

14. Following the training session on the indicators and criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach, the participating countries recommitted to prepare and send to the secretariat, as agreed during the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the respective self-assessments by the end of September 2011.

15. Following the decision of the Bureau, the secretariat was to collect the self-assessments, which were to be reviewed by a core group composed of the Chair of the Working Group on Implementation, the Vice-Chairs of the Conference of the Parties and the member of the Working Group representing the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The core group was chaired by the Chair of the Working Group.

16. The core group was able to evaluate 10 self-assessments out of 15 that should have been submitted by the countries participating in the Bratislava training.

17. The core group was disappointed that the quality of the self-assessments received was not satisfactory and showed, to differing degrees, a lack of understanding of the use of the mechanism of the strategic approach, as well as misunderstanding of the mechanisms explained in the document and of the working areas of the Convention.

18. The core group's disappointment was largely due to the countries' misunderstanding of the functioning of the Convention, even when assessing areas of work for which specific training sessions had been organized. Nonetheless, the core group also identified examples of good self-assessment, notably those by Serbia and Croatia.

19. Following the evaluation of the self-assessments received, the Chair of the Working Group on Implementation sent letters containing feedback to the countries, including specific suggestions to improve the self-assessment. The countries were requested to send to the secretariat a new version of the self-assessment as soon as possible and preferably before sending the action plans.

20. The participants in the workshop in Bratislava also recalled a decision of the Conference of the Parties requesting the beneficiary countries to send their action plans to the secretariat by the end of February 2012. At the time of preparation of the present document the secretariat had received only four action plans: namely, from Albania, Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Of the countries requested to send a second version of the self-assessment together with the action plan, only Belarus had sent a revised version, but without sending the action plan.

21. The Bureau discussed with concern the results of this first round of self-assessments and the low rate of action plans received. It decided to organize the work for the implementation of the strategic approach so that this could be effectively monitored and decisions on the way forward could be taken. Additionally, the Bureau, aware of the importance of the use of the indicators and criteria and of the implementation of the strategic approach also for countries to request sustainable assistance activities, recognized the need to invest more time and resources in ensuring that they were understood and used effectively.

22. The Bureau also requested the secretariat to prepare a template for project proposals, as presented in annex I.

### C. Organizational arrangements for the implementation of the strategic approach

23. Following the results of the review of the self-assessments, the Bureau decided that there should be a specific structure allowing an effective monitoring of the progresses in the Assistance Programme and in the implementation of the strategic approach. Consequently, the Bureau revised the arrangements for the implementation of the strategic approach and for sharing responsibilities among the bodies under the Convention in this respect.

24. After reviewing the tasks that would fall on the Bureau and Working Group on Implementation with regard to the Assistance Programme and the implementation of its strategic approach, the Bureau decided to split the tasks among the two bodies, to manage effectively all the tasks.

25. It was therefore decided that the Bureau would keep the overall responsibility for all the steps and for monitoring them. The Bureau would also be in charge of taking the relevant decisions in accordance with its terms of reference. At the same time, it was decided to entrust the Working Group on Implementation with the tasks related to the implementation of the strategic approach (see table 1) and that the Chair of the Working Group on Implementation would decide on the way of working and whether to invite members of the Bureau to support the monitoring and the reviewing.

Table 1

#### Proposed tasks and division of competences under the Assistance Programme

<i>Main tasks</i>	<i>Detailed tasks</i>	<i>Competent body</i>
I. Deliver needs-driven guidance in preparatory phase	Organization of awareness-raising workshops or missions	Working Group on Implementation (substance), Bureau (approval)
	Review of progress in implementing the recommendations after the workshop or mission	Working Group on Implementation
II. Monitoring of application of the strategic approach	Ensure each of the three steps of the cyclic mechanism is carried out by each of the beneficiary countries	Working Group on Implementation
	Encourage beneficiary countries to be active	Working Group on Implementation
III. Approving of activities	Review the beneficiary countries' self-assessments and action plans	Working Group on Implementation with the lead of its Chair
	Evaluate the requested assistance on substance, and provide guidance	Working Group on Implementation
	Take decision on approving the activity vis-à-vis available funds	Bureau

<i>Main tasks</i>	<i>Detailed tasks</i>	<i>Competent body</i>
IV. Monitoring progress	Make sure progress is achieved in implementing the Convention through the three-step approach and, if no progress, enquire the reasons therefor from the beneficiary countries	Working Group on Implementation
	Evaluate the progress under the Assistance Programme in general	Bureau
V. Ensuring funds for the Assistance Programme	Ensure funds are available for accepted assistance activities	Who is responsible?

26. The Bureau decided that the existing core group should continue the evaluation of the self-assessments and action plans until the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties, after which the new arrangement, if agreed by the Conference of the Parties, should be introduced.

## II. Implementation phase in 2011–2012

27. In 2011–2012 the work in the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme focused on needs-driven capacity-building activities requested by countries in the following areas:

(a) Prevention: a project on on-site inspections for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and national training sessions on identification of hazardous activities under the Convention, organized for Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan;

(b) Prevention, preparedness and response: a project in the Danube Delta for the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine, with the participation of Romania.

### A. Assistance Programme activities organized in 2011–2012

#### 1. Second phase of project on safety evaluation in the Balkans: on-site inspections for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

28. A training session on on-site inspections for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia took place in Zagreb from 29 to 31 March 2011. It was a follow-up to a previous training session involving the three countries and concentrating on the evaluation of safety reports (Belgrade, 8–10 February 2010). One of the outcomes of the previous training session was the elaboration of a checklist for the evaluation of safety reports.

29. Each country was represented by 10 participants from its ministerial policy sections and from its inspectorates. Three facilitators worked with the national experts. The project was funded by the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety and received in-kind contributions from Norway and Croatia. In particular, Croatia ensured the availability of a safety report from one of its installations to national experts and facilitators, and provided a translation of the report into English.

30. The main objective of the training session was to strengthen the knowledge of the public authorities in verifying the evaluation of safety reports, through conducting

inspections at installations with hazardous activities, based on the conclusions of the safety report evaluation.

31. The participants were to work on the basis of the checklist developed in the previous training session and modified by the facilitators following the comments received from the national experts. The need for modifying the checklist was expressed by the participants, based on their experience with using it after the first training session. The national experts concluded that, for more frequent and wider use, the checklist should be more user-friendly and should allow the user to identify more clearly, in a safety report, the items to be assessed through a desk review and those to be assessed through an on-site inspection.

32. As the training participants and the experts were of the opinion that the information contained in the previous version of the checklist was valuable, they decided not to discard any information, but rather to move it to the new guidelines for the use of the checklist.

33. An integral part of the training session was a simulated inspection of a hazardous industrial site. The inspection was run by the national experts who were guided by the facilitators. The installation visited was a gas storage facility in Ivanjic Grad, 40 kilometres from Zagreb. The inspection was conducted in groups following a plan elaborated during the work in groups the previous day; the plan included topics to verify and questions to be asked.

34. One of the topics discussed during the three-day training session was the conduct of inspections in an integrated mode, i.e., safety inspections of hazardous installations combined with labour inspections and/or environmental ones. The national experts expressed general agreement on the usefulness of running integrated inspections. However, they expressed concern related to the coordination and organization of such inspections, considering the involvement and jurisdictions of different governmental authorities.

35. The national experts from the three countries expressed their interest in receiving more information on how this kind of inspection worked in other countries, especially whether the functioning of integrated inspections was based on a legal framework, which authorities were involved, how the planning was made and what elements were covered.

36. The second version of the checklist, after having been tested during the training session, was translated into Russian for use by countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, where the Russian language is used more widely than English.

## **2. Project on improvement of the legal basis for Georgia**

37. The project on legislation concerning preparedness measures that was accepted by the Conference of the Parties for Georgia was cancelled. Georgia indicated that it wished to avoid duplication with a similar EU twinning project being organized for Georgia. Representatives of the Czech Republic, which had offered to be the main in-kind contributor to the Assistance Programme project, agreed with the decision to cancel the project.

## **3. Danube Delta Project**

38. A project on hazard and crisis management in the Danube Delta was started in December 2010 following the expression of interest by the Republic of Moldova for work to strengthen its cooperation with Ukraine and Romania towards effective prevention of and response to emergencies involving hazardous activities in the Danube Delta.

39. This was to be achieved through cooperation by enhancing and, where possible, harmonizing the mechanisms and approaches for efficient and effective hazard and crisis management between the three countries in the Danube Delta region. Industry, as well as

other organizations and programmes dealing with prevention and response to accidental water pollution, were also to be fully involved.

40. The project was funded under the Advisory Assistance Programme for Environmental Protection in the Countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, and was supported by numerous in-kind contributions, notably by Germany and the Netherlands.<sup>1</sup>

41. The three-year project comprised two components addressing hazard and crisis management, respectively. For each component, a number of specific activities had been organized at the time of the preparation of the present document (see table 2). The organization of the activities was based on the project implementation plan agreed upon by the countries at the kick-off meeting on 11 May 2011 in Kyiv.

Table 2

**Meetings organized under the Danube Delta Project in 2011–2012**

<i>Date (venue)</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Objective</i>
<b>Preparation Phase</b>		
11 May 2011 (Kyiv)	High-level kick-off meeting	Adoption of the project implementation plan
<b>Hazard Management</b>		
12–13 July 2011 (Chisinau)	Technical workshop on hazard management	Analysis of national legal frameworks for hazard identification, prevention and public participation
27–29 September 2011 (Galati, Romania, and Giurgiulesti, Republic of Moldova)	Joint visit to the ports of Galati and Giurgiulesti	Discussion on basic safety measures to be applied at facilities hazardous to waters, with the use of a checklist methodology
14 March 2012 (Berlin)	First meeting of the expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals	Initiating the work of the expert group
18 June 2012 (Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation)	Second meeting of the expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals	Discussion on the material produced in the follow-up to the first meeting and on next steps
<b>Crisis Management</b>		
13–14 December 2011 (Chisinau)	Technical workshop on crisis management	Discussion on procedures for emergency preparedness and response, including in the transboundary context

<sup>1</sup> For an extensive list of in-kind contributions, please refer to annex II of this document, table on in-kind contributions.

42. The main outcomes of the project at the time of writing of this report, and as a consequence of six project activities, were the following:

(a) The exchange of information on national procedures for both hazard and crisis management, which was a first step towards the drawing up of joint agreements at the end of the project;

(b) The preparation and exchange of inventories of hazardous activities with possible transboundary effects, which were important steps towards the elaboration of a hazard map for the Danube Delta;

(c) The initiation of the work of an expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals, which is one of the expected project results.

43. Together with the achievements listed above, the project also encountered challenges to its implementation with, in particular, Ukraine encountering difficulties with the hosting of joint inspections and the provision of data considered to be confidential. All project countries were expected to take in turn a leading role for project activities, but this occurred to a lesser degree than expected.

44. The secretariat, in agreement with the main donor country, took actions to urge Ukraine to provide the necessary input and to implement the activities agreed on in the project implementation plan. In addition, it was also agreed to encourage the other two project countries to take the lead on substantial matters when organizing specific project activities. It was also felt that a rotating chairmanship for activities and events among the three project countries would increase their ownership of the project.

45. The donor country, taking into consideration the delays in the project, decided to prolong the project until 30 November 2014 and agreed to reschedule the activities that were due to be implemented in 2012.

## **5. National training sessions on the identification of hazardous activities in Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan**

46. Two training sessions on the identification of hazardous activities under the Convention took place in the biennium 2011–2012. The first was organized at the request of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan and was held in Bishkek on 22 and 23 November 2011. The second was organized at the request of Uzbekistan and was held in Tashkent on 6 and 7 December 2011.

47. Both training sessions were supported by an in-kind contribution from the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment, through the participation of experts from Zoï Environment Network,<sup>2</sup> and by the joint programme “Regional Dialogue and Cooperation on Water Resources Management” between ECE and the German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ), funded by the Government of Germany.

48. The objectives of both training sessions, carried out following the same structure, were twofold:

(a) To improve the knowledge of governmental experts in the area of identification of hazardous activities under the Convention and under the EU Seveso II Directive,<sup>3</sup> as well as to enhance awareness of industry with respect to the potential risk of hazardous activities;

---

<sup>2</sup> Mention of any commercial firm, or not-for-profit company, does not imply endorsement by the United Nations.

<sup>3</sup> Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9 December 1996 on the control of major-accident hazards involving

(b) To discuss with representatives of the countries about the follow-up to the workshop on indicators and criteria for the implementation of the strategic approach held in Bratislava in May 2011.

49. For the first part of the training session the participants were also able to:

(a) Learn about the application of annex I to the Convention, including differences between annex I and the location criteria of the Convention and annex I of the Seveso II Directive;

(b) Discuss other techniques used for the identification of hazardous activities (worst-case scenario analysis);

(c) Discuss good practices for collecting, processing and inventorying information on hazardous activities.

50. The second part, on the follow-up to the Bratislava training workshop, was also an opportunity for the secretariat to remind participants of the commitment made by the countries in Bratislava to send to the secretariat the self-assessment on the level of implementation of the Convention. Additionally it was stressed that the self-assessment would be a useful instrument for all the countries to identify the elements to be improved and possible needs for assistance.

51. The presentations by the national experts revealed that in all three countries the legal and institutional frameworks contained procedures related to the identification of hazardous activities, including classification of chemicals and data collection.

52. Kyrgyzstan was in a particular situation at the time of the training session, as it was in the process of preparing new legal requirements for risk assessment and it was also expecting changes in the institutional framework and responsibilities. The national experts were of the opinion that they could greatly benefit from familiarization with other countries' good practices under the Convention.

53. Especially in Uzbekistan there was a recognition of the usefulness of the training session as providing a forum for discussions and the exchange of experiences. It had raised awareness on the Convention and its provisions among the national experts, especially among those from authorities so far not involved in the work under the Convention.

54. In all three countries the participants expressed the need for, or interest in, some topics being treated in greater depth, including: the elaboration of the worst-case scenario and the use of location criteria; and safety reporting and the regime for hazardous installations with quantities of substances below the levels indicated by the Convention. In Tajikistan participants also mentioned that getting to know good practices from other countries would be useful for them since the legislation on safety reporting was under preparation.

55. All three countries were participating to the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) council on industrial safety. Participants agreed that it would be useful to promote joint activities together with the other CIS countries; activities could include the promotion of the harmonization of legislation with the Convention and also improvement of their own legislation.

56. During the discussions that followed the presentations it became evident that there was a need for more specific language to avoid confusion over several common terms and

---

dangerous substances, as extended extended by Directive 2003/105/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2003 amending Council Directive 96/82/EC.

definitions frequently used in the Convention. In particular, there was confusion between notification of hazardous activities to neighbouring countries and notification of industrial accidents.

57. In all three countries the participants expressed awareness of the importance of creating strong inter-agency cooperation, in addition to international cooperation. In Uzbekistan, the Ministry of Emergency Situations indicated its intention to form an inter-agency group, as proposed by the State Nature Protection Committee, to work on the Convention's implementation within the months following the workshop.

58. The secretariat and the facilitators also delivered presentations reminding countries how to proceed with the self-assessments and what the advantages were of using that instrument to request assistance activities. Neither Tajikistan nor Uzbekistan had submitted its self-assessment at the time of the training session; Kyrgyzstan had sent to the secretariat a partial self-assessment. The secretariat highlighted the importance of submitting a complete self-assessment. All the countries committed to send their self-assessments by different dates, but before the end of January 2012. However, no new information has been received to date.

## **B. Future activities under preparation**

### **1. Danube Delta Project — continuation**

59. In 2013–2014 the activities under the Danube Delta Project will be continued following the new schedule which will be decided upon at a project management group meeting on 14 September 2012. Germany, the main donor of the project, proposed to prolong the project and therefore to postpone some of the expected outcomes. It is expected, however, that the work to be carried out in the next biennium will be on the following:

- (a) Continuation of the work of the expert group for the preparation of the guidelines on oil terminals;
- (b) Continuation on the work under the hazard management component towards the preparation of multilateral or bilateral agreements between the countries;
- (c) Strengthening and continuing the work under the crisis management component towards the preparation of a joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta.

### **2. Third phase of project on safety evaluation in the Balkans: additional on-site inspections for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

60. Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia identified the need to receive assistance to strengthen the knowledge of the public authorities on ways to improve on-site inspections of hazardous installations, based on the results of training session on the evaluation of safety reports.

61. The first activity in the subregion was an evaluation of safety reports, in 2010. This was followed by the second phase of on-site inspections (see section II.A.1 above). These two activities concluded with training sessions held in Serbia and Croatia, respectively. The main project outcomes were the development of a checklist system for safety reports and its practical implementation.

62. The three countries then proposed the organization of a third phase of the project, focusing again on on-site inspections. The focus of this third phase would be the organization of inspections at hazardous installations. The lessons learned in the training would need to be applied in the countries and included in a mechanism that would allow an

effective implementation of the legislation. The need for such training was also highlighted through the self-assessment of the prevention policies in the three countries.

63. The Bureau of the Convention approved the proposal and funds were identified through ENVSEC.

64. The training session was expected to take place in October 2012. In-kind contributions, in terms of experts, were to be provided by the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission and by the United Kingdom. The secretariat was in contact with other Parties to receive further in-kind contributions.

### **III. Preparatory phase in 2011–2012**

65. In 2011–2012 there was only one activity that could be considered as being part of the preparatory phase of the Assistance Programme.

#### **Workshop on obligations and procedures of the Espoo<sup>4</sup> and Industrial Accidents Conventions and opportunities the two Conventions provide for Turkmenistan**

66. The Convention had the opportunity of meeting with experts and officers from Turkmenistan in the framework of the ECE-GIZ Regional Dialogue and Cooperation on Water Resources Management in Central Asia.

67. A national workshop on the obligations and procedures of the Espoo and Industrial Accidents Conventions took place in Ashgabat, on 5 and 6 June 2011.

68. The objective of the workshop was to familiarize participants with the procedures and benefits of the two ECE multilateral environmental agreements.

69. This was the first opportunity to present the Industrial Accidents Convention to the authorities in Turkmenistan. Representatives from Italy, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova and Slovenia shared their countries' experiences in the practical application of the two Conventions.

70. The representatives of Turkmenistan found the work of the two Conventions interesting and expressed their interest in future cooperation under the ECE umbrella, including through a possible joint initiative between the five ECE environmental conventions.

71. During a meeting at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio de Janeiro, 20–22 June 2012), Turkmenistan reiterated its wish to know more about the Assistance Programme under the Convention.

---

<sup>4</sup> ECE Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo, 1991).

## Annex I

### **Template for the submission of project proposals under the Assistance Programme**

Countries benefitting from the Assistance Programme will find below a template to be used when requesting assistance activities. In order to be able to fill in correctly the current template the countries should have already performed a self-assessment and elaborated an action plan with the use of the indicators and criteria and as indicated in the strategic approach. The project proposals should be sent to the secretariat by the country's focal point through an official letter.

### **Project proposal for activities under the Assistance Programme**

#### **1. Information about the applicant**

- (a) Country/Ministry;
- (b) Name of contact person (in case more countries are involved, please indicate the name of one contact person per country);
- (c) Contact details (per each contact person).

#### **2. Overview of the project proposal**

- (a) Title (should reflect the nature/content or key issues of the project);
- (b) Duration;
- (c) Beneficiary countries and their involved ministries;
- (d) Partner countries and their involved ministries;
- (e) Overall estimated project cost.

#### **3. Detailed information about the project proposal**

(Please use the information provided in your country's self-assessment and action plan. Please note that the information provided needs to demonstrate the need of the activity proposed.)

##### **(a) Project background**

(Why is the project needed? Please describe the project background based on the results of your country's self-assessment, in particular with regard to the: (a) area(s) of work and indicator(s) the project proposal refers to; (b) the current situation in your country, as expressed in the progress stage identified for the indicator(s); and (c) shortcomings and challenges identified. In case this is a follow-up activity to one previously organized, please report also on the results achieved in previous activities (table 3 of the Benchmarks document). (Approximately 500 words.))

**(b) Project objectives**

(What are the project's general objectives? What is the foreseen impact? Please describe the project objectives, and the hoped-for impact of the activity in the country. Please base this description on the results of your country's action plan. (Approximately 200 words.))

**(c) Expected project results:**

(What are the concrete/targeted results that should have been achieved after the implementation of the project? Please describe, based on the objectives in section (b) above, the expected results of the project. (Approximately 150 words.))

**(d) Project activities**

(What activities (for instance availability of guidance, training session, etc.) would better tackle the objectives and expected results identified in sections (b) and (c) above? Please propose a description of the way such activities should be conducted (for instance, what kind of guidance, if a training session who should be the participants, how many, etc.) (Approximately 200 words.))

**(e) External assistance**

(What kind of external assistance would best respond to your needs? Please describe, based on the information provided in your country's action plan.)

**(f) Project budget**

(What would be the estimated costs for the project activity or activities?)

**(g) Time frame**

(According to which time frame do you plan to implement the project?)

## Annex II

### In-kind contributions to the Assistance Programme in 2011–2012

<i>Donor country or organization</i>	<i>In-kind contribution</i>
Croatia	For translation of material and liaison with company for the training session on on-site inspections
Germany	Expert services and travel expenses for: meetings under the Danube Delta Project
Italy	Expert services for workshop in Turkmenistan
Kyrgyzstan	Support in the organization of the training session on identification of hazardous activities
Netherlands	Expert services and travel expenses for workshop on indicators and criteria and meetings under the Danube Delta Project
Norway	Expert services and travel expenses for training session on on-site inspections; core group on evaluation of self-assessments; and workshop on indicators and criteria
Poland	Expert services and travel expenses for a meeting under the Danube Delta Project
Republic of Moldova	Workshop in Turkmenistan; support in organizing meetings under the Danube Delta Project
Romania	Support in organizing meetings under the Danube Delta Project
Serbia	Expert services for workshop on indicators and criteria
Slovakia	Logistical support for workshop on indicators and criteria
Slovenia	Expert services and travel expenses for core group on evaluation of self-assessments; workshop on indicators and criteria. Expert services for workshop in Turkmenistan
Switzerland	Expert services and travel expenses for core group on evaluation of self-assessments; workshop on indicators and criteria; training session on on-site inspection; national training session on identification of hazardous activities for Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan; and national training session on identification of hazardous activities for Uzbekistan
Ukraine	Support in organizing meetings under the Danube Delta Project
United Kingdom	Expert services and travel expenses for core group on evaluation of self-assessments and workshop on indicators and criteria

<i>Donor country or organization</i>	<i>In-kind contribution</i>
Uzbekistan	Support in the organization of the training session on identification of hazardous activities
Commission on the Protection of the Black Sea Against Pollution	Expert services and travel expenses for a meeting under the Danube Delta Project
Giurgiulesti Oil Terminal	Expert services and travel expenses for the expert group on guidelines on oil terminal facilities
European Federation of Chemical Engineers	Expert services for the expert group on guidelines on oil terminal facilities
European Process and Safety Centre	Expert services and travel expenses for the expert group on guidelines on oil terminal facilities
Federal Institute for Materials Research and Testing	Expert services and travel expenses for the expert group on guidelines on oil terminal facilities
GCE Group (Russian Federation)	Expert services and travel expenses for the expert group on guidelines on oil terminal facilities
Joint Research Centre of the European Commission	Expert services and travel expenses for the second phase of the training session on on-site inspections
Joint United Nations Environment Programme/Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Environment Unit	Expert services and travel expenses for technical workshop on crisis management under the Danube Delta Project