

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Training for Trainers from EECCA countries Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine

Evaluation report

December 2007

Content:

1. Background
 2. Objectives of the training course
 3. Training methodology and content
 4. Training agenda
 5. Participants
 6. Summary of the training outcomes
 7. Course evaluation
 8. Acknowledgment
- Annex 1: List of participants
Annex 2: Evaluation form
Annex 3: An example of outcomes from the group work

1. Background

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) offers a promising methodology to promote and improve planning processes in general and the integration of environmental aspects into policies, plans and programmes in particular. SEA has been introduced as an obligatory instrument in many industrialised countries and is meeting with growing interest in developing and transition countries too.

SEA provides support to achieve the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), agreed to by all the world's countries and the world's leading development institutions at the UN General Assembly in 2000. MDG 7 on Environmental Sustainability resolves "to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse loss of environmental resources".

Taking this into account, the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) has established a Task Team on Strategic Environmental Assessment. This was established in 2004 as a response to the demand for guidance on the most efficient and effective way to apply SEA in the context of development cooperation. The product was the OECD publication "Applying Strategic Environmental Assessment. Good Practice Guidance for Development Cooperation".

Since the UNECE Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment¹ is very important document for further development of SEA in ECCAA region, the training for trainers from ECCAA countries aimed to promote the Protocol and its practical application.

¹ The UNECE Protocol on SEA (Kiev, 2003) was negotiated to supplement the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo, 1991). The Protocol has been signed by 37 States and the European Community. It will enter into force once 16 signatories have ratified it and become Parties, and several States have already done so. Once in force, the Protocol will be open for accession by any Member State of the United Nations, subject to approval by the existing Parties, and may so become a global instrument for SEA.

2. Objectives of the training course

The training course had four main objectives:

- (i) To introduce participants the concept and use of SEA and illustrate the process through a hypothetical case study on a regional development programme;
- (ii) To relate the lessons learnt from the case study to the context in the participants countries;
- (iii) To illustrate possible ways on the effective SEA implementation following the provision of the UNECE SEA Protocol;
- (iv) To obtain and discuss recommendations on future actions for streamlining SEA in ECCAA region and networking among relevant stakeholders.

3. Training methodology and content

The training was based on SEA training manual which has been developed by the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ/InWent). This training package is based on both practical experiences with impact assessment tools in development cooperation, and the “Good Practice Guidance on Applying SEA in Development Cooperation”, the official guidance of the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC). It employs innovative methods by intensively exploiting opportunities for action learning and group work. Being based on the case work methodology of the Harvard Business School, the training focuses on practical approaches to SEA.

In order to a) promote principles of the UNECE SEA Protocol, and b) to accommodate the training to the context of ECCAA region, the fictitious case study was modified (focused on SEA for regional development plan) and the slides regarding the requirements of the UNECE SEA Protocol and its practical application were integrate in the PowerPoint presentations.

The training was run over 4.5 days (the last half-day was dedicated to the meeting with the representatives of the Ministry of Environment and wrap-up discussions) and was subdivided into several modules. After introductory sessions the further modules were structured according to the case works from the fictitious case study (see detail schedule of agenda) i.e. participants went through following exercises:

- a. Link programme and SEA
- b. Determine the right issues and scope of assessment
- c. Analyse the baseline trends
- d. Analyze proposed development priorities and their alternatives
- e. Assess cumulative impacts of proposed development activities and propose their optimization
- f. Use effective means of participation
- g. Ensure reflection of SEA results in decision-making as well as an adequate management and monitoring system for implementation
- h. Manage SEA effectively within budgetary and time constraints

Each module was introduced by short presentation on a given SEA task focused on explanation of the task’s purpose and relevant requirements of the UNECE SEA Protocol. The main part was dedicated to the group work followed by the presentations and wrap-up discussions (including few PowerPoint slides with summary of key issues). The discussions were facilitated by the lecturers. The groups – i.e. SEA teams (three altogether) – were established before the first group work and the participants continued working in the same group during the whole training.

The case study was elaborated for the preparation of the Regional Development Plan of fictitious Rumburec Region. It included map of the Region as well as detail map of proposed specific projects (industrial sites), and several exhibits for group work.

This approach allowed to the participants to compare different results (from groups) and discuss other possible approaches, methods and tools.

Working groups



4. Training agenda

Date/ Timing	Sunday 21	Monday 22	Tuesday 23	Wednesday 24	Thursday 25	Friday 26
Venue		Hotel Regina, Prague	Hotel Regina, Prague	Hotel Regina, Prague	Hotel Regina, Prague	Hotel Regina, Prague
08:30	Arrivals of participants	Introduction and training objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to training • Presentation of participants • Learning objectives • Practical information Corners game	Evolution and current status of SEA in participants' countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations & discussions 	Special lecture: Landscape and habitat fragmentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing fragmentation in SEA • Experience from the Czech Republic 	Use effective means of participation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Meeting with representatives of the Czech Ministry of Environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation on SEA legislation in the Czech Republic • SEA system in the Czech Republic • Group discussion on the man issues
10:00		Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea
10:30		Brief introduction to SEA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic information • Evolution of SEA Introduction to case study	Determine the right issues and scope of the assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Analyze proposed development priorities and their alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Ensure reflection of SEA results in decision-making & monitoring system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Continued
12:00		Lunch arranged	Lunch arranged	Lunch arranged	Lunch arranged	Lunch arranged
						- End of training -

13.00		Link programme and SEA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Analyze the baseline trends <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Assess cumulative impacts of proposed activities and propose their optimization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	Manage SEA effectively within budgetary and time constraints <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work • Wrap-up & Discussion on how this relates to participants' context 	
14.30		Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea	Coffee/Tea	
15.00 - 17.00		Continued Evolution and current status of SEA in participants' countries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assignment of tasks 	Continued	Continued	Closing session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap-up of the training • Training evaluation • Participants' view • Distribution of certificates 	
18.00	Welcome dinner	Dinner arranged	Dinner arranged	Dinner arranged	Dinner arranged	Individual dinner

5. Participants

The training course was held for a total of 17 participants. The participant included staff from public authorities, NGOs, freelance experts, universities. Organizations represented included:

- REC Caucasus
- Millennium Challenge Account
- NGO Ecological Sustainability
- International Sakharov Environmental University
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus
- Committee for Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection
- OSCE – Mission to Georgia, Aarhus Centre Georgia
- Georgian State Agricultural University
- Milieukontakt International
- REC Moldova
- UNDP CO Moldova
- Green Technologies Ltd
- Kharkiv National Academy of Municipal Economy
- The National Technical University of Ukraine
- UNDP Crimea Integration and Development Programme

As a part of the introductory sessions, the participants were asked to formulate their expectations from the training. As summary below shows, the participants expected to learn about following topics and issues:

- How to apply SEA in regional development and spatial planning
- Environmental assessment systems, including legal, in other EECCA countries and on how can be experience gained in CEE countries (new EU members) applied in EECCA countries
- What is difference between conducting EIA and SEA, and what is the linkage between them
- Incentives for introducing and applying SEA in EECCA countries
- Different ways to develop capacity for SEA application
- Methodologies and procedures used in SEA, in particular how to conduct scoping
- Transboundary aspect of SEA
- How to apply public participation in SEA
- How to build relations with responsible authorities
- Financial aspect / cost of SEA
- How to prepare good quality SEA report
- New methods and approaches to teaching SEA / developing SEA curricula
- Post-SEA monitoring
- Links between SEA and planning

6. Summary of the training outcomes

As mentioned above each training module consisted from short introduction of the topic and case work, group work on the assigned task, presentations of the results and facilities wrap-up discussion. The presented results showed that it is possible to use different approaches and tools to solve the tasks of the case study. Some groups were using flipchart for preparation of the presentations, the other ones presented results in the electronic format. To illustrate the outcomes, two tables are attached in the annex to this report – from different groups working on the task “use effective means of participations”².

Evolution and current status of SEA in participants’ countries

The participants prepared the overview of the evolution and current status of SEA in their counties focused on:

- Relevant legislation and other documents (methodologies etc.)
- Existing practice
- Scope of application
- Procedure
- Key actors (planning authorities, decision-makers, environmental and health authorities, public involved)
- Key issues (problems / benefits / what works well / what shall be improved?)

It's obvious the countries within ECCAA region have already developed national systems for SEA and in some cases also gained practical experience with its application. On the other hand the need for further support of the improvement of the situation was expressed within the discussions – as regards to capacity building of administrative capacities (SEA authorities) and other relevant stakeholder groups (planners, NGOs, public), carrying out pilot assessment and development of guidance.

Determine the right issues and scope of the assessment

The discussions following the presentations of the case work results were focused on the problems with the identification and specification of relevant environmental themes and objectives and their modification for the specific assessment. It was stressed out there is a strong link with overall system of country's strategic documents on the environmental protection. Another topic was procedural approach to the scoping i.e. need of iterative scoping exercise during the SEA procedure was discussed.

Baseline analysis

The discussion following the case work exercise focused on the issues related to the data quality and interpretation. On the basis of the case work as well as their own experience

² This task required to prepare the communication plan for SEA addressing the following questions:

- What are the key analytical tasks in the SEA process within which discussions with stakeholders should take place?
- Which key stakeholders should be consulted when you are working on these issues?
- Which key stakeholders belong to the public concerned?
- What techniques (public meetings, workshops, information hotline, questionnaires, brochures, negotiation roundtables, advisory committees, etc.) would be appropriate for the active participation of each of the key stakeholders?
- To which extent would your SEA team hold consultations jointly with the planning team? Which role would you give the planning team throughout the participation process?

participants discussed frequently occurring data flaws and techniques for their mitigation. A sound and careful approach towards the data sources and their interpretation was stressed. An involvement of experts with a local knowledge was suggested as a good way of reducing the risk of data misinterpretation.

Landscape and habitat fragmentation

The lecture on landscape fragmentation delivered by the external lecturer triggered a discussion on the techniques and methodology for assessment of fragmentation. The need for the advance of GIS methods and data bases was stressed as a condition for the future progress in the participants' respected countries. The expected extensive transport infrastructure development in these countries will constitute a major challenge as to how to effectively tackle the problem of ecosystems fragmentation at the level of strategic decision-making in the near future.

Analyze proposed development priorities and their alternatives

Drawing on the results of the case work exercise the participants debated appropriate means of comparing development alternatives. A suitability of methods such as CBA, multicriterial analysis, and others was discussed. The quality of the strategic document itself, the reasonability of suggested alternatives and the level of their elaboration are of key importance for the decision on approach and methods to be used within the SEA.

Assess cumulative impacts of proposed activities and propose their optimization

The slightly different approaches were presented by the participants. One of the questions discussed was how to compare direct impacts of specific projects and indirect effects of more general activities (such example was provided by the case study). The participants were interested in various techniques to be used for evaluation.

Use effective means of participation

Participants put forth several strategies for enhancing the effectiveness of the public participation, stressing out the need for transparency and the information availability from the initial stages and throughout the whole SEA process. The discussion confronting the experiences of trainers and those of the participants revealed a risk of the rapid fade of people's interest to participate in the SEA processes after first several pilot SEAs are completed.

Ensure reflection of SEA results in decision-making & monitoring system

The problem of the SEA influence on the actual decision making is of critical importance. The following principles were suggested in the discussion to ensure the SEA outcomes are taken into account: The employed methods and the form of presenting outcomes must be understandable for the decision makers. The SEA should intensively communicate with the planners so that the SEA proposed modifications could be considered at as early stage of the plan drafting as possible. The follow-up activities and monitoring are key tools for assuring that the SEA outcomes were actually taken into account.

Manage SEA effectively within budgetary and time constraints

The case work mock budgeting exercise stimulated a fruitful debate on resources allocation within a SEA project. The pros and cons of employing short-time experts vis-à-vis having a broader team of core experts were discussed. A close cooperation with the authorities and plan developers helps to avoid dual work and reduce some of the costs of data gathering and public participation

Meeting with representatives of the Czech Ministry of Environment

The presentations on the SEA legislation and the practical aspects of the SEA system in the Czech Republic facilitated a discussion on strengths and weaknesses of the current Czech arrangement. The Czech internet based SEA/EIA information system enabling public to access the full documentation of individual SEA processes including all related documents and records from the public hearings was praised by the participants as a good model for the future development in their respective countries.

Training follow-up - potential training application in the countries

Though not part of the original training agenda participants were asked to provide information on current or planned SEA related activities in their countries, which could in theory represent entry points for such SEA training application. The responses are summarized below:

- Belarus: Intensive SEA training is included in the national SEA capacity development strategy recently adopted by the government of Belarus; SEA training planned within the SEA component of the project submitted to TACIS: “Building Capacity for SEA in Belarus” (project duration: 24 months).
- Ukraine: Potential application to build capacity of local experts responsible for conducting planned SEA of the Dnepropetrovsk district development plan.
- Moldova: Being one of the priority countries for the Czech Republic ODA, training can be part of the broader SEA capacity development project, in case the government of Moldova would submit such project proposal to the Czech government.
- South Caucasus: Ongoing water sector development provides the entry point for SEA application, including training.

Suggestions for improving regional – EECCA – cooperation in the SEA field

Representatives of the countries have also stressed a need to strengthen cooperation among the EECCA countries and have suggested the following:

- To create web-site or to utilize existing ones (e.g. site of the UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre, Environment and Energy Practice) for better and more frequent exchange of information and experience in the SEA field;
- To create the ‘community of practice’ / expert network consisted of the training participants and other country experts;
- To introduce a group email address, possibly related to the ‘community of practice’ mentioned above;
- To support exchange of experts within EECCA region (when possible) to avoid or minimize costs related to hiring international experts;

7. Course evaluation

The course was evaluated by using the evaluation form (see annex II) at the end of the training. The overall rating³ is provided in the table below.

Categories	1	2	3	4	5	6	average rating
working methods				8	6	3	4,6
workshop content				8	7	2	4,6
learning aspect				5	8	4	4,9
Trainers				1	10	6	5,3
group dynamics			2	7	4	3	4,5
applicability in your working area			1	4	10	2	4,8
degree of expectations met			1	3	11	2	4,8
organisation, logistics, venue			1	2	4	10	5,4
time-table				5	7	5	5,0

At the end of each day of the training the participants were also asked to think about following issues and prepare written notes:

- The most interesting substantive issues discussed today
- Information / findings which can be used in your daily practice
- Suggestions for further improvement of the training (especially related to the learning aspect)
- Any other comments related to today's' training agenda

Three selected participants were asked to present their ideas in the morning following day. Participants suggested to:

- To refer to the practical examples within slide presentation (e.g. when presenting SEA benefits);
- To ask for reaction on learning aspect after each case work,
- To have all the questions requiring participants action printed / be part of the training material
- Always react after the end of case works, especially in case groups come with different approaches, and they get confused by it;
- One way of realizing the above is to provide / show participants sample filled-in case works to decrease confusion from the fact that groups tend to take different approaches to case works (what is still considered as a positive feature); trainers have to be careful and stress that the approach they present at the end is not the only and prescribing way / approach that can be taken in the different SEA stages;

³ Numbers in cells express the number of participants scoring given category by rating indicated in the first cell in column. The following rating scale was used: 1=very bad; 2=bad; 3=regular; 4=good; 5=very good; 6=excellent (columns in the table).

- Have space adequate to the number of participants, to enable effective work in groups;
- To provide more clear explanation of each case work / to make sure everybody understands what he/she is supposed to do;
- To include information on success stories and failures from concrete SEA applications;
- To include discussion on difference and relation between EA system currently applied in EECCA (OVOS/SER) and system SEA protocol refers to; only applicable to training for EECCA countries' participants;
- To focus more on methods and techniques applicable in the very environmental assessment, to allocate time on demonstration of practical use of certain techniques such as CBA or multi-criterial analysis.

8. Acknowledgements

The original training was developed by a consultant team consisting of Jiri Dusik, Alfred Eberhardt and Felipe Perez supported by Harald Lossack, Axel Olearius (GTZ) and Jan-Peter Schemmel (GTZ).

The set of PowerPoint slides for this particular training, incorporating the requirements of the UNECE SEA Protocol, was prepared by Jiri Dusik with inputs from Nicholas Bonvoisin (UNECE).

The present fictitious case study on the Regional Development Plan of Rumburec Region has been prepared by Integra Consulting Services Ltd. (Martin Smutny and Michal Musil) in cooperation with Jiri Dusik, Henrieta Martonakova (UNDP), Nicholas Bonvoisin (UNECE) and Axel Olearius (GTZ).

The training has been conducted by Martin Smutny and Michal Musil from the Integra Consulting Services Ltd., and Henrieta Martonakova (UNDP). The logistical support to the training has been provided by the Marie Muchova from the Integra Consulting Services Ltd.

Annexes

Annex 1: List of participants

Name	Country	Organization	Position
Lilit Harutyunyan	Armenia	REC Caucasus	Programme coordinator
Simonyan Armine	Armenia	Millennium Challenge Account – Armenia	Environmental and Social Impact Officer
Inam Mammadov	Azerbaijan	NGO Ecological Sustainability.	Project coordinator
Viktoryia Misiuchenka	Belarus	International Sakharov Environmental University	Associate professor
Igor Tchoulba	Belarus		Independent consultant
Ludmila Ivashechkina	Belarus	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Republic of Belarus:	Deputy chief, Inspection of the State Ecological Expertise
Mariam Betsiashvili	Georgia	Committee for Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection	Deputy head
Mariam Ubilava	Georgia	(OSCE), Mission to Georgia, Aarhus Centre Georgia	EIA Public Outreach Specialist
Nato Kobakhidze	Georgia	Georgian State Agricultural University	Dean of faculty of forestry
Iordanca - Rodica Iordanov	Moldova	Milieukontakt International	Consultant and teacher of environmental and land law / State University of Moldova
Victor Cotruta	Moldova	REC Moldova	Finance & Development Director
Vasile Filatov	Moldova	UNDP CO Moldova	Programme Officer
Daniela Petruschevski	Moldova		Independent SEA Consultant
Alla Lytvynenko	Ukraine	Green Technologies Ltd	Director on Development

Olena Borysova	Ukraine	Kharkiv National Academy of Municipal Economy, Department of Environmental Engineering and Management	Associate professor, PhD
Liubov Zharova	Ukraine	The Nation Technical University of Ukraine	Lecturer, Socio-economic aspects of environmental management, Economics and industrial engineering
Andriy Demydenko	Ukraine	UNDP Crimea Integration and Development Programme	SEA team leader

Annex 2: Evaluation form

SEA Training for Trainers October 22-26, 2007

EVALUATION FORM

Dear participant!

Your opinion is very important to us. Therefore we kindly ask you to fill in this questionnaire for us. Your comments and recommendations will help us to improve the SEA training.

Please rate each of the following categories between 1 and 6 and mark the corresponding column.

(1=very bad; 2=bad; 3=regular; 4=good; 5=very good; 6=excellent)

Categories	1	2	3	4	5	6
working method						
workshop contents						
learning aspect						
trainers						
group dynamics						
applicability in your working area						
degree of expectations met						
organisation, logistics, venue						
time-table						

In this part of the evaluation, you are kindly requested to give us your opinions and comments on the different aspects of the workshop.

Working method:

Workshop contents:

Learning aspect:

Trainers:

Group dynamics:

Applicability in your working area:



Degree of expectations met:

Organisation, logistics, place:

Time-table:

Suggestions for improvement:

Would you recommend this SEA training to others?

Interest and possibilities of continuing the learning / training process after the workshop has ended:

Annex 3: An example of outcomes from the group work

Group 1

Key analytical tasks of SEA	Stakeholders that should be involved	Tools to be used
Review the planning process and identify key issues that SEA should advise on	Ministries of Env, Industry and Commerce, Agriculture and Rural development, Labor, Health, Regional Directorate of Highways, major investors, Rumburec University, NGOs	Kick-off roundtable, Web-page [regularly updated] Information hotline Brochure?
Identify relevant environmental and health issues for the PPP	Ministry of Health Ministry of Environment Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development University NGO Agenda 21 Farmers' Association Official delegation from Govland	Advisory committee Questionnaires
Analyse past trends for main issues and their future evolution should the PPP not be implemented (env. baseline, zero-alternative)	Ministry of Health Ministry of Environment University Hydrological Institute Academy of Science Management authorities of protected landscape areas	Advisory committee
Assess proposed development scenarios, objectives and priorities and contribute to their optimizing	Broad-based participation of regional and ministerial authorities, research, business and NGOs	Workshops Advisory committee Negotiation roundtables
Assess cumulative impacts of proposed development actions and contribute to their optimizing	Ministry of Health Ministry of Environment University Hydrological Institute Academy of Science Management authorities of protected landscape areas	Advisory committee
Propose environmental management and monitoring system for implementation of the PPP, addressing also main uncertainties in the assessment	Ministry of Environment Environment Protection Agency Hydrological Institute Specialized NGOs	Advisory committee Roundtable Hotline Webpage Brochures

Group 2

Key analytical tasks of SEA	Stakeholders that should be involved	Tools to be used
Inform stakeholders about beginning SEA process	All stakeholders	Information hotline and website Announcement in newspapers, radio/ TV Workshop with P/P/P developers and key stakeholders
Review the planning process and identify key issues that SEA should advise on	Regional authorities responsible for RDP development P/P/P Development Team Ministry of Environment Ministry of Health	Working meetings Negotiation roundtables Information hotline
Identify relevant environmental and health issues for the plan, programme or policy (while considering the overall nature of the P/P/P and key environmental features in the study area)	Ministry of Environment Ministry of Health Environment Protection Agency National Environmental Fund Centia's Academy of Science Rumburec University – Faculty of Environmental Management & Science Centre of Forestry Engineering Management authorities of protected landscape areas in the Region	Advisory committees Negotiation roundtables Questionnaires Information hotline
Analyse past trends for main issues and their future evolution should the P/P/P not be implemented (env. baseline, zero-alternative)	Ministry of Environment Ministry of Industry and Commerce Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Regional Directorate of Highways and Roads Environment Protection Agency Ministry of Health Municipal Authorities Regional Council & Departments Centia's Academy of Science Hydrological Institute of Centia Management authorities of protected landscape areas in the Region	Advisory committees Negotiation roundtables Workshops Information hotline,
Assess proposed development scenarios, objectives and	Ministry of Environment Ministry of Industry and	Public meetings

Key analytical tasks of SEA	Stakeholders that should be involved	Tools to be used
<p>priorities and contribute to their optimising</p>	<p>Commerce Ministry of Agriculture Development Management authorities of protected landscape areas in the Region National Environmental Fund Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs Ministry of Health Regional Council & Departments Municipal Authorities Centia's Academy of Science City Councils of Rumburec and Svestkovec Centre of Forestry Engineering Association of farmers and agricultural producers</p>	<p>Workshops Advisory committees Negotiation roundtables Information hotline, Questionnaires</p>
<p>Assess cumulative impacts of proposed development actions and contribute to their optimising</p>	<p>Centia's Academy of Science Rumburec University – Faculty of Environmental Management & Science Hydrological Institute of Centia Bio waste Research Institute Centre of Forestry Engineering</p>	<p>Advisory committees Negotiation roundtables</p>
<p>Propose environmental management and monitoring system for implementation of the P/P/P, addressing also main uncertainties in the assessment</p>	<p>Regional Council & Departments Municipal Authorities Ministry of Environment Centia Environmental Information Agency Association of farmers and agricultural producers NGOs</p>	<p>Public meetings Workshops Information hotline/website/mass-media Questionnaires Brochures</p>