



# Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General  
7 January 2013

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

### Report of the Conference of the Parties on its seventh meeting

#### Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction .....	1–8	3
A. Attendance .....	2–3	3
B. Organizational matters .....	4–8	3
I. Report of the Bureau on the activities under the Convention since the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties .....	9	4
II. Election of officers and other members of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties .....	10–11	4
III. Implementation of the Convention .....	12–23	4
A. Activities of the Working Group on Implementation and the sixth report on the Convention's implementation .....	12–21	4
B. Election of members of the Working Group on Implementation for 2013–2014 .....	22–23	6
IV. Use of financial resources in 2011–2012 .....	24–25	6
V. Involvement of Parties and other stakeholders .....	26–27	6
VI. Exchange of information .....	28–35	7
A. Report on the joint seminar on land-use planning around hazardous industrial sites .....	28	7
B. Report on the workshop on cost-effectiveness for major accident prevention .....	29	7
C. Seminar on how national authorities can support local authorities in preparedness and response .....	30–35	7

VII.	Assistance Programme .....	36–47	8
	A. Progress report on the activities carried out within the Programme’s preparatory and implementation phases.....	36–42	8
	B. Indicators and criteria for the Strategic Approach for the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme .....	43–47	9
VIII.	Strategic partnerships .....	48–52	11
IX.	Financing .....	53–54	13
X.	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Industrial Accident Notification System.....	55–56	13
XI.	Prevention of accidental water pollution.....	57–63	13
	A. Joint Ad Hoc Expert Group on Water and Industrial Accidents.....	57–59	13
	B. Report on the seminar on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Sandoz accident .....	60	14
	C. Activities related to the Protocol on Civil Liability and Compensation for Damage Caused by the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters.....	61–63	14
XII.	Possible amendment of the Convention .....	64–67	15
XIII.	Plan of action under the Convention .....	68–74	16
XIV.	Date and venue of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.....	75–76	17
XV.	Final statements and closing of the meeting.....	77–79	17
Annexes			
I.	Sustainable financial mechanism .....		18
	Appendix: Indicative amounts for estimating the level of workplan resource requirements and for costing in-kind contributions .....		22
II.	Priorities, workplan and resources under the Convention for 2013–2014 .....		23
III.	Guiding principles for financial assistance to support the participation of experts and representatives from countries with economies in transition in meetings organized within the framework of the Conference of the Parties and in the activities under the Assistance Programme .....		27

## Introduction

1. The seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, was held from 14 to 16 November 2012 in Stockholm.

### A. Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by delegations from the following States Parties to the Convention and other member States of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE): Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Representatives of the European Commission (EC) represented the European Union (EU), a Party to the Convention. The representative of Cyprus also made some statements on behalf of the EU and its member States.

3. Representatives of the Convention secretariat attended the meeting. Representatives of two United Nations bodies also attended the meeting: the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). One non-governmental organization (NGO) was represented: Eco-Peace (Armenia). In addition, an academic from the Technical University of Ostrava attended the meeting.

### B. Organizational matters

4. The outgoing Chair of the Conference of the Parties, Mr. C. Dijkens (Netherlands), opened the meeting.

5. Mr. N. Svartz, Deputy Director General of the Swedish Civil Contingency Agency, speaking also on behalf of the host country, welcomed delegates and made opening remarks. The Director of the Environment Division of United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) also gave an opening address.

6. The Conference adopted its agenda (ECE/CP.EIA/23), which had been prepared by the secretariat in agreement with the outgoing Chair.

7. The Conference noted the status of ratification of the Convention and its Protocol on Civil Liability and Compensation for Damage Caused by the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/1), as well as the status of competent authorities and points of contact as required under article 17 of the Convention. The Conference noted that Montenegro had yet to designate a competent authority. The Conference reminded all Parties of their obligation to designate a point of contact. It also reminded all Parties of the obligation to inform the other Parties, through the secretariat, of any changes regarding the designation of a point of contact or competent authority.

8. The secretariat reported on the representation at the meeting and the credentials submitted by the representatives of the Parties. The Conference accepted the report on credentials and noted the representation. The Conference regretted the absence of 11 Parties: Denmark, Greece, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Portugal, Russian Federation and Spain. The Conference entrusted the Bureau

with trying to ensure participation by all Parties in future meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

## **I. Report of the Bureau on the activities under the Convention since the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties**

9. The outgoing Chair of the Conference of the Parties presented a report on the activities of the outgoing Bureau in 2011–2012 (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/2). The Conference endorsed the report of the Bureau, thanked the outgoing Bureau for its work and requested the in-coming Bureau to report to the next meeting in a similar way.<sup>1</sup>

## **II. Election of officers and other members of the Bureau of the Conference of the Parties**

10. In accordance with its rules of procedure (ECE/CP.TEIA/3), as amended at the fourth meeting (ECE/CP.TEIA/15, Part I, paras. 12–13), the Conference unanimously re-elected Mr. Dijkens as its Chair. The Conference also re-elected Ms. J. Karba (Slovenia) and elected Mr. G. Hem (Norway) as its Vice-Chairs and elected or re-elected as Bureau members: Ms. A. Aleksandryan (Armenia), Mr. P. Forint (Czech Republic), Mr. G. Winkelmann-Oei (Germany), Mr. C. Piacente (Italy), Ms. S. Stirbu (Republic of Moldova), Mr. B. Gay (Switzerland) and Ms. J. Michielssen (European Commission).

11. The Conference thanked Mr. Gay for his service as Vice-Chair and thanked outgoing Bureau members Ms. O. Shashkina (Georgia), Mr. S. Kozlenko (Russian Federation) and Ms. S. Milutinovic (Serbia).

## **III. Implementation of the Convention**

### **A. Activities of the Working Group on Implementation and the sixth report on the Convention's implementation**

12. Mr. Hem, the outgoing Chair of the Working Group on Implementation, reported on the Working Group's activities and meetings since the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He informed the Conference of the status of reporting on the implementation of the Convention by Parties and other ECE member States within the sixth round of reporting.

13. In the ensuing discussion, delegates emphasized the value and necessity of reporting. The EU encouraged the secretariat to identify issues of common interest and to facilitate the dissemination of good practices from those countries with an advanced level of implementation. The Conference stressed the issue of timely and qualitative reporting by Parties and by beneficiary countries of the Convention's Assistance Programme.

14. The Conference noted and shared the Working Group's concern that one Party — the Russian Federation — and six beneficiary countries of the Assistance Programme — Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan — had

---

<sup>1</sup> The delegation of Norway asked that the report record that Norway had subsequently made a contribution of US\$ 3,202 to support participation of countries with economies in transition in the meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

failed to report. The Conference mandated the Bureau to explore the reasons and possible solutions for non-reporting by the beneficiary countries that were not Parties. The representatives of two of the countries concerned, Kyrgyzstan and Ukraine, explained the particular challenge that they faced because of the frequently changing roles and responsibilities in their national authorities.

15. The Conference regretted the failure of the Russian Federation to report in compliance with its legal obligations under the Convention (article 23). The Conference requested the ECE Executive Secretary to write to the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation to communicate its concern and to ask for the country to report on its implementation of the Convention.

16. In addition, the Conference invited the Working Group on the Development of the Convention to consider possible remedies for non-compliance with the reporting requirement.

17. The Conference also urged those beneficiary countries of the Assistance Programme that were not Parties to the Convention to comply with their commitment to report on implementation. It requested the ECE Executive Secretary to write to the respective ministers responsible for the countries' competent authorities to remind them of their earlier commitment to report.

18. The outgoing Chair of the Working Group on Implementation then introduced the sixth report on the implementation of the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/3), including its conclusions and recommendations, prepared by the Working Group on the basis of the national implementation reports received from Parties. There was particular support from the EU for the recommendation for Parties to focus on continued cost-effective enforcement of safety policies, including through:

- (a) Better coordination between competent authorities at various levels;
- (b) The establishment of a safety culture in enterprises;
- (c) Appropriate identification and notification of hazardous activities;
- (d) Joint management and exercise of transboundary emergencies;
- (e) Appropriate systems for ensuring public participation and providing information to the public, including in the absence of an accident;
- (f) The exchange of experience and good practice on land-use planning and on methodologies for risk assessment and risk management, including the taking into account of natural hazards.

19. The Conference adopted the sixth report on implementation of the Convention, taking into account the remarks made by delegations, and requested the preparation of a seventh report on implementation. In particular, while appreciating the past simplification of the reporting procedure and of the report format by the Working Group on Implementation, the Conference requested the Bureau and the Working Group to investigate further simplification of reporting, based on the remarks made by delegations. Reporting was recognized as a rich source of information on good practices in the implementation of the Convention, and there was a call to strengthen reporting on emergency planning and response.

20. To illustrate one of the good practices revealed through reporting, representatives of the Czech Republic and Germany reported on their joint inspections of hazardous activities falling within the scope of the Convention. Those voluntary joint inspections had been carried out alternately in the two countries on an annual basis since 2007. The speakers highlighted the benefits of the inspections, including an improvement in the quality of

inspections, the strengthening of bilateral cooperation, the building of trust and the harmonization of safety standards. A representative of Poland reported that a similar initiative was beginning between Germany and Poland; a representative of Switzerland reported on similar arrangements between three countries in the framework of the Franco-German-Swiss Conference of the Upper Rhine.

21. The representative of Serbia illustrated how her country had successfully used the indicators and criteria for the implementation of the Strategic Approach (see ECE/CP.TEIA/2010/6) to support the process of reporting on implementation of the Convention. That example also demonstrated how the Working Group had sought to avoid duplication of work on reporting for those Parties that were participating in the Assistance Programme.

## **B. Election of members of the Working Group on Implementation for 2013–2014**

22. In accordance with the terms of reference of the Working Group on Implementation (ECE/CP.TEIA/2, annex III, appendix), the Conference elected or re-elected nine members of the Working Group from among the candidates nominated by Parties, for a term to last until its next meeting: Mr. E. Baranovsky (Belarus); Mr. H. Buljan (Croatia); Mr. L. Iberl (Germany); Mr. F. Senzaconi (Romania); Ms. S. Milutinovic (Serbia); Ms. A.-S. Eriksson (Sweden); Mr. M. Merkofer (Switzerland); Ms. E. Kjupeva Nedelkova (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia); and Ms. S. Ashcroft (United Kingdom). The Conference entrusted the Bureau to identify a tenth member of the Working Group and to inform the Parties once it had done so. The Working Group was expected to elect its own Chair when it met.

23. The Conference thanked the outgoing members of the Working Group: Ms. A. Aleksandryan (Armenia); Mr. V. Lozheczko (Belarus); Mr. M. Cozzone (Italy); Mr. G. Hem (Norway); Ms. S. Stirbu (Republic of Moldova); and Mr. T. Trcka (Slovakia).

## **IV. Use of financial resources in 2011–2012**

24. The secretariat introduced the report on the use of financial resources under the Convention in 2011–2012 (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/4). Delegates observed that, although the trust fund was relatively healthy, the level of contributions was decreasing from year to year. Delegates suggested that the workplan may have been too ambitious and observed that contributions had been insufficient to allow its implementation in full. The EU and its member States remarked that, in the absence of sufficient funds, priority should be given to the Assistance Programme.

25. The Conference then endorsed the report on the use of financial resources in 2011–2012. The Conference requested the secretariat, at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, to report in a similar way on the use of resources for 2013–2014, but that all in-kind contributions should be summarized in the reports first table and not just those that totalled over US\$ 20,000 by a country.

## **V. Involvement of Parties and other stakeholders**

26. The secretariat identified occasions on which members of the Bureau or the secretariat participated in forums to reach out to competent authorities and other stakeholders to promote and further increase the understanding of the work under the

Convention, further to the Long-term Strategy for the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/22, annex I). The secretariat also reported on the use of other targeted communications, such as press releases and the website, in line with the Long-term Strategy.

27. The Conference took note of the information provided by the secretariat.

## **VI. Exchange of information**

### **A. Report on the joint seminar on land-use planning around hazardous industrial sites**

28. A representative of the Netherlands reported on the outcome of the joint seminar on land-use planning around hazardous industrial sites (The Hague, 11–12 November 2010), organized in the framework of the Convention and the ECE Committee on Housing and Land Management. The Conference took note of the information provided.

### **B. Report on the workshop on cost-effectiveness for major accident prevention**

29. A representative of Poland reported on the outcome of the workshop on cost-effectiveness for major accident prevention (Warsaw, 12 October 2011) and informed participants about the workshop's proposals for further work at the international level to increase effectiveness. He concluded that there were opportunities for increasing effectiveness, including cost-effectiveness, for major accident prevention, but that those opportunities required careful evaluation by competent authorities in countries, so that the implementation of a potential solution would bring the expected effects. The Conference took note of the information provided by the representative of Poland.

### **C. Seminar on how national authorities can support local authorities in preparedness and response**

30. The host country, Sweden, organized a half-day seminar within the meeting on how the national authorities in Sweden support local authorities in regard to preparedness and response to industrial accidents. The first two presentations in the seminar gave perspectives beyond Sweden.

31. The seminar began with a presentation on an EU project on Cross-border Exposure Characterization for Risk Assessment in Chemical Incidents (CERACI), by Ms. E. Hall of the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment in the Netherlands. She concluded by describing a proposed activity in the Convention's new workplan that would comprise a CERACI-derived project for non-EU countries. The project would investigate exposure and risk assessment capabilities, organization and good practices, and develop tailor-made guidelines and recommendations.

32. The second presentation was of experiences from the Czech Republic, made by Mr. P. Danihelka, Technical University of Ostrava in the Czech Republic. He concluded that addressing transboundary accidents required cooperation between central and local authorities on several points: policy and strategy; the development of methodology; the sharing of information; and the creation of reserves that improved recovery. In addition, his country's experience was that an active approach by the central authorities led to good cooperation and effective emergency response.

33. The seminar then turned to practices in Sweden, with three presentations by staff of the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency — Ms. H. Nässländer, Mr. O. Brunnström and Mr. T. Eriksson — on:

(a) The use of national reinforcement resources as support for the local fire and rescue services in case of complex incidents;

(b) Coordinators of the response to hazardous materials emergency releases (Hazmat coordinators), who represented one of the national reinforcement resources, supporting the work of the municipalities in their region for planning and preventing incidents involving hazardous substances, but not in an operational capacity;

(c) An integrated decision-support system for prevention and emergency management that combined an extensive library, a chemical database with dispersion models, risk management tools and a command and control system.

34. The seminar also included a presentation on corporate chemical contingency, by Mr. B. Olsson of the Swedish Plastics and Chemical Federation, which outlined a Sweden-wide partnership agreement that regulated participation of the chemical industry within municipal fire and rescue services in the event of emergencies involving certain substances.

35. The seminar provided the participants with useful examples and good practices that could be implemented in other countries or from which other countries could learn, such as in the sharing of information and in the cooperation with neighbouring countries. Delegates thanked Sweden for organizing the seminar and the speakers for their interesting presentations.

## **VII. Assistance Programme**

### **A. Progress report on the activities carried out within the Programme's preparatory and implementation phases**

36. The secretariat presented the progress report on the Assistance Programme for 2011–2012 (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/5). The Conference of the Parties had adopted and launched the internationally supported Assistance Programme in 2004 to help the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe in strengthening the implementation of the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/2004/2 and ECE/CP.TEIA/12, para. 39). The secretariat also recalled the adoption of the Strategic Approach in 2008 and, in 2010, and of the indicators and criteria for its implementation (ECE/CP.TEIA/2010/6). There was a need for beneficiary countries to carry out a self-evaluation (identifying shortcomings) and to prepare action plans (i.e., lists of activities to be carried out to overcome the shortcomings) in order to benefit from projects to strengthen capacity to implement the Convention.

37. The secretariat then described projects carried out under the Assistance Programme in the previous two years:

(a) The second and third phases of a project on safety evaluation in the Balkans, comprising on-site inspections for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (Zagreb, March 2011 and Split, Croatia, October 2012);

(b) A project on hazard and crisis management in the Danube Delta between the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine, which had begun with a kick-off meeting in May 2011 (Kyiv) and that included:

(i) A workshop on hazard management (Chisinau, July 2011);

(ii) A joint visit to oil terminals at Galati, Romania, and Giurgiulesti, the Republic of Moldova (September 2011);

(iii) A workshop on crisis management (Chisinau, December 2011);

(iv) Two meetings of an expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals (Berlin, March 2012 and Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, June 2012);

(c) National training sessions on the identification of hazardous activities in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan (Bishkek, November 2011) and Uzbekistan (Tashkent, December 2011).

38. Finally, the secretariat reported on the holding of a joint workshop on the obligations and procedures of the Convention and another ECE environmental convention, and the opportunities the two conventions provided for Turkmenistan (Ashgabat, June 2011).

39. For each project, the secretariat mentioned the countries and organizations that had provided financial or in-kind support noting, in particular, that Denmark was for the first time one of the countries providing in-kind support. Denmark had provided an expert for the third phase of the project on safety evaluation in the Balkans.

40. Representatives of Croatia, Kyrgyzstan, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Ukraine then presented additional information on the above projects. The representative of Kyrgyzstan proposed that a national seminar be organized soon in his country for government departments involved in industrial safety, with expert input from Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation. In addition, a representative of the Armenia NGO Eco-Peace reported on a German-funded project providing assistance in raising knowledge of industrial safety at universities in Armenia.

41. The Conference took note of the information presented on the activities carried out under the Assistance Programme, as well as the information provided by the Armenian NGO, and endorsed the progress report on the Assistance Programme. The Conference requested the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation to report on further progress achieved under Programme to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

42. The Chair of the Conference invited the meeting to consider whether to invite other States to join the Assistance Programme. Montenegro had not been an independent country at the time of the Assistance Programme's high-level commitment meeting in 2005. Since then the country had become a Party to the Convention and could benefit, as its neighbours did, from participation in the Assistance Programme. Also, following the national workshop held in Turkmenistan in June 2011, that country had expressed further interest in the Convention in a subsequent meeting with the ECE Executive Secretary. As a consequence, the Conference requested the secretariat to invite Montenegro and Turkmenistan to join the Assistance Programme.

## **B. Indicators and criteria for the Strategic Approach for the implementation phase of the Assistance Programme**

43. The outgoing Chair of the Working Group on Implementation presented the outcome of the review of the first self-evaluations<sup>2</sup> and action plans received within the implementation of the Strategic Approach. To help the beneficiary countries to understand

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes also referred to as self-assessments.

how to apply the Strategic Approach, a workshop on the use of indicators and criteria for the implementation of the Strategic Approach had been held (Bratislava, 4–6 May 2011). Despite that assistance, 5 of the 15 beneficiary countries had not submitted self-evaluations: Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan. Only those submitted by Croatia and Serbia could be considered complete and of an adequate quality. The self-evaluation by Serbia could be used by countries seeking a good example. Countries other than Croatia and Serbia were requested to submit a revised self-evaluation before submitting an action plan. Only Belarus had provided an updated self-evaluation and only Albania, Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had submitted action plans.

44. The Conference reminded all beneficiary countries of their obligation to carry out self-evaluations and to submit action plans. The Conference asked the Bureau or the Working Group on Implementation to write to the countries accordingly.

45. Recognizing that countries still encountered difficulties using the indicators and criteria, the Conference entrusted the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation with an evaluation of the criteria and indicators and with finding ways to assist countries with their application.

46. The outgoing Chair of the Working Group observed that the Bureau and the Working Group had been assigned a joint responsibility to follow up on the self-evaluations and action plans. That had necessitated the establishment of an effective mechanism for sharing tasks and responsibilities in both the shorter and longer terms. The two bodies had identified an interim solution — in the period leading up to the present meeting — for the assessment of the first round of self-evaluations, whereby a small group consisting of four members from both bodies, supported by the secretariat and led by the speaker, reviewed the first self-evaluations and action plans and provided feedback to the countries. The secretariat then presented a proposal by the Bureau and the Working Group for a longer-term division of responsibilities for the management of the Assistance Programme, as set out in the table below. Accordingly, the Conference decided that the Working Group on Implementation be entrusted in the future with the monitoring of the Strategic Approach and the review of self-assessments and action plans.

47. In addition, the Conference endorsed, as one of the tools for the implementation of the Strategic Approach, the proposed template for the submission of project proposals (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/5, annex I). The Conference requested the Working Group on Implementation to develop also outline terms of reference for implementation of projects within the Programme. It also requested publication of the indicators and criteria in a user-friendly and flexible form, following possible adjustment (see para. 45 above).

### Tasks and division of work between the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation

<i>Main tasks</i>	<i>Detailed tasks</i>	<i>Competent body</i>
I. Preparatory phase	Organization of awareness-raising workshops or missions	Working Group on Implementation (substance), Bureau (approval)
	Review of progress in implementing recommendations after 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-evaluations and action plans	Working Group on Implementation with the lead of its Chair
	Evaluate requested assistance on substance, and provide guidance	Working Group on Implementation
	Take decision on approving activity vis-à-vis available funds	Bureau
IV. Monitoring progress	Make sure progress is achieved in implementing Convention through three-step approach and, if no progress, enquire reasons from beneficiary countries	Working Group on Implementation
	Evaluate progress under the Assistance Programme in general	Bureau
V. Ensuring funds for the Assistance Programme	Seek to ensure funds are available for accepted assistance activities	Bureau with the support of the Working Group on Implementation

## VIII. Strategic partnerships

48. The Chair of the Conference presented the results of the work carried out by a task force, established by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation, on the identification of key strategic partners and the design of actions facilitating cooperation. The key strategic partners had been split into two groups: priority partners and other partners (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/2, sect. I.D). The secretariat provided an overview of actions taken to develop key partnerships, as well as reporting on the possibility to cooperate with the ECE Committee on Housing and Land Management in the organization of a thematic session on land-use planning and industrial safety within the Europe and Central Asia Housing Forum (Geneva, April 2013).

49. The Chair also presented the outcome of informal meetings between the representatives of the governing bodies of the ECE environmental conventions and the Chair of the ECE Committee on Environmental Policy, held in Geneva on 22 November 2011 and 16 April 2012. The informal meetings had resulted in:

(a) A joint statement to the December 2011 Regional Preparatory Meeting for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to convey the role that the ECE multilateral environmental agreements could play in the transition to a green economy. That statement was subsequently reflected in the interventions made by national delegations at the Preparatory Meeting;

(b) A joint statement promoting the ECE multilateral environmental agreements and their importance, for inclusion in the intervention by the Chair of the ECE Committee on Environmental Policy at her meeting with the ECE Executive Committee, during its review of the reform of ECE carried out in 2005;

(c) A discussion on common challenges and on synergies, with some of the latter already being realized, and the initial drafting of a strategic paper on possible synergies between the conventions, with a particular focus on logistical and procedural issues.

50. Representatives of strategic partners then made interventions:

(a) A representative of UNEP described its flexible framework for addressing chemical accident prevention and preparedness;

(b) A representative of the WHO European Centre for Environment and Health reported on the placing on the WHO agenda of prevention of, preparedness for and response to emergencies;

(c) A member of the Convention's Bureau also a member of the Bureau of the Working Group on Chemical Accidents of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) reported on a recent OECD Working Group meeting including, in particular, a session on international programmes for chemical accident prevention, preparedness and response. The Deputy Director of the ECE Environment Division informed the Conference that, as a result of the OECD Working Group meeting, it had been agreed that ECE would host an inter-agency meeting on industrial accidents early in 2013;

(d) A representative of the EC told the meeting about the EU Major Accident Reporting System (MARS). The secretariat noted that ECE had earlier agreed terms of reference for cooperation with the EC body responsible for MARS, which had been adopted by the Conference of the Parties in 2000 but which had later lapsed. The secretariat also recalled decision 2000/4 of the Conference of the Parties providing that reporting past industrial accidents with transboundary effects would be mandatory for all Parties to the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/2, annex V).

51. The secretariat also demonstrated an online training platform on industrial accidents that was being developed as a result of collaboration between ECE, UNEP and the Joint Environment Unit of UNEP and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

52. The Conference took note of the outcome of the task force's work and the presentations made. The Conference encouraged all Parties and other ECE member States to report on major accidents with transboundary effects using MARS, and requested the EC and the secretariat to facilitate reporting.

## **IX. Financing**

53. The Conference, at its sixth meeting, had entrusted the Bureau to elaborate the details of a sustainable financial mechanism and to present it at the seventh meeting (ECE/CP.TEIA/22, para. 24 (b)). The Chair presented a draft sustainable financial mechanism for the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/6), which had been elaborated by a task force established by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation. The Conference decided that the draft mechanism's reference to the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations, which has been established for mandatory contributions to United Nations funds, should be removed as such a reference might raise expectations that some Parties might not be in a position to fulfil. However, the Conference decided that, should Parties request advice as to the amount of financial contributions or the nature of possible in-kind contributions, the secretariat will provide such advice. The Conference adopted the sustainable financial mechanism, as amended (see annex I).

54. In addition, the Conference requested the Chair to include on the agenda of the next informal meeting of representatives of the governing bodies of the ECE environmental conventions an item on a harmonized approach and general solutions for sustainable extrabudgetary financing of those agreements.

## **X. United Nations Economic Commission for Europe Industrial Accident Notification System**

55. The secretariat reported on an electronic consultation of the Convention's points of contact in May 2012 and on a June 2012 communications exercise using the ECE Industrial Accident Notification (IAN) System. The secretariat noted that the System was not fully functional following the migration of the ECE website in 2011.

56. The Conference took note of the outcome of the electronic consultation and the communications exercise. It decided to maintain the System as it stood, and that it was unnecessary to work towards more standardized notification systems, but that it was necessary to avoid overlapping with other existing systems. Further, the Conference decided to carry out further tests and exercises using the System and to evaluate the System at its next meeting.

## **XI. Prevention of accidental water pollution**

### **A. Joint Ad Hoc Expert Group on Water and Industrial Accidents**

57. During the period 2011–2012, the Joint Ad Hoc Expert Group on Water and Industrial Accidents worked to elaborate guidelines and good practices for crisis management on transboundary waters. A co-Chair of the Joint Expert Group reported on progress made with the drafting of ECE safety guidelines and good practices and indicated an approximate schedule for the completion of the draft.

58. The Conference thanked the Group for its work to date and took note of the presentation. The Conference requested that the current draft guidelines be presented to the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation when they met in January 2013. A representative of Germany expressed readiness to contribute expertise to the Group and suggested that further inputs to the draft would be better coordinated by the secretariat rather than by a consultant.

59. The Chair also observed that one of the earlier products of the Group's work, the safety guidelines and good practices for tailings management facilities (ECE/CP.TEIA/2008/9), could usefully be published in a more attractive and user-friendly form. The Conference requested publication of the safety guidelines on tailings management facilities accordingly.

## **B. Report on the seminar on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Sandoz accident**

60. A representative of Germany reported on the outcome of the seminar on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Sandoz accident (Bonn, Germany, 8–9 November 2011). The Chair observed that some of the recommendations from the seminar had been reflected in the draft workplan. The Conference took note of the information presented.

## **C. Activities related to the Protocol on Civil Liability and Compensation for Damage Caused by the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters**

61. The Conference of the Parties, at its sixth meeting, had agreed on three steps to help countries with economies in transition to ratify the Protocol on Civil Liability and Compensation for Damage Caused by the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters (ECE/CP.TEIA/22, para. 65). The Chair reported on the completion of the first step, which had resulted in a consultant's study on national legislation needed to implement the Protocol, and on progress made in completing the other actions (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/7). The Chair highlighted three points from the consultant's study:

(a) The study suggested that a range of legislative and regulatory measures would be required to implement the Protocol. Any legal difficulties that might arise could be overcome through proper drafting;

(b) The study examined the compatibility of the Protocol and the related EU Directive on environmental liability.<sup>3</sup> It identified relative advantages and drawbacks of the Protocol and concluded that there was no incompatibility and that the two instruments were complementary rather than contradictory;

(c) The consultant suggested that, though the EU itself had no intention of ratifying the Protocol, there was nothing in either EU or international law that would prevent individual EU member States from ratifying the Protocol.

62. The EU reported that it was not in a position to ratify the Protocol at that stage because of the complexity of some issues covered by the Protocol that touched upon a large number of interrelated EU laws and EU member State laws. The Republic of Moldova, one of the two countries expected under the third step to receive recommendations to enable implementation of the Protocol, expressed its continuing support for the three-step approach.

63. The Conference took note of the consultant's study under step 1 and agreed to continue with step 2, subject to the availability of funding.

---

<sup>3</sup> Directive 2004/35/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 April 2004 on environmental liability with regard to the prevention and remedying of environmental damage.

## XII. Possible amendment of the Convention

64. The secretariat presented a Bureau paper on the possible amendment of the Convention (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/8).

65. The Conference requested the Working Group on the Development of the Convention to draft a revised annex I to bring it into line with the United Nations Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (ST/SG/AC.10/30/Rev.4) and to maintain consistency with the corresponding EU legislation.<sup>4</sup> It decided that the proposed amendment should be circulated to the Parties not less than 90 days in advance of its next meeting.

66. The Conference, wishing to minimize the frequency of amendments to the Convention, also requested the Working Group to evaluate the possible amendment of the Convention to address the following provisions and issues:

- (a) Revised and additional definitions (art. 1);
- (b) Revised scope (art. 2);
- (c) Strengthened public participation (art. 9);
- (d) Revised scope of mutual assistance (art. 12);
- (e) Clarified frequency of meetings (art. 18, para. 1);
- (f) Clarified or strengthened reporting obligations (art. 23);<sup>5</sup>
- (g) Accession by other Member States of the United Nations (art. 29);
- (h) Application of amendments to new Parties (art. 29);
- (i) Provisions on land-use planning;
- (j) Provisions on the review of compliance;
- (k) Governance structures under the Convention.

67. It was anticipated that the Conference of the Parties would then prioritize issues at its eighth meeting with a view to adopting an amendment at its ninth meeting. The Conference requested the Bureau to identify a Chair of the Working Group and to make arrangements for the two meetings foreseen for the tasks entrusted to it (i.e., the third and fourth meetings of the Working Group). In addition, the Conference requested the secretariat to:

- (a) Draft a detailed background paper for the third meeting of the Working Group;
- (b) Follow strictly the Committee on Environmental Policy's criteria for financial support to meetings of the Working Group, with only eligible Parties to receive such support;
- (c) Present to the fourth meeting of the Working Group a draft proposed amendment as an official document, translated in the official languages;
- (d) Republish the Convention after the entry into force of any amendment.

---

<sup>4</sup> Directive 2012/18/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 July 2012 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances, amending and subsequently repealing Council Directive 96/82/EC.

<sup>5</sup> Under section III.A above, the Conference had also requested the Working Group to consider possible remedies for non-compliance with the reporting requirement.

### XIII. Plan of action under the Convention

68. The secretariat described the structure of the workplan proposed by the Bureau for 2013–2014 (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/9). The outgoing Chair of the Working Group on Implementation then presented a prioritization of possible activities based on recommendations from workshops and seminars held since the previous meeting (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/10).

69. The Chair invited delegations to pledge voluntary financial and in-kind contributions. In response, Italy pledged a financial contribution of €50,000 in 2013, Norway indicated that it would strive to maintain or increase its previous level of contributions, Switzerland pledged to maintain the same level of support as in the 2011–2012 biennium and the EC pledged €35,000 annually.<sup>6</sup> Germany pledged several in-kind contributions as identified in the workplan. The United Kingdom indicated that it would continue in-kind contributions through expertise upon demand and subject to available resources; it would also host one joint meeting of the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation.

70. The EU observed that, given the current level of activity and the prevailing financial situation, it was questionable whether the proposed workplan was realistic and attainable. The Conference decided, therefore, to prioritize certain activities. The Conference then adopted the workplan for 2013–2014 and the corresponding budget, with prioritization, as set out in annex II.

71. In addition, the Conference requested all Parties, and invited other ECE member countries, to participate actively in implementation of workplan for 2013–2014, and invited them to take the lead in specific projects. The Conference welcomed the financial contributions to the budget pledged at the meeting, as well as the pledged in-kind contributions, and urged other Parties and other ECE member countries to provide voluntary financial and in-kind contributions to the budget, including for ensuring adequate human resources in the secretariat.

72. The Conference mandated the Bureau to oversee implementation of the workplan, to seek lead countries for activities without a leader and to raise additional funds for requested activities within the Assistance Programme. It requested the secretariat to manage activities contained in the workplan, in particular under the Assistance Programme, and to manage voluntary financial contributions in agreement with the donor countries or institutions. Further, the Conference invited the ECE Executive Secretary to continue supporting the work under the Convention by organizing the activities planned in the workplan and providing formal documentation for and publication of the outcomes of those activities, as appropriate.

73. The Conference requested the Bureau to draw up, with the support of the secretariat, a budget for 2015–2016 for adoption at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

74. Finally, on the basis of a proposal by the Bureau, the Conference decided to maintain the guiding principles for financial assistance to ensure effective participation of experts and representatives from countries with economies in transition in meetings

---

<sup>6</sup> The EC will maintain its annual contribution at this level until that amount falls below 2.5 per cent of the total estimated costs of activities under the workplan not covered by the United Nations regular budget. This percentage represents the standard EU contribution to multilateral environmental agreements. This commitment is, however, subject to annual endorsement by the budgetary authorities of the EU. It is in addition to the contributions made individually by the EU member States.

organized within its framework and in the activities under the Assistance Programme, depending on the availability of funds, as set out in annex III.

#### **XIV. Date and venue of the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties**

75. The Conference of the Parties took a unanimous decision to hold its eighth ordinary meeting in autumn 2014.

76. The Chair invited Parties to inform the Bureau, through the secretariat, if they wished to host the eighth meeting, bearing in mind that the meeting was expected to see the adoption of an amended annex I to the Convention.

#### **XV. Final statements and closing of the meeting**

77. The Conference agreed on the main decisions taken at the meeting, as presented by the secretariat. The meeting entrusted the secretariat to finalize the report after the meeting in consultation with the Bureau.

78. In his closing remarks, the Chair thanked the delegates for their active participation in the meeting. The Conference thanked Sweden as host country for the warm welcome and the excellent arrangements. The Conference expressed its thanks to the delegation of Finland for hosting a reception during the meeting period to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the adoption of the Convention in Helsinki in 1992. The Director of the ECE Environment Division also made some final remarks.

79. The Chair officially closed the meeting on Friday, 16 November 2012.

## **Annex I**

### **Sustainable financial mechanism**

#### **I. Objective**

1. The sustainable financial mechanism refers to extrabudgetary resources provided on a voluntary basis.
2. The objective of the sustainable financial mechanism is to establish the necessary financial foundations to meet the long-term priorities and directions set in the Long-term Strategy, which are to be achieved through the activities stipulated in the biennial workplans.
3. To achieve the overall objective the mechanism shall:
  - (a) Establish the necessary basis for preparing predictable biennial workplans with defined resource requirements;
  - (b) Introduce a fair way for sharing the responsibility among all Parties to provide the necessary resources for the implementation of the biennial workplans;
  - (c) Encourage all Parties and other stakeholders to support the implementation of the workplans;
  - (d) Encourage those Parties that have previously made significant contributions to continue providing extrabudgetary resources, when possible at a substantial level, for the implementation of the workplan activities.

#### **II. Elements of the mechanism**

##### **A. Structure and funding assumptions for biennial workplans**

4. The biennial workplans, which are prepared by the Bureau for consideration and adoption by the Conference of the Parties, shall consist of two parts:
  - (a) Core activities;
  - (b) Assistance activities.
5. The core activities are grouped according to the following priority areas of the Long-term Strategy:
  - (a) Involvement of Parties and other stakeholders — priority area I;
  - (b) Exchange of information — priority area II;
  - (c) Strategic partnerships — priority area IV;
  - (d) Financing — priority area V.
6. The core activities also include mandatory meetings under the Convention.
7. Assistance activities — priority area III of the Long-term Strategy — included in the workplan are projects approved for implementation and additional projects that are expected to be implemented within the biennium.
8. The cost of workplan activities shall be calculated in United States dollars. Assistance activities shall normally have budgets defined on the basis of an estimation

previously submitted to the Bureau. Funding requirements, or estimated costs of core activities, will be stated according to the indicative amounts contained in the appendix. These indicative amounts are also used to define the value of in-kind contributions.

9. The cost of all activities shall also include an estimate of the work-months of the secretariat staff needed to prepare and carry them out. Work-months exceeding the resources of regular budget staff should be covered by extrabudgetary resources and expressed in United States dollars.

10. The biennial workplans shall allow for predictable resource requirements from Parties. To this end, the level of resource requirements should not differ substantially between subsequent workplans. However, this condition should be waived in the case of joint projects with other bodies that result in substantially higher resource requirements, which are covered by large contributions from these bodies (see section E below).

#### **B. Workplan activities vis-à-vis the extrabudgetary resources**

11. Parties, other ECE member countries, the European Commission, international organizations and industry are invited to provide extrabudgetary resources for any workplan activity. In that regard, co-funding shall be the preferred method for the implementation of workplan activities, i.e., funding coming from more than one of the above-named groups of stakeholders.<sup>7</sup>

12. The primary responsibility for securing the necessary resources needed to implement the workplans lies with the Parties. The sustainability of the mechanism therefore requires the participation of all Parties in the implementation of the workplan activities.

#### **C. Contributions**

13. Resources may be provided through a financial or in-kind contribution. A financial contribution should be made to the Convention's trust fund. Financial contributions can be made towards the overall implementation of a biennial workplan or be earmarked for a particular activity. An in-kind contribution can be made through covering the cost of services linked to a workplan activity (organization of a meeting, provision of expertise, etc.).

14. All Parties are encouraged to provide resources for the implementation of the workplan activities and they are invited to consider contributions that reflect their economic strength, or higher. Other stakeholders are encouraged to provide contributions also.

15. Those Parties that have previously made significant contributions are invited to continue providing substantial contributions.

16. Financial contributions, unless earmarked to the contrary, will be used in accordance with the priorities assigned to areas and activities in the workplan.

#### **D. Call for contributions from Parties**

17. In the years when meetings of the Conference of the Parties are held, the Parties will receive a draft biennial workplan with the resource requirements prepared by the Bureau together with a letter inviting them to provide contributions. Those Parties that have previously made significant contributions will be invited to maintain the level of their past contributions for the present workplan. Other Parties will be requested to provide contributions reflecting their economic strength.

---

<sup>7</sup> Work to secure contributions from Strategic Partners is in development. In previous bienniums most funding has come from voluntary extrabudgetary contributions from the Parties.

18. The Parties will receive a letter in the year between the meetings of the Conference of the Parties referring to the adopted workplan, and reporting on the status of the trust fund, and will be invited to provide contributions. If shortfalls in biennial funding occur, the letter will draw the attention of the Parties to this fact.

19. Parties that have not made or pledged a contribution to the trust fund, and that have not made or pledged an in-kind contribution to the implementation of the workplan, will be encouraged to do so. Should Parties request advice as to the amount of financial contributions or the nature of possible in-kind contributions, the secretariat will provide such advice.

#### **E. Seeking contributions by other stakeholders**

20. Contributions by stakeholders other than Parties can be an important part of funding workplan activities, particularly under the Assistance Programme. To this end, ECE member countries, the European Commission, international organizations and industry are encouraged to provide their support. Information is to be exchanged with them on mutual needs and interests, as well as reciprocal benefits from organizing joint activities. Where possible, long-term partnerships in areas of mutual interest with co-funding schemes for joint activities should be concluded.

21. The Chair or a Vice-Chair of the Bureau, with the support of the secretariat, should meet and correspond with representatives of such stakeholders, to raise awareness of the Convention and its Assistance Programme and to explore possibilities for funding of activities, with financial or in-kind contributions, as well as other forms of cooperation. Such cooperation might include, for example, coordination of joint activities for strengthening industrial safety and complementing each other's work.

22. Parties are encouraged to assist in exploring possibilities for involving different groups of stakeholders and in establishing long-term partnerships with international organizations and programmes, particularly where Parties are able to influence decision-making by such stakeholders.

23. Furthermore, a crucial role in ensuring additional contributions, especially coming from the European Commission's dedicated funds, can be played by Parties or ECE member countries according to the rules on application eligibility.<sup>8</sup>

### **III. Application of the sustainable financial mechanism**

24. The following are the roles of the Parties, the Conference of the Parties, the Bureau and the secretariat with regard to the application of the sustainable financial mechanism:

- (a) Parties:
  - (i) Pledge or indicate, prior to adoption of a biennial workplan, the level of annual voluntary financial and in-kind contributions (the pledges show whether the implementation of the workplan prepared by the Bureau is feasible);
  - (ii) Take an active part in ensuring additional contributions;
- (b) The Conference of the Parties:
  - (i) Adopts the workplan;

---

<sup>8</sup> Depending on the particular instrument, the application eligibility may lie with beneficiary countries for which the instrument was established, for others they can be dedicated for application by European Union member States.

- (ii) Prioritizes activities, including identifying activities which should be put on hold in case the pledges and indications for voluntary contributions by Parties are assessed as insufficient to cover the implementation of the whole of the workplan;
- (c) The Bureau:
  - (i) Prepares an affordable workplan and other related documents in accordance with the sustainable financial mechanism;
  - (ii) Actively encourages Parties to provide support at least at a level reflecting their economic strength and, when relevant, in case of non-contributing Parties, arranges meetings to foster their support and build awareness on the need for sustainable financing;
  - (iii) Monitors the implementation of the workplan and the assistance activities and introduces relevant adjustments, including prioritization of activities, when needed;
  - (iv) Encourages an active role of ECE member countries, the European Commission, international organizations and industry in ensuring additional contributions;
- (d) The secretariat:
  - (i) Implements and manages the workplan activities, including assistance activities;
  - (ii) Supports the Bureau in preparing the workplan and related documents for further consideration by the Conference of the Parties.

## Appendix

### **Indicative amounts for estimating the level of workplan resource requirements and for costing in-kind contributions**

Indicative amounts:

- (a) Core activities:
  - (i) Organization of a meeting of the Conference of the Parties: \$50,000;
  - (ii) Organization of a workshop: \$30,000;
  - (iii) Organization of a joint meeting of the Bureau and Working Group on Implementation: \$7,500;
  - (iv) Organization of a meeting of the Bureau or Working Group: \$5,000;
  - (v) Organization of a task force meeting: \$2,500;
  - (vi) Participation of an expert from a country with an economy in transition in a workplan core activity: \$1,500;
- (b) Provision of expertise within assistance activities:
  - (i) Travel of expert: \$1,000;
  - (ii) Expertise provided during one mission: \$2,000.

## Annex II

### Priorities, workplan and resources under the Convention for 2013–2014

The implementation of the activities in the workplan requires not only regular budget (RB) but also extrabudgetary (XB) resources. Therefore, Parties, other ECE member countries and other stakeholders are invited to support the Convention's activities in 2013–2014 by contributing to the Convention's trust fund, by financing activities directly and by making in-kind contributions. Contributions from other sources, especially from the private sector, are also encouraged. Parties are also invited to take the lead in supporting the specific activities substantially.

#### Priorities

The Conference of the Parties prioritized the following areas and activities: the Assistance Programme; formal meetings (listed under "Other activities" in table 1); the development of a guide on the methodology for hazard rating; the sharing of good practices on land-use planning and industrial safety; and other activities with a lead country or earmarked cash or in-kind support.

Table 1  
Workplan and resources for 2013–2014

Area	Activities, lead/supporting countries	<i>XB financial resources (cash and in kind)</i>	<i>RB/XB human resources in work-months of Professional (P) and General Service (G) secretariat staff to support the planned activities</i>	
		US\$	P	G
<b>I. Core activities of the Convention</b>				
Involvement of Parties and other stakeholders	Targeted communication (newsletters, press releases, leaflets, website, participation in forums)	15 000		
	Working visits and high-level meetings to Parties	9 000		
	Working visits to other stakeholders	6 000		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>30 000</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
Exchange of information	Exchange of experience and good practices among Parties and to promote the continuous organization of bilateral exercises for preparedness	30 000		
	Raising knowledge on industrial safety at universities (follow-up to pilot project in Armenia) <i>Lead country: Germany</i>	30 000 (in kind by Germany) <sup>a</sup>		
	Sharing good practices for increasing public involvement in national work on industrial safety (possibly in cooperation with the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters)	30 000		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>90 000</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>

Area	Activities, lead/supporting countries	XB financial resources (cash and in kind)	RB/XB human resources in work-months of Professional (P) and General Service (G) secretariat staff to support the planned activities	
		US\$	P	G
Strategic partnerships	Development of a guide on the methodology for hazard rating, with partners	30 000	–	–
	Sharing of good practices for safety and land-use planning <sup>b</sup>	40 000	–	–
	Activities (to be defined) to raise awareness of the risk of complacency, to ensure prevention and to maintain a high level of safety, with partners	50 000	–	–
	Development with partners of guidelines on transboundary risk assessment, possibly including the characterization of exposure risks <i>Lead country: Netherlands</i>	60 000	–	–
	Risk management at tailings management facilities: development of a checklist and practical exercises <i>Lead country: Germany</i>	(in kind) <sup>c</sup>	–	–
	Meeting of the Joint Ad Hoc Expert Group on Water and Industrial Accidents for the elaboration of a checklist or methodology for harmonized contingency planning for accidents with potential impacts on transboundary waters	20 000	–	–
	Carrying out the second step identified to assist countries in the ratification of the Protocol on Civil Liability and Compensation for Damage Caused by the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters	25 000	–	–
	Online training on industrial accidents, with UNEP and the Joint UNEP/OCHA Environment Unit (continued)	15 000	–	–
	Meeting with partner organizations to coordinate joint activities	30 000	–	–
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>270 000</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>4.5</b>
Financing	Donor meetings	5 000	–	–
	Bilateral visits	10 000	–	–
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>15 000</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.5</b>
Other activities	Eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties	80 000	–	–
	Meetings of the Bureau, or jointly with the Working Group on Implementation	75 000	–	–
	Meetings of the Working Group on Implementation	30 000	–	–
	Meetings of the Working Group on Development	25 000	–	–
	Consultation for points of contact to review the effectiveness of the ECE IAN System	40 000	–	–
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>260 000</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>
<b>Subtotal Section I</b>		<b>675 000</b>	<b>45.0</b>	<b>19.0</b>

Area	Activities, lead/supporting countries	XB financial resources (cash and in kind)	RB/XB human resources in work-months of Professional (P) and General Service (G) secretariat staff to support the planned activities	
		US\$	P	G
<b>II. Assistance activities of the Convention</b>				
Assistance Programme	Activities under the preparatory phase (e.g., in Montenegro, Turkmenistan)	15 000	–	–
	Activities under the implementation phase further to an action plan approved by the Bureau (e.g., Serbia) <sup>d</sup>	100 000 (indicative)	–	–
	Activities under the implementation phase further to an action plan approved by the Bureau (e.g., the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) <sup>e</sup>	100 000 (indicative)	–	–
	Meetings of the Working Group on Implementation reviewing self-assessments and action plans developed by the beneficiary countries, backed up by teleconferences	20 000	–	–
	Subregional workshops or meetings for feedback and training on the self-assessments and action plans developed by the beneficiary countries	90 000	–	–
	Danube Delta project involving the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and Romania — hazard management (continued) <i>Lead country: Germany</i>	100 000 (estimate)	–	–
	Danube Delta project involving the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine and Romania — crisis management (continued)	100 000 (estimate)	–	–
	Other projects submitted by countries through action plans under the Assistance Programme, in accordance with the cyclic mechanism	150 000	–	–
	Two advisory missions	20 000	–	–
	Administrative assistance to project implementation (General Service staff, 15 per cent)	105 000	–	–
<b>Subtotal Section II</b>		<b>800 000</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>
<b>III. Other secretariat activities</b>		–	<b>4.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>
<b>Total activities (Sections I + II + III)</b>		<b>1 455 000</b>	<b>81.0<sup>f</sup></b>	<b>33.0</b>

<sup>a</sup> Germany is expected to provide funding of €25,000 for the project, plus financial support for up to 10 participants from other countries in the ECE region.

<sup>b</sup> Co-funding might be sought through the ECE Committee on Housing and Land Management.

<sup>c</sup> Germany is expected to fully fund the activity in kind but with the support of experts being provided in kind by other countries.

<sup>d</sup> Serbia has indicated a need for external assistance in terms of international experts to support the review of training materials and the organization of training activities for the authorities or operators on a number of topics, as well as to provide advice to operators on the preparation of safety reports and emergency plans.

<sup>e</sup> The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has indicated a need for a broader range of technical assistance, including the development of legislation, regulations and guidance materials, the delivery of training, the creation of

inventories and databases, the definition and implementation of contingency plans, the carrying out of a public information campaign and the setting up of an industry help desk.

<sup>f</sup> One post (P or G) translates into 21 work-months per biennium. Therefore, in terms of human resources, the implementation of the workplan, apart from one P-4 RB post and one associate expert, requires two additional professional posts financed from XB resources. The estimated financial requirements for the two posts amount to US\$ 750,000 per biennium, as indicated in table 2 below.

Table 2  
**Total resources for 2013–2014**

<i>Items/activities</i>	<i>Amount in US\$</i>
Core activities of the Convention	655 000
Assistance activities of the Convention	800 000
Staff:	
RB, Professional	(provided by United Nations RB)
RB, General Service	(provided by United Nations RB)
XB, Professional (Assistance Programme Manager)	420 000
XB, Professional (Programme Support Officer)	330 000
XB, Professional (Associate Expert)	(currently provided by Germany, but see note)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2 205 000</b>

*Note:* The Programme Support Officer is currently at the P-2 level; the secretariat envisages raising this position to the P-3 level (the same as the Assistance Programme Manager), with an associated increase in cost. The associate expert is funded by Germany until 30 October 2013. Germany might decide to extend the post, in which case equal co-funding from the trust fund (i.e., by donors) would be required. To extend the post by two years would require funding of US\$325,000, half of which would be payable from the trust fund; a one-year extension might also be possible, under similar conditions.

## Annex III

### **Guiding principles for financial assistance to support the participation of experts and representatives from countries with economies in transition in meetings organized within the framework of the Conference of the Parties and in the activities under the Assistance Programme**

1. The following countries of Eastern European, the Caucasus and Central Asia — Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Republic of Moldova, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan — as well as the following countries of South-Eastern Europe — Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina — are eligible for full financial assistance (travel expenses and daily subsistence allowance (DSA)) to support the participation of their experts and representatives in activities organized within the framework of the Conference of the Parties. Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkmenistan are eligible for partial financial assistance (DSA only).

2. The countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia and South-Eastern Europe, as accepted by the Conference of the Parties as recipient countries in the Assistance Programme under the Convention, are eligible for full financial assistance (travel expenses and DSA) to support the participation of their experts and representatives in the capacity-building activities organized within the Programme.

---