

17th October 2006

**EU Submission
on issue of subsidiary bodies (ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2006/2, para 22)**

The European Union welcomes the opportunity to respond to questions regarding the establishment of subsidiary bodies under the PRTR Protocol. While the position expressed by the EU during the meeting of the Working Group on PRTR in May remains valid, the contribution below addresses in more detail questions posed by the Working Group.

(a) Which issues would need to be dealt with on the international level in the periods between sessions of the Meeting of the Parties?

The following issues might become relevant for discussion under the PRTR Protocol:

(i) Information exchange on a technical level, e.g. on:

- how to identify PRTR reporting facilities;
- the use of electronic tools;
- how to measure, calculate and estimate releases and transfers;
- which releases from diffuse sources to identify and how;
- how to present the data on releases and transfers;
- how to organise public participation in the development of PRTRs;
- economic and social impacts of PRTRs.

(ii) Information exchange on capacity building issues

- Updating of the capacity building activities matrix (list of PRTR projects);
- Listing of specific capacity building needs per topic and Party;
- Cooperation with other international organisations (UNEP, UNITAR, OECD, etc.) on funding of capacity building projects.

(iii) Technical PRTR Assessment

- Drafting of assessment report(s) on experience gained in development of national PRTRs according to Article 6(2) of the Protocol;
- Drafting of recommendations on technical issues to MOP based on the assessment report(s).

(iv) preparation of next session of the MOP and in particular drafting of programme of Work under the Protocol

(b) On the basis of the answer to question (a), is there any need for the first session of the Meeting of the Parties to establish a subsidiary body, and if so, on which basis, standing or ad hoc?

Any decision related to whether a subsidiary body needs to be established should be guided by careful consideration of appropriate terms of reference for such a body.

Ad a(i): The issues could be dealt with at the MOPs and within workshops, seminars and conferences organized and funded voluntarily by Parties or other donors. In addition, Parties could use the well-organized information exchange tool provided via the UNITAR website ("Virtual Classroom"). In this regard, the EU notes that the MOP shall consider establishing financial arrangements and technical assistance mechanisms.

Ad (a)(ii): These issues could be dealt with at every MOP.

Ad (a)(iii) : MOP 2 might consider the establishment of an (ad hoc) subsidiary body to deal with these issues

The European Union, while sharing the view that - as a guiding principle - any unnecessary increase of subsidiary bodies should be avoided, is willing to further consider, in the light of any discussion of this issue and any progress made at the next working group meeting, the possibility of establishing as appropriate at either the first or second Meeting of the Parties an ad hoc group, with a time-limited and clearly defined mandate.

(c) On the basis of the answer to question (a), is there a need for a separate technical subsidiary body or bodies, and if so, on which basis, standing or ad hoc?

See answer to question b.