
Economic Commission for Europe

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

Bureau

Twenty-second meeting

Stockholm, 27–28 June 2012

Minutes of the meeting

I. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

1. The Bureau of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents held a meeting in Stockholm on 27 and 28 June 2012 at the invitation of the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency.
2. The following members of the Bureau attended the meeting: Mr. Chris Dijkens (Netherlands), Chair of the COP; Ms. Jasmina Karba (Slovenia) and Mr. Bernard Gay (Switzerland), COP Vice-chairs ; Mr. Pavel Forint (Czech Republic); Mr. Gerhard Winkelmann-Oei (Germany); Ms. Olga Shashkina, who had replaced Ms. Irma Gurguliani (Georgia); Mr. Sergey Kozlenko (Russian Federation); and Ms. Jill Michielssen, who had replaced Mr. Tobias Biermann (European Commission). Mr. Cristiano Piacente (Italy) and Ms. Suzana Milutinovic (Serbia) had informed the secretariat in advance that they could not participate.
3. In addition, Mr. Gunnar Hem (Norway), Chair of the Working Group on Implementation, and Ms. Ann-Sofie Eriksson (Sweden), participated in the meeting. Mr. Pär Ryen, Ms. Helena Fridh and Ms. Helena Nasslander (Sweden), and Mr. John Vijgen, a consultant, participated in the relevant agenda items.
4. The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) secretariat was represented at the meeting by Mr. Nicholas Bonvoisin, Secretary to the Convention, and Ms. Virginia Fusé.
5. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei suggested that, at the beginning of each meeting, the minutes of the previous meeting be adopted. The Chair observed that this had not been practice previously but, nonetheless, the minutes of the previous meeting were adopted.
6. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei also suggested that when, as in this case, there were many documents presented by the secretariat, it would be useful to make clear reference to them in the provisional agenda.
7. The Bureau adopted the provisional agenda (ECE/CP.TEIA/2012/INF.1, or COPB44), which had been prepared by the secretariat in agreement with the Chair.

II. Financing

8. The secretariat reported on contributions to and expenditure from the Convention's trust fund, and presented a draft paper on the use of financial resources in the format agreed

by COP at its fifth meeting. Ms. Michielssen indicated that a further €35,000 was available from the European Commission and that an invoice was awaited. The Chair indicated also that the Netherlands was considering to provide €40,000 in 2012.

9. The Bureau asked the secretariat to include firmly pledged as well as received contributions in the document to be presented to the COP and that major in-kind contributions be added to the presentation (table 1). There should also be recognition, in general terms, of the contribution made in-kind by members of the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation, participating in meetings and representing the Convention at events.

10. A workshop in Armenia on raising awareness of industrial safety at university level, funded by Germany, should also be reflected in the financial report, but only as a qualitative statement. The Bureau also requested the secretariat to insert an additional paragraph identifying which activities in the past workplan had not been carried out and explaining why. The paper should highlight how the overall budget agreed upon at the previous COP meeting (US\$1,950,000) had not been matched by financial and in-kind contributions (totalling approximately US\$1,500,000).

11. The Bureau members agreed to provide the secretariat additional comments on the document, including the identification of further significant in-kind contributions, by the end of July 2012.

12. The secretariat reported that there had not been progress in organizing a meeting with the Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation in Geneva regarding possible funding of activities, for example those linked with adequate and proper application of the Convention's indicators and criteria by the Assistance Programme beneficiary countries.¹ The Bureau encouraged the secretariat to seek as large a contribution as possible, and asked Mr. Kozlenko to explore the possibility of participating in a meeting in Geneva. Mr. Kozlenko indicated that he might be able to join a meeting if the Chair or a Vice-Chair would also be willing to support the event.

13. The secretariat reported on progress with the recruitment of an additional extrabudgetary staff member, with the closing date for applications being 26 June 2012, and explained the recruitment process. The secretariat indicated that it was not possible to indicate a date for the new staff member to enter in service, as much of the process is beyond the control of ECE.

14. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei asked what would happen if there are insufficient funds for new staff member. The secretariat also mentioned that, for the future budget, the extra funds for the salary of the German-funded associate expert should be considered, as any prolongation beyond the initial two-year period would require matching funds from other sources; Germany would pay half of the associate expert's costs for either a one- or two-year extension. The secretariat indicated that there was naturally a preference for retaining long-term extrabudgetary staff, not least because of their institutional memory.

15. The Bureau discussed but was unable to conclude how to ensure additional funding in order to build a financial reserve for implementation of the 2013–2014 workplan.

III. Seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties

16. Ms. Eriksson, the focal point in the host country, Sweden, showed the Bureau the conference facilities and provided an update on the practical arrangements for the holding of the COP meeting in Stockholm, in the same building that provided the venue for the

¹ A first meeting was organized in July 2012; a follow-up meeting was expected in September 2012.

Bureau meeting. She also reported that the Swedish Ministry of Defence was going through the host-country agreement and would soon provide its comments.

17. The secretariat informed the Bureau that Switzerland had kindly provided funding to support the participation of eligible Central Asia and Azerbaijan participants at the seventh meeting of the COP. Other Bureau members were asked to check whether their countries might provide funds for other eligible participants.

18. The other representatives of Sweden present in the meeting described a proposed event on the rendering of support to the local level from national authorities in preparedness and response, including how it would be organized within the framework of the COP meeting. The Bureau agreed that the event be held on the second day of the meeting, on 15 November, in the afternoon. The Bureau also agreed that the Chair would contact the project on Cross-border Exposure characterisation for Risk Assessment in Chemical Incidents (CERACI) so that the event would include a presentation on that project. The Bureau suggested that other Parties be invited to share their perspectives, with the Russian Federation being identified as a primary candidate. The Bureau emphasized the need to link presentations to the scope and provisions of the Convention, and decided that the event should be reflected in a one-page summary to be annexed to the report of the COP meeting.

19. The Bureau discussed the possible holding of a multi-stakeholders event to examine synergies in industrial safety that might be organized back to back with the meeting. The secretariat informed the Bureau that the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Working Group on Chemical Accidents had now planned a rather similar event in October 2012, but that it might be proposed that similar events be organized on an annual basis, rotated among the key stakeholders; the Bureau agreed that ECE might host such an event, depending on the outcome of the OECD event, in the period leading up to the eighth COP meeting. The Bureau asked the secretariat to invite the Chair of the OECD Working Group, Mr. Mark Hailwood, to present the outcome of the OECD event to COP.

20. The Bureau concluded that it should not invite private companies to the COP meeting, but that stakeholders that had already been identified as strategic partners should be invited, as well as relevant United Nations programmes and agencies. In particular, it was suggested that two or three of the organizations already identified as strategic partners should be invited to present to COP, under the agenda item on the long-term strategy, how they contribute to prevention of, preparedness for and response to industrial accidents and how they cooperate with the Convention.

21. The Bureau reviewed the draft of a publication celebrating the twentieth anniversary of the Convention, expected to be launched at the COP meeting.

22. In addition, the secretariat reported on its contact with the Water Convention secretariat and Finland to explore possibilities for organizing a joint event for celebration of the anniversary of both Conventions in Helsinki, where they were both adopted in 1992. The secretariat informed the Bureau that Finland had advanced arrangements in place for the celebration of the Water Convention in mid-September, precluding a joint event with the Industrial Accidents Convention. The Bureau asked the secretariat to investigate the possibility of the Finnish Embassy in Stockholm hosting an evening reception during the COP meeting to celebrate the anniversary; the European Union's representation in Stockholm might also be involved. Another possibility would be for the Finnish Ambassador to be invited to speak to the COP, though this might be contrary to the earlier Bureau decision that the COP meeting would not be at a high level.

23. The Bureau discussed in some detail a proposal by the Chair and Vice-Chairs for the future composition of the Bureau and of the Working Group on Implementation, to be put before the COP meeting in November. The proposed composition of the Bureau was complete, including the Chair, but with the current Vice-Chairs indicating their willingness

to take on an ordinary membership role. The proposed membership of the Working Group on Implementation was nearly complete.

24. The secretariat presented an overview of the expected official documentation for consideration by COP, comprising:

- Provisional agenda
- Ratification status
- Report of the Bureau
- Sixth report on the implementation of the Convention
- Sustainable financial system
- Progress report on the Assistance Programme
- Recommendations from workshops and seminars in 2011 and 2012
- Use of financial resources
- Priorities, workplan and resources under the Convention for 2013–2014
- Implementation of the decision of the Conference of the Parties concerning the Protocol on Civil Liability
- Possible amendments to the text of the Convention

25. The Bureau then reviewed and agreed on the preparation of the above-listed documents, as outlined below.

26. Regarding the provisional agenda, the Bureau decided that the discussion on the use of financial resources should take place earlier, immediately after the review of the report on the implementation of the Convention. Reference to the credentials was to be moved into the footnote on the cover page, and the Chair should report on the joint meetings of representatives of the five ECE environmental conventions. In addition, the Bureau advised that the core of the agenda be structured according to the Convention's long-term strategy. Further, each agenda item should include background information, then an indication of who was expected to speak about what, followed by the action expected of COP (e.g. adoption or endorsement of a document) under a separate heading. The secretariat should inform the Co-Chairs of the Joint Expert Group on Water and Industrial Accidents (JEG) that they would be expected to speak at the COP meeting.

27. Further, the Bureau recommended that all presentations be kept concise, that presenters be told how long they would have to speak, and that documents for projection be sent in advance to the secretariat. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei offered to arrange a presentation of Germany's work in Armenia on raising awareness of industrial safety.

A. Report of the Bureau

28. The secretariat informed the Bureau that it had not been able to draft the Bureau's report to COP on the Bureau's work during the biennium 2011–2012. However, the Bureau did decide to continue its previous practice of backing up its written report to COP with a presentation by the Chair. The Bureau asked the secretariat to annex to the report, as necessary, the text of the twentieth anniversary publication, to allow its translation into French and Russian.

29. The Bureau asked the secretariat to prepare a list of countries eligible for financial support and to circulate the list among the Bureau members prior the COP meeting; the secretariat would then show the list as a PowerPoint² presentation to COP.

30. The secretariat took this opportunity to report on the results to date of discussions by electronic mail between representatives of points of contact on the effectiveness of the Industrial Accident Notification System and on its future, as well as reporting on the carrying out of tests and analytical exercises. The secretariat presented possible recommendations in this regard.

31. The Bureau broadly agreed with many of the recommendations, and asked that they be included in the Bureau's report to COP. The Bureau did not consider that the System should be abandoned as yet nor, at this stage, was it necessary to hire a consultant to fix problems with the software. The Bureau decided to recommend to COP that it urge Parties and other countries to register in the System and to constantly update the contact details of their points of contact. The Bureau asked the secretariat to revert to those Parties that had not responded to the consultation process, to remind them of their obligations under the Convention. Points of contact should be encouraged also to carry out more frequent and intensive exercises, including field exercises and with the involvement of neighbouring countries.

32. However, the Bureau did recognize that some Parties might wish to abandon the System. Such Parties would need to demonstrate that alternative systems already in place would satisfy the requirements of the Convention, including with respect to other Parties potentially affected.

B. Sixth report on the implementation of the Convention

33. The Chair of the Working Group on Implementation informed the Bureau on the status of reporting within the 2010–2011 reporting round on the implementation of the Convention, and on progress in the preparation of the sixth report on implementation to COP. He presented the report's conclusions and recommendations and he highlighted several issues and gaps identified by the Working Group.

34. The Bureau expressed its appreciation of the report and asked that its format and length not be changed. The Bureau asked the Chair of the Working Group to present the report to COP. The Bureau highlighted the usefulness of presenting at the COP meeting some of the good practices revealed in the national implementation reports. The Bureau decided to invite the Czech Republic and Germany to present their joint inspections, and Serbia to present the use of indicators and criteria in preparing its national implementation report. At the same time, it was also recognized that some countries lacked an understanding of the Convention's basic requirements and that tailored assistance was therefore needed.

35. The Bureau expressed strong concern that the Russian Federation had again failed to submit the implementation report, thereby failing to fulfil its obligation under the Convention. The Bureau also expressed its disappointment that none of the committed countries under the Convention's Assistance Programme, that were not Party to the Convention, had reported. The Bureau suggested that COP should express strong concern regarding both these situations. The secretariat raised a question as whether national reports

² Mention of a commercial firm or product in this document does not imply endorsement by the United Nations.

might be made available to the public in the light of the obligations that most Parties have under the Aarhus Convention.³

C. Sustainable financial system

36. The Bureau discussed extensively two alternative draft documents on the sustainable financial system. The Bureau chose the version that made only brief reference to the scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations, though some considered that the other version was more transparent. There was agreement that the document would provide for letters being sent to Parties that had neither made nor pledged cash or in-kind contributions, proposing a contribution calculated on the basis of the entire budget for the Convention's workplan (not the amount out-standing) in combination with the scale of assessments. The Bureau asked that the current scale of assessments (A/RES/64/248) be available through the website.

37. The Bureau decided that the document should be circulated to Parties in August 2012, along with the COP provisional agenda, with a request that they come to the COP meeting with comments ready. The covering letter should explain how and why the Bureau agreed on the proposal, and what COP is expected to do. The proposal would be presented through a PowerPoint show at the COP meeting.

D. Progress report on the Assistance Programme

38. The secretariat informed the Bureau that the document containing the progress report on the Assistance Programme in the biennium 2011–2012 was not yet ready and that it would be circulated at a later stage. However, the secretariat outlined the expected content of the document to enable the Bureau to decide how to report progress under the Assistance Programme to COP.

39. Mr. Hem, chair of the core group established by the Bureau and the Working Group on Implementation to follow the submission of self-assessments and action plans from countries beneficiary to the Assistance Programme, until the next COP meeting, recalled the outcome of the first round of self-assessments received from countries. Mr. Hem pointed out that in general the level of these documents was disappointing. He also reported that no updated version of self-assessments had been received by the time of the meeting and only three action plans were sent to the secretariat.

40. The Bureau agreed that the progress report would highlight some of the issues that had been faced and present possible ways forward. In particular it was decided that the document should make reference to the following:

(a) The decision taken by the Bureau at its previous joint meeting with the Working Group on Implementation (Edinburgh, 29 February – 1 March 2012) on the division of work between the two bodies concerning the implementation of the Assistance Programme's Strategic Approach should be included;

(b) The importance of the use of the indicators and criteria and the implementation of the Strategic Approach should be raised strongly at the next COP meeting through the document. In addition it should be made clear that it appeared that further activities were needed to support countries in their the use of these tools;

³ Monaco, the Russian Federation and Switzerland are Parties to the Industrial Accidents Convention but not the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters. (Aarhus 1998). The Russian Federation and Switzerland are in the process of, respectively, acceding to and ratifying the Aarhus Convention.

(c) Together with the usual reporting on activities having taken place in the past biennium, the document should also include additional challenges faced in the implementation of the Danube Delta project and the possible ways forward that had been identified. Some of the tools identified were for instance the preparation after the COP meeting of terms of reference for the implementation of projects within the Assistance Programme. The Bureau also decided on the general content of such terms of reference. The Bureau further decided that this task could be assigned by COP to the Working Group on Implementation;

(d) A template for the preparation by countries of project proposals under the Assistance Programme should be annexed to the document and proposed to COP for endorsement as part of the instruments to implement the Strategic Approach. The project proposal was also to contain instructions for its submission by Assistance Programme countries and in particular it was to highlight that it should be submitted by an officer of the competent authorities together with an official letter.

41. The secretariat provided an update on the on-going activities under the Danube Delta project and on the need to clarify some issues before proceeding with its further implementation. The secretariat informed that it was working towards the organization of a project management group meeting to overcome the bottlenecks.

42. The Bureau considered with concern the extra work for the secretariat generated by implementation issues in the Danube Delta project and expressed its wish that the situation would improve with the three project countries (Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine) fully committed to carrying out actively their roles in the project, thus relieving the secretariat from some of the work.

43. The secretariat also informed the Bureau about the future organization of the second phase of on-site inspections projects for Croatia, Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The Bureau expressed support for the project. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei pointed out that one of the consequences of the previous phase of the project was the fact that trainees would have become trainers on their turn. The secretariat explained that this process was on-going and accepted the suggestion of inviting the three focal points from the project countries to have the role of assistant-facilitators during the training session that would take place in Croatia in October 2012.

44. The secretariat informed that Turkmenistan had expressed its interest in further information on the Assistance Programme and its activities. The Bureau welcomed the information and decided to invite the country to the COP meeting. The Bureau also decided to contact Montenegro and investigate whether the country would like to participate to the Assistance Programme.

45. The secretariat was requested to present the document at the COP meeting and was instructed to highlight some aspects in particular, including: challenges (e.g. the implementation of the Strategic Approach and the use of the indicators and criteria, and the need for the smooth implementation of projects) and how project approved should be managed in practice.

E. Recommendations from workshops and seminars since the previous meeting of the Conference of the Parties

46. The Chair of the Working Group on Implementation presented a clustering of the recommendations from three workshops and seminars held since the previous COP meeting: addressing the area of industrial safety and land-use planning (The Hague); on cost-effectiveness for major accident prevention (Warsaw); and on the occasion of the 25 years anniversary of the Sandoz accident (Bonn, Germany). The clustering, undertaken by the Working Group, had been followed by the selection of priority activities that derived

from the workshops and seminars and that found a correspondence in the national implementation reports:

- (a) Guide on methodology for hazard rating (Warsaw);
- (b) Criteria or standards for safety and land-use planning, incorporating long-term trends (The Hague);
- (c) Exchange of experience and good practices among Parties and promotion of the continuous organization of bilateral exercises for preparedness (Bonn);
- (d) Risk of complacency in ensuring prevention and maintaining a high level of safety (Bonn).

47. The Chair of the Working Group suggested that all of the activities might be performed in cooperation with possible partners, such as OECD, European Commission or the European Process Safety Centre. Projects and the way of working should be clearly defined before being accepted into the workplan.

48. The Chair of the Bureau highlighted that hazard rating and assessment, as a follow-up to the CERACI project, was relevant to the Convention and had not as yet been addressed.

49. The Bureau suggested that the next Bureau, elected by the upcoming COP meeting, assign a Bureau member to each activity in the workplan, with the Bureau member being responsible for observing implementation of the activity and for reporting at the end of the biennium how it was organized or, as appropriate, why it was not organized. At the same time, Bureau members observed that it was not the role of the Bureau to be involved in the actual implementation of projects.

50. The Bureau agreed to take the above information into account in its later discussion on the workplan.

F. Use of financial resources

51. The document on the use of financial resources was addressed under agenda item 2.

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

52. The secretariat presented an outline document for the next workplan, structured according to the long-term strategy. The Bureau decided that each workplan activity should be briefly described in a separate informal document, with Mr. Hem, Ms. Karba, Mr. Gay and Ms. Fusé to draft and circulate the document by the end of July 2012.

53. The Bureau suggested that the workplan should include activities covering the basic requirements of the Convention, as inserted by Bureau members, and that the previous regional training on indicators and criteria (Bratislava, 4–6 May 2011) should be repeated on a subregional basis.

54. The Bureau discussed the Armenian project on raising awareness of industrial safety at universities, being funded by Germany. It was decided that the Bureau should receive through the secretariat an official letter of commitment from the competent authorities in Armenia. The project might then be inserted in the workplan, under the exchange of information, as a bilateral project between Germany and Armenia with outreach possibilities. For the time being there were no resource requirements from the trust fund.

55. The Bureau agreed that the workplan should be revised, including making clear that financial resources could be made available in cash or in-kind. The workplan should also

reflect on the results of the clustering activity and the conclusions of the sixth report on implementation.

56. Following a presentation by a consultant, Mr. John Vijgen, the Bureau decided that an activity on tailings management facilities would be included under 'other activities', but without indicating a budget as the project was out to tender.

57. The workplan should also include financial support, of representatives of Parties and in accordance with the criteria adopted by the ECE Committee on Environmental Policy, for two open-ended meetings of the Working Group on Development.

58. Further, the workplan should provide for meetings examining self-assessments and action plans developed by countries under the Assistance Programme. The assistance activities should include support under both preparatory and implementation phases of the Assistance Programme. The current Danube Delta project should be split into separate crisis and hazard management components.

59. The Bureau emphasized the importance of share the draft workplan with other ECE multilateral environmental agreements.

60. The secretariat reported on progress with the development of guidelines for crisis management on transboundary waters by JEG. The Bureau expressed its opinion that COP needed to decide whether to continue or abandon this work. The Bureau agreed to contact the JEG Co-Chair representing industrial accidents to request an update on the status of the work and the schedule for future steps.

H. Implementation of the decision of the Conference of the Parties concerning the Protocol on Civil Liability

61. The secretariat presented a proposal on the implementation of the second of the three steps in the approach adopted by COP to help countries with economies in transition to ratify the Civil Liability Protocol.

62. The Bureau decided that a paper should be submitted to the COP meeting and the upcoming session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Water Convention. The paper should provide an update on the agreed three steps to support ratification of the Protocol and include in annex the executive summary of the study carried out by the Institute for European Environmental Policy for the first step;⁴ the full report should be available on the website.

63. The Bureau asked that the second step⁵ be carried out; Mr. Gay suggested that the secretariat contact the Chair of the Water Convention Bureau to see what financial resources she had available.

64. Ms. Michielssen informed the Bureau of possible changes to the corresponding EU legislation—the Environmental Liability Directive—foreseen in the coming years. The Bureau agreed that this important information should also be included in the paper for submission to COP. Ms. Michielssen agreed to provide further information on the possible changes to the EU legislation. The Bureau was of the opinion that it was still important to carry out the second step as providing useful information.

⁴ Step 1: to strive to better understand what national legislation was required to implement the Protocol in light of differences between the Protocol and other civil liability instruments.

⁵ Step 2: to carry out case studies based on realistic potential accidents to understand the implications including the benefits of implementing the Protocol and/or other instruments.

65. The Bureau asked the secretariat to explore possibilities for funding by Switzerland of the second step, and to report to bodies under the Water Convention.

I. Possible amendments to the text of the Convention

66. The secretariat presented a short discussion paper outlining possible amendments to the Convention and providing justification. The Bureau agreed to propose to the COP meeting that the Working Group on Development be tasked with revising annex I in line with the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals, and revisions to the corresponding EU legislation (Seveso Directive). The draft amendment should be finalized in time for its consideration and possible adoption at the next COP meeting, in 2014. The Bureau saw a leading role for the European Commission in the drafting of the revised annex I.

67. The Bureau discussed extensively what to propose to the COP meeting with regard to possible further amendments to the Convention possibilities (e.g. on opening the Convention to all Member States of the United Nations, clarifying the frequency of COP meetings, addressing land-use planning). In particular, Bureau members expressed differing views as to whether the Working Group on Development might be tasked initially with only identifying and evaluating other amendments, with a view to eventual adoption in 2016, or whether the Working Group should be expected to draft a possible amendment to the Convention in time for the next COP meeting, in 2014.

68. The Bureau agreed that different approaches to amendment should be put before COP, and that a bullet list of possible topics (e.g. definitions, scope, opening up, ambiguities) be included in the short official document for the COP meeting. The document should refer to recent legislative changes and recent major industrial accidents. The Bureau hoped to come forward with a proposal for the Chair of the Working Group on Development in advance of the COP meeting.

IV. Involvement of Parties and other stakeholders

69. Members of the Bureau and the secretariat were invited to report on activities to promote the Convention and its mechanisms for improving industrial safety. Brief information was provided on initial contacts with the competent authorities in China, and on the International Forum on Industrial Safety, held in St. Petersburg (Russian Federation) and organized by GCE Group.

V. Exchange of information

70. The secretariat reported on its circulation to all focal points for the Convention of the notes with information on the rationale, objectives and scope for two activities initially planned for 2012 that had yet to attract proposals for lead countries: a workshop on sharing good practices for increasing public involvement in national work on industrial safety; and a workshop on the exchange of experience in preparedness and response. Unfortunately, no response had been received.

VI. Strategic partnerships

71. The task force on strategic partnerships and financing, and the secretariat, were invited to report on steps undertaken to progress the establishment of partnerships with the organizations identified as priority partners, and on proposals for specific activities with partner organizations to be included in the Convention's workplan for 2013–2014.

72. The secretariat reported on its participation in:

(a) The workshop on management of Natech accidents,⁶ organized by OECD in May 2012;

(b) A meeting between the Director of the ECE Environment Division, the Chair and EC Environment Directorate-General, held in Brussels on 26 March 2012, which is expected to be followed by a second meeting between the three in Geneva in autumn 2012;

(c) Joint work with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), and UNEP's Sustainable Production Branch, on the development of on-line training on prevention, preparedness and response to industrial accidents. The secretariat called for pictures and videos (high-resolution, free-of-charge and copyright-free) to be added to the training materials.

73. The secretariat briefly reported on the outcome of the 16 April 2012 meeting between chairs of the five ECE environmental conventions and the Chair of the Committee on Environmental Policy. The secretariat also mentioned its input to the review of the 2005 reform process being carried out by the Executive Committee of ECE.

VII. Other activities and meetings

74. The secretariat reported that the Chair had written to the Chair of the Committee on Housing and Land Management on issues of industrial safety and land-use planning; no response had been received. The secretariat was asked to follow up.

75. Due to a lack of time, the Bureau was unable to consider a report provided by the member of the Working Group on Implementation from the Republic of Moldova on her participation in a workshop organized under the CERACI project. Bureau members were requested to send comments on the report to the Chair.

VIII. Closing of the meeting

76. The Bureau decided to meet again on 13 November 2012 (from 2 to 6 p.m.), in Stockholm, immediately prior to the COP meeting.

77. Bureau members and the secretariat expressed their thanks to Ms. Eriksson and to Sweden for the excellent arrangements for their meeting. Mr. Gay, on behalf of the Chair, closed the meeting.

⁶ Accidents initiated by a natural hazard or disaster that result in the release of hazardous materials.