

UNECE Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

5th Conference of the Parties Geneva 25 – 27 November 2008

Fourth report on the Convention's implementation

Gunnar Hem, Norway

Chairman

Working Group on Implementation





Outline of presentation

- WGI activities and reporting process
- Evaluation of the reports:
 - Competent Authorities
 - Implementation (Legislation; Problems/Obstacles)
 - Identification of hazardous activities
 - Prevention
 - Notification and mutual assistance
 - Emergency preparedness
 - Scientific and technological cooperation and exchange of information
 - Participation of the public
 - Decision-making on siting
- Conclusions: Quality/overall assessment of reporting/implementation





Working Group on Implementation

- Elected members from Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation Slovakia and Sweden
- 4 meetings (3 as joint meetings with Bureau)
- Some changes in composition of WGI
- Non-attendance of the elected representative of the Russian Federation





Fourth reporting round on implementation

- Initiated by Secretariat with letter of 22.08.07 to Parties and other UNECE member countries with deadline for reporting 31 January 2008
- By deadline reports received from 35 Parties + EC, 7 countries from EECCA/SEE committed under the Assistance Programme, and Turkey as other UNECE member state
- Albania and the Russian Federation (Parties) and Tajikistan (committed) did not submit their report by deadline or before the final meeting of the WGI
- Official reminders by letters, after which Albania has reported, but no responses from the Russian Federtation and Tajikistan

- expresses appreciation of the contributions received
- recommends that the Russian Federation is reminded by the CoP of its reporting obligations
- recommends that Tajikistan is reminded by the CoP of its commitment





Competent Authorities (Q1)

- All reporting countries have appointed Competent Authorities
- Some changes in contact information have been noted
- Need for immediate update of contact information in case of changes is vital



Implementation (Q 2 - 6)

- Most Parties and other UNECE member countries reporting have established legislation that seems relevant, but general description does not allow for a thorough evaluation of completeness and quality of legislation
- Still only a few countries provided references to relevant articles of the Convention
- Very few responses from countries subject to Seveso II as regards legislation on issues beyond the Directive
- General observation as in previous round: Quality of legislation varies between regions





Implementation - Recommendations regarding legislation

- encourages countries to provide a clearer and more comprehensive description of legislation and appurtenant control mechanisms in future reporting rounds
- reiterates the request for references to specific articles
- asks countries having implemented Seveso II to provide a more comprehensive description of legislation, particularly as regards those fields that are not covered by the Directive
- recommends that a list of the differences between Seveso II and the Convention should be elaborated





Implementation - Problems/obstacles

- Western and Central European countries encountered no problems, whilst most EECCA and SEE countries specified various obstacles and needs for assistance
- Needs for assistance are sorted and listed in the annex to the report according to the Convention's working areas and cross-cutting areas as defined in the Kiev legal and institutional capacity building activity (2007)
- Future assistance should be based on countries' analysis of these areas cfr. the proposed Strategic Approach for the Assistance Programme

- recommends the Strategic Approach based on analysis and supports further capacity building activities for the identification of assistance needs
- recognizes the need to follow up the requested assistance in practice
- calls for adoption of the Strategic Approach for the Assistance Programme and for continued commitment from donors





Identification of hazardous activities (Q 7 – 8)

- All Parties/Members have submitted information, except one
- Some changes from previous reporting were noted. This may be due to different reasons, e.g. actual changes in installations, better understanding of Annex I or actual problems in applying the Annex.
- Improvement in bilateral cooperation was noted, however reporting indicates that such cooperation may be general rather than directed at identification as such

- stresses the importance of proper identification and continuos updating of relevant information
- invites countries to initiate cooperative activities in this regard
- recommends a training session on identification and notification under the Assistance Programme.



Prevention (Q 9)

- Differing specificity and quality of replies, as previously
- Many only referring to Seveso II implementation or to legislation rather than to practices
- EECCA and SEE countries still faceing considerable problems, cfr. annex to the report

- WGI

- encourages advanced countries to give clear descriptions and evaluation of preventive measures applied in order to communicate best practices to countries in need of assistance
- invites EECCA and SEE countries to be active in strengthening prevention and to this end cooperate with Bureau and WGI in preparing capacity building activities and advisory sessions





Notification and mutual assistance (Q 10 – 18)

- Presently 43 members of the IAN network.
- 24 countries report to have established regional/local notification systems
- Results from tests in 06 and 07, discussed at the Third consultation of points of contact (Sibiu 04.08), indicate that many failures are due to outdated contact details

- recommends that national points of contact should regularly test if contact details are up-to-date, using the web based application and conduct exercises based on scenarios
- welcomes the implementation of the web-based application for the IAN System
- invites countries to share good practice on notification
- encourages countries to set up notification systems at regional/local level



Emergency Preparedness (Q 19 – 20)

- Level of detail varies and limited detail on testing/revision procedures
- Level of cross border cooperation in practice is uncertain
- WGI
 - encourages countries in future reporting to focus more on efficiency and effectiveness of implemented measures
 - invites countries to harmonize contingency plans in a transboundary context and report results
 - invites EECCA and SEE countries to look for possibilities to test and revise their plans, and to this effect utilize the Assistance Programme





Scientific and technological cooperation and exchange of information (Q 21)

- A majority of Parties are engaged in bi- and multilateral programmes – some are very extensive
- Note the achievements of the Joint Ad Hoc Expert Group on Water and Industrial Accidents (tailing facilities)
- WGI reiterates its satisfaction with Parties and other countries undertaking bi- and multilateral cooperation under the Convention, and urges the continuation of such activities





Participation of the public (Q 22 – 24)

- Most Parties have formally implemented the provisions regarding public participation, but little information on how the legislation is applied
- Many only refer to implementation of the Aarhus Convention
- Still room for greater and more active involvement of the public
- Some countries still do not give potentially affected public in neighboruring countries access to such participation or equal access to judicial and administrative procedures
- WGI points to a number of good examples of participation models, and the Assistance Programme should take up these issues



Decision-making on siting (Q 25 – 26)

- Very general replies received which did not allow for a full assessment of state of play
- Most countries handle these issues through their land use planning systems
- Some countries apply risk assessments in this regard, but no country referred to particular methodologies or specific risk acceptance or decision criteria
- WGI recommends that information exchange on this topic should be strengthened and invites countries that do not have adequate systems to apply available guidance material





Quality of reporting and assessment of implementation

- Overall quality of reports as in previous rounds gives sufficient input to draw fairly good conclusions
- Further descriptions and evaluations of the working areas and cross cutting areas and how they are inter-linked in national legislation and practices would have been valuable in order to establish a more complete picture
- Even if there is an improvement in reporting from EECCA and SEE countries there is still need for improvement, particularly as regards collection of data to be reported
- Better national coordination and cooperation is vital to achieve this
- WGI recommends the Strategic Approach for the Assistance Programme to be applied with self evaluation as a basic element





Quality of reporting and Assessment of implementation (continued)

- Progress in implementation was difficult to measure based on current reports
- Continued Active engagement of Western and Central European countries is vital, also by showing further progress they are achieving in implementing the Convention (practical application)
- Need to strengthen practical application of the Convention (particularly on implementation of legislation and procedures) in EECCA/SEE countries is obvious – Assistance Programme and its Strategic Approach should be seen as the right tool
- New and simplified reporting procedure, focusing on progress achieved and practical application, should be investigated
 - Important: future reporting should aim at collecting the most relevant information on implementation status and progress, ensuring that EECCA and SEE countries learn from good practices of other countries, but imposing NO additional burden

