



Federal Ministry for the
Environment, Nature Conservation
and Nuclear Safety

**Umwelt
Bundes
Amt** 
Für Mensch und Umwelt

UNECE Convention on the
Transboundary Effects of
Industrial Accidents

**Assistance
Programme**



UNECE Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

Project under the Assistance Programme

PROJECT ON HAZARD AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT IN THE DANUBE DELTA

Second Meeting of the Project Management Group

14 September 2012

Kyiv, Ukraine

Meeting Minutes

UNECE 2012

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	- 2 -
1 Introduction and welcome of the participants.....	- 3 -
2 Review of the first project year and discussion on lessons learned.....	- 3 -
2.1 Effectiveness of the project's organizational structure.....	- 3 -
2.2 Role of the national groups.....	- 4 -
2.3 Identification of lead countries for certain activities.....	- 5 -
2.4 Involvement of project partners.....	- 5 -
2.5 Impact of the project.....	- 6 -
3 Identification of the way forward.....	- 6 -
3.1 Joint visit to the ports of Izmail and Reni (Ukraine).....	- 7 -
3.2 Table-top exercise.....	- 8 -
3.3 Joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta.....	- 8 -
4 Discussion on further project activities.....	- 8 -
4.1 Comparative analysis of the national legal frameworks.....	- 9 -
4.2 Inventories and hazard spot map for the Danube Delta region.....	- 9 -
4.3 Expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals.....	- 9 -
4.4 High-level report to the project countries.....	- 10 -
4.5 Project interim report.....	- 10 -
4.6 Financial review/outlook for the project.....	- 11 -
4.7 Support of an international consultant for 2012/13.....	- 11 -
4.8 Date for the next Project Management Group meeting.....	- 11 -
4.9 Other business.....	- 12 -
5 Closure of the meeting.....	- 12 -
ANNEX I List of action items after the second PMG meeting.....	I
ANNEX II List of participants.....	III

1 Introduction and welcome of the participants

The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Oleg Shevchenko, Head of Department of International Cooperation and European Integration of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine and by Mr. Chris Dijkens, Chair of the Industrial Accidents Convention Bureau and representing the Netherlands. Mr. Shevchenko opened the meeting and welcomed the participants (listed in annex II). Mr. Dijkens expressed his gratitude to Mr. Shevchenko for hosting the second meeting of the project management group in Kyiv and recalled that it was also here that the kick-off meeting of the project took place on 11 May 2011. Mr. Dijkens also emphasized the importance of the project and the involvement of project partners to reach the expected results. In this respect, he thanked for their participation in this meeting: Ms. Mihaela Popovici (International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River, ICPDR) and Mr. Volodymyr Kuznietsov (Programme for the Prevention, Preparedness and Response to Man-made and Natural Disasters in the ENPI East Region and the European Union, PPRD East).

The participants adopted the meeting agenda without change.

2 Review of the first project year and discussion on lessons learned

Mr. Dijkens invited the secretariat to give an overview of the project implementation. The secretariat recalled the objectives, activities as well as expected outcomes for the project and informed that good progress had been reached through the implementation of some activities, such as the organization of two technical workshops (July and December 2011), a joint visit to ports in Romania and the Republic of Moldova (September 2011) and the initiation of an expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals (March and June 2012). The secretariat also informed that the joint visit to Ukraine and the table-top exercise, originally planned for May and September 2012, had not yet been implemented and that this would have an impact on the implementation of the subsequent activities. The secretariat informed further that the extension of the project until 30 November 2014 had been discussed with Germany and that the group should bear this in mind when discussing a new time schedule for the project.

2.1 Effectiveness of the project's organizational structure

Mr. Dijkens introduced the current organizational structure of the project that consists of three groups: groups on project management (PMG), on hazard management and on crisis management. He explained that experience from the project implementation to date indicated that the members of both the hazard and crisis management group were almost the same and he suggested therefore merging the two groups to one technical group. Mr. Dijkens suggested that the technical group should be responsible for planning and discussing the specific and more technical details for the implementation of project activities and that it should be chaired by the project countries on a rotational basis. He further proposed that the PMG should be maintained to coordinate

activities and to make sure that the project objectives would be followed and that appropriate support to the national work would be provided.

All three project countries supported the proposal to merge the two groups to one technical group and to keep the PMG. The Republic of Moldova requested however further information on the rotation of chairing. Mr. Dijkens explained that countries should take the lead for the organization of certain project activities (to be identified under item 2.3 of the agenda) and that they could host and chair those activities. The project countries agreed to take the lead for certain activities, but indicated that it would be better to have an independent chair for the meetings of the technical group, such as the secretariat. The secretariat informed that it would strongly support the countries in chairing but should not chair a meeting. The countries therefore concluded that not the project countries but an independent party, to be identified at a later stage, would chair the meetings of the technical group.

2.2 Role of the national groups

Mr. Dijkens invited the national groups to report on the progress achieved to date in the project. Ukraine informed that the kick-off meeting had been organized in Kyiv in May 2011 and that the checklist for basic safety measures was used in Ukraine in other inspections. Ms. Tarasova also informed that the coordination between the different ministries in Ukraine was difficult because Ukraine was not a Party to the Convention and has no competent authority or budget for the coordination of activities under the Convention.

The Republic of Moldova informed that, to date, the project has already led to an increase in the level of awareness and to the identification of relevant players on the national and regional levels. The Republic of Moldova further reported that there was effective cooperation between the three involved ministries: the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (State Ecological Inspectorate and Environmental Quality Monitoring Department); Ministry of Interior (Civil Protection and Emergency Service); and the Ministry of Economy (Main Inspectorate for Industrial Safety). The Republic of Moldova mentioned also that it faced challenges in the project implementation, caused mainly by an increased workload that needed to be carried out with a limited number of staff and financial resources. Further Ukraine indicated that it had experienced similar challenges and explained with regard to the limited financial resources that the following items are not covered by the project budget: the translation of documents, such as the project interim report; simultaneous translation for PMG meetings; pocket money at events; and the preparation of substantive national documents. Ukraine also indicated that there was no budget line in Ukraine to cover those expenses as Ukraine was not a Party to the Convention.

Mr. Dijkens and Mr. Winkelmann-Oei, representing Germany, the donor for the hazard management component of the project, reminded the countries that the project had been agreed on a high-level with each country providing in-kind contributions. Ukraine emphasized its willingness to implement the activities within the project, but

indicated that it would need financial support for the above-mentioned and other items. The Republic of Moldova supported the request by Ukraine, stating that the limited number of staff and financial resources led to the situation where, for example, translations were done by the project coordinators themselves which led to a delay in the delivery of outputs.

In order to assist the countries to overcome the above-mentioned obstacles in implementation, Mr. Dijkens suggested that the project countries prepare a list with those expenses that they considered were not covered by the project. The list should be sent to the secretariat, which would try to reallocate resources in the current budget or to find further financial support. The countries and the secretariat agreed.

With regard to the progress made in the national groups, Romania informed that it had organized one meeting under the project so far (joint visit to Galati and Giurgiulesti in September 2011) and that the national coordination between the ministries (from local to high level) worked well in the country because the leading organizations for industrial accident management had already been identified in the framework of the implementation of the Seveso Directive.

2.3 Identification of lead countries for certain activities

The secretariat reminded the participants that, at the beginning of the project, it had been agreed that the project countries should take the lead for certain activities. In accordance with that, the secretariat pointed out the next activities to be implemented and invited: (i) the Republic of Moldova to take the lead in organizing the table-top exercise; (ii) Romania to take the lead in the elaboration of a joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta; and (iii) Ukraine to lead the organization of the joint visit to Reni and Izmil. The project countries welcomed the proposal and agreed to discuss the implementation of the activities more in detail under agenda item 3.

2.4 Involvement of project partners

Mr. Dijkens invited ICPDR and PPRD East to share their views on potential areas for cooperation within the project.

Ms. Popovici informed that ICPDR has an Accident Prevention and Control (APC) Expert Group that (i) maintains inventories of accidental risk, and contaminated as well as mining sites, and (ii) supports the operation of the Accident Emergency Warning System, within which framework tests were carried out in national Principle International Alert Centres twice a year. She stated that ICPDR could provide intellectual support for the implementation of project activities (such as for the table-top exercise, the joint contingency plan, the comparative analysis of the legal basis for hazard and crisis management, etc.) and that the Convention on Co-operation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the River Danube could also work as a framework for cooperation. The group welcomed the proposal by ICPDR and Mr. Winkelmann-Oei emphasized the many synergies between the project and the work of ICPDR. In

addition, Ukraine suggested that it would be easier to implement activities under the Danube River Convention because Ukraine was a Party to the Convention.

Mr. Kuznietsov informed that he works as a communication expert for PPRD East in Ukraine on raising public awareness on the prevention of, preparedness for and response to man-made and natural disasters in the six partner countries (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine). Mr. Kuznietsov informed that a network of journalists had recently been established. He offered that PPRD East could send journalists to participate in future project activities in order to report on them and create awareness of the need for industrial safety in the region. All participants welcomed this proposal. Mr. Dijkens suggested combining the cooperation with PPRD East with working out a communications strategy for the project that would allow for better public awareness of the project results. Mr. Kuznietsov agreed to develop the communications strategy and requested further information on the project, which the secretariat agreed to send by 21 September 2012.

With regard to the involvement of further project partners, the secretariat reported that a representative from the Black Sea Commission had been invited to the meeting, but could not attend. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei suggested that the finalized minutes of the meeting be circulated among all project partners by email. The participants agreed.

2.5 Impact of the project

The group agreed that the project should have sustainable effects in the countries, such as through the use of a checklist methodology or raising awareness of the need for increased industrial safety. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei emphasized that, in particular, a continuation in transboundary cooperation could build trust, such as through the invitation of inspectors from other countries to national inspections on a voluntary basis. Romania and the Republic of Moldova welcomed the proposal for voluntary cooperation; Romania indicated however that due to the language barrier with Ukraine this might be problematic in practical terms. Ms. Tarasova, Ukraine, indicated that inviting foreign inspectors to domestic site inspections would not be possible in Ukraine because of the necessary formalities. However, Mr. Obodovsky, also Ukraine, discussed with Ms. Stirbu, the Republic of Moldova, the participation of Moldovan representatives as observers in an inspection exercise in Odessa (Ukraine), planned for October or November 2012.¹

3 Identification of the way forward

The secretariat introduced a table that should help to structure the discussion on the next steps to be taken for the organization of (i) the joint visit to the ports of Izmil and Reni (Ukraine), (ii) the table-top exercise and (iii) the elaboration of the joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta. According to the table, the group should

¹ After the meeting, Ukraine sent official invitations for up to three Moldovan representatives to participate as observer in an exercise for emergencies in industries to be held in the first week of November 2012. Two representatives from the emergency situations department participated.

identify the necessary tasks to be carried out, including deadlines for identifying the people in charge, and agree on a new date for each activity.

3.1 Joint visit to the ports of Izmail and Reni (Ukraine)

The secretariat welcomed the proposal of Ukraine earlier in the meeting to lead the organization of this activity. It further recalled that the joint visit to Ukraine was originally planned for May 2012 and encouraged the countries to discuss the tasks for the organization of the activity, such as sharing the port's safety declaration in English with the project countries or determining the application of the concrete checklist.

Ukraine reported that the Ministry of Infrastructure of Ukraine would be in charge for the organization of the joint visit to Izmail and Reni, but that no representative from that Ministry was present at the meeting. Ms. Tarasova explained that, before the preparations for the joint visit could begin, the Ministry of Infrastructure would need to confirm the implementation of the activity and that access to the ports would be granted. She also indicated that coordination with the Ministry of Infrastructure was problematic and that Ukraine would thus need more time for the implementation of the activity. In the light of the above and the parliamentary elections in Ukraine in October 2012, Ms. Tarasova concluded that summer 2013 would be a realistic date for the implementation of the joint visit in Ukraine.

The Republic of Moldova, supported by Romania, expressed their surprise at the difficulties of Ukraine with the organization of the joint visit and requested further clarification on the obstacles. Ms. Tarasova indicated that the main problem was to get access to the ports for which the Ministry of Infrastructure was responsible. Ms. Stirbu shared with Ukraine the experience of the Republic of Moldova, which had contacted the operator in Giurgiulesti directly for the first visit. She recommended contacting first the local level (a bottom-up approach) instead of the ministerial level (a top-down approach) to get access and documents from the ports. She also offered Ukraine support in contacting the local level after the meeting.

Mr. Winkelmann-Oei agreed that the joint visit could be organized in summer 2013. He also suggested that the joint visit could be organized as a paperwork exercise only or that another project country host the event, if Ukraine encountered insuperable difficulties with its organization. Romania and the Republic of Moldova recalled that a joint visit to all countries was planned as an integral part of the project and that in the spirit of reciprocity also a joint visit to Ukraine should be implemented. The group agreed therefore to organize the joint visit to Ukraine in July, August or September 2013.

In addition, the group discussed the concept for the joint visit and whether to apply the basic checklist in Izmail and the advanced one in Reni. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei agreed with the application of the advanced checklist in Reni; at the same time, he did not recommend using again the basic checklist. Instead, Mr. Winkelmann-Oei suggested also using the safety guidelines for oil terminals, which were to be elaborated by an

expert group by March 2013 (see item 4.3). The project countries agreed with this proposal and requested the secretariat to work out and circulate a new concept for a two- or three-day joint visit.

3.2 Table-top exercise

Following the offer by the Republic of Moldova to lead the table-top exercise, the group discussed the objective of the exercise. Romania suggested that the aim of the exercise should be to test transboundary cooperation and joint response actions between the countries rather than national emergency plans. To be able to test procedures for transboundary cooperation, Romania further suggested that, as a first step, a joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta should be elaborated and that, based on this plan, an exercise scenario could be elaborated to be tested in a table-top exercise. The project and donor countries agreed with this proposal. The Republic of Moldova agreed further to prepare, based on the joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta, a scenario for the exercise. The scenario would most likely simulate an oil spill from the oil terminal in Giurgiulesti. The Republic of Moldova, supported by Romania, emphasized further the importance to implement the joint visit in Ukraine before the table-top exercise would take place in order to assure the cooperation on and involvement of the local level in Ukraine. The group agreed to hold the table-top exercise in October 2013.

3.3 Joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta

Romania agreed to lead the development of a joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta. In particular, Romania suggested the establishment of a working group that should consist of members from all project countries and that should work out, based on existing emergency plans, the joint contingency plan. The project countries agreed with Romania's proposal. They further agreed to send their national emergency plans as well as the names of the nominated experts for the working group by the end of October 2012, through the secretariat, to Mr. Senzaconi of Romania. Ukraine indicated that it would send the emergency plan for the Black Sea Commission and Mr. Winkelmann-Oei said that he would send the German-Polish emergency plan to Romania.

Romania agreed to collect the emergency plans and to work out, by 15 November 2012, a draft programme of work for the development of the joint contingency plan. Under the lead of Romania, the working group should elaborate the joint contingency plan by May 2013.

4 Discussion on further project activities

Mr. Dijkens invited the project countries to discuss further project-related activities.

4.1 Comparative analysis of the national legal frameworks

Ms. Popovici reiterated the commitment of ICPDR to assist in the preparation of a comparative analysis of the national legal frameworks for hazard and crisis management in the project countries. Ms. Popovici suggested that there would be two options for carrying out the analysis: either by a consultant to be hired or by ICPDR itself. Funding would be needed for a consultant. If ICPDR were to carry out the work, the analysis would take a couple of months and could be finalized by April or May 2013.

The project countries agreed that ICPDR should elaborate the comparative analysis. Romania suggested that the results of the legal analysis might also be useful for the development of the joint contingency plan. Romania and ICPDR agreed therefore to keep contact and to share draft documents with each other.

4.2 Inventories and hazard spot map for the Danube Delta region

The secretariat introduced the first draft of the hazard spot map, prepared based on the inventories provided by the project countries. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei considered the map to be a good first draft. He also proposed to make a few changes to simplify the map, such as including only those facilities with a water risk index over five because those under that threshold have a very low risk potential. In addition, Romania observed that the water risk index of some Ukrainian installations was not indicated and suggested adding the missing information. Ukraine agreed to send an updated inventory, including all requested information, to the secretariat. The group agreed further that all project countries should provide comments on the hazard spot map in writing to the secretariat by the end of October 2012. The secretariat would then submit a second draft version for discussion at the next PMG meeting.

In addition, the group discussed the possibility of publishing the hazard spot map. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei stated that Germany would have to publish all project outcomes and recommended to publish the hazard spot map as soon as possible. Romania generally supported the proposal to publish the map, but expressed concerns about the level of detail to be provided in the map, in particular with regard to the names and quantities of hazardous substances present at each installation. Ms. Popovici reported that there was currently a similar discussion between ICPDR member States on whether to publish inventories of hazardous substances. She further reported that, during a meeting on 2–3 October 2012, this question would be resolved. The group acknowledged that the decision of ICPDR could be useful for this discussion and agreed to wait for the result of the ICPDR meeting before taking further steps to publish the hazard map.

4.3 Expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals

Mr. Winkelmann-Oei, as a member of the expert group for the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals, informed the PMG about the progress made in the elaboration of safety guidelines. He explained that the expert group had been

established in March 2012 and that, as a result of its two meetings, a first draft of the safety guidelines had been prepared. Mr. Winkelmann-Oei further informed that the first draft was currently under review and should be discussed at the third meeting of the expert group, expected in December 2012 or January 2013. He also reported that the expert group was making good progress and should finalize the elaboration of safety guidelines by March 2013.

The project countries welcomed the positive developments in this area. Romania – supported by the other countries – expressed its desire to receive more information about the work of the expert group. Hence, the secretariat suggested sharing the draft version of the safety guidelines with the project countries and keeping the countries regularly informed about the work of the expert group. Mr. Dijkens invited the countries further to provide comments on the draft document.

Ukraine suggested that Ukrainian industry might also be interested in the future safety guidelines and suggested to forward the minutes of the present meeting to industry representatives. The group agreed with this proposal and Mr. Winkelmann-Oei suggested that, for example, the oil industry could organize a regional meeting or workshop to test the safety guidelines. Ms. Tarasova agreed to explore such possibilities.

4.4 High-level report to the project countries

Mr. Dijkens emphasized the importance of informing high-level officials of the implementation of the project. He recalled that, in April 2012, high-level reports had been sent to the project countries with an initial request to forward them to high-level officials but that due to concerns expressed by the project coordinators, it had been agreed to discuss the reports at the next PMG meeting before forwarding them.

The project countries agreed that it was important to inform high-level officials of the progress achieved in the project. They therefore requested the secretariat to circulate by the end of September 2012 the high-level report, updated based on the decisions taken at the present meeting, for comments. The project countries further committed to provide their comments by 15 October 2012 to the secretariat, which would thereafter prepare the final version to be sent to high-level officials.

4.5 Project interim report

Mr. Dijkens introduced the draft project interim report and invited the group to provide comments. Ukraine informed that it did not have the time to translate the report into Russian and requested more time to provide comments. The project countries agreed to provide comments in writing to the secretariat by 7 October 2012.

In addition, Mr. Winkelmann-Oei stated that the report gave a good overview of the project activities and the progress achieved. At the same time, he suggested including a part in the report that gave an overview of the situation in the countries before the

project started in order to compare it better with the current situation. He further proposed that the project countries should contribute this part to the report as they best knew the impacts of the project. Romania agreed with this proposal, but drew attention to the fact that the project had just started and that at the moment only limited information could be provided about what had changed in the country. Also Romania added that it would be helpful to know on which aspects they should report exactly. The group therefore agreed that the secretariat should prepare a template with elements to report on that would allow the countries to better compare and evaluate the situation before, during and after the implementation of the project. Based on this template, the project countries agreed to prepare a part containing the baseline information for the next interim report.

The secretariat agreed to finalize the project interim report upon receipt of the countries' comments, taking also into account the decisions of the meeting.

4.6 Financial review/outlook for the project

The secretariat gave an overview of the project budget and expenditures to date, explaining that, currently, the expenses incurred exceeded the receipt of financial resources from the donor countries, but that future invoices would correct this difference. The project and donor countries requested further clarification on certain expenses. The secretariat agreed to provide greater detail on the use of funds.

Furthermore, the secretariat recalled that the current budget covered only activities under the hazard management component of the project and that funding for crisis management activities would still be needed. Bearing in mind that a new secretariat member was being recruited (see item 4.7), the project countries agreed that the secretariat should investigate the possibility of funds from the European Union, or elsewhere, to support the project implementation. The secretariat encouraged also the project countries to take an active role in this matter.

4.7 Support of an international consultant for 2012/13

Mr. Dijkens recalled that ZOI Environment Network supported the implementation of project activities in the first project year and invited the group to discuss the need to contract a consultant for the future. The secretariat informed that currently a new P3 staff member for the Convention's secretariat is being recruited and that one of the new staff's main tasks would be the management of projects under the Convention's Assistance Programme, in particular also with regard to fundraising activities. The group agreed therefore not to contract a consultant for the time being.

4.8 Date for the next Project Management Group meeting

The PMG agreed to meet again in February or March 2013, provided progress had been made in carrying out and arranging project activities (see annex I for list of action items).

4.9 Other business

The group agreed that the secretariat would circulate the final meeting minutes by the end of October 2012 to the PMG members and other interested institutions, such as ICPDR, PPRD East, the European Commission, the Black Sea Commission, etc.

5 Closure of the meeting

Mr. Dijkens summarized the decisions taken at the second PMG meeting and congratulated the participants on contributing to a successful and efficient meeting. The co-Chairs closed the meeting.

ANNEX I List of action items after the second PMG meeting

Nr.	Action item	Person in charge	Deadline
1.	Circulate meeting minutes to PMG members and other interested institutions	Secretariat	31 Oct.2012
2.	Send list with expenses that are not covered by the project to the secretariat	Project countries	-
3.	Compile a list with those expenses that are not covered by the project	Secretariat	Upon receipt of (2)
4.	Work out a communications strategy for the project	Mr. Kuznietsov, supported by the secretariat	-
5.	Send further information on the project to Mr. Kuznietsov	Secretariat	21 Sep. 2012.
6.	Organize the joint visit to Ukraine	Ukraine, supported by the secretariat	Jul., Aug. or Sep. 2013.
7.	Work out and circulate a new concept for a two- or three-day joint visit	Secretariat	-
8.	Organize a table-top exercise	Republic of Moldova, supported by the secretariat	Oct. 2013
9.	Establish a working group, consisting of members from all project countries, to develop a joint contingency plan for the Danube Delta	Romania, supported by the secretariat	-
10.	Send national emergency plans as well as names of the nominated experts for the working group on development of a joint contingency plan through the secretariat to Mr. Senzaconi (Romania)	Project countries, supported by the secretariat	31 Oct. 2012
11.	Send German-Polish emergency plan to Mr. Senzaconi (Romania)	Mr. Winkelmann-Oei	31 Oct. 2012
12.	Send the emergency plan for the Black Sea Commission	Ms. Tarasova	31 Oct. 2012
13.	Work out a draft programme of work for the development of the joint contingency plan	Romania	Upon receipt of (10) by 15 November 2012
14.	Elaborate a comparative	ICPDR	Apr. / May 2013

	analysis of the national legal frameworks for hazard and crisis management in the project countries		
15.	Provide comments on the hazard spot map to the secretariat	Project countries	31 Oct. 2012
16.	Prepare a second draft version of the hazard spot map	Secretariat	For next PMG meeting
17.	Keep the project countries regularly informed about the work of the expert group on the elaboration of safety guidelines for oil terminals	Secretariat	-
18.	Update the current high-level report and circulate it for comments to the project countries	Secretariat	30 Sep 2012
19.	Provide comments on the high-level report to the secretariat	Project countries	15 Oct. 2012
20.	Provide comments on the project interim report to the secretariat	Project countries	7 Oct. 2012
21.	Finalize the project interim report upon receipt of the countries' comments	Secretariat	-
22.	Prepare a template with elements that help the project countries report better on the impacts of the project (to be included in the next interim report)	Secretariat	-
23.	Provide greater detail on the use of funds	Secretariat	-

ANNEX II List of participants

Project coordinators

1. Mr. Gavril Gilca, Republic of Moldova, Monitoring Department on Environment Quality and Focal Point of UNECE TEIA Convention;
2. Ms. Svetlana Stirbu, Republic of Moldova, Monitoring Department on Environment Quality, Secretary of National Group of Industrial Accident Convention implementation;
3. Mr. Francisc Senzaconi, Romania, General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations of the Ministry of the Interior;
4. Ms. Marilena Ghiu, Romania, Ministry of Environment and Forests;
5. Ms. Oksana Tarasova, Ukraine, Ministry of Environmental and Natural Resources, Advisor to the Ministry;
6. Mr. Serhii Obodovskyi, Department of Civil Protection, Ministry of Emergency Situations of Ukraine – representing the second project coordinator from Ukraine
Mr. Vasyl Kvashuk who did not attend the meeting;

Project management team (project donors and secretariat)

7. Mr. Chris Dijkens (co-Chair of the meeting), Chairperson of the Conference of the Parties, Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents and Director of International Enforcement Cooperation, Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment of the Netherlands;
8. Mr. Gerhard Winkelmann-Oei, Member of the Bureau, Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents and Technical Expert, German Federal Environment Agency;
9. Mr. Nicholas Bonvoisin, Secretary to the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents;
10. Ms. Claudia Kamke, Associate Expert, Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents;

Further participants:

11. Mr. Oleg Shevshenko (co-Chair of the meeting), Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine;
12. Ms. Mihaela Popovici, Technical Expert in Water Management, International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River;
13. Mr. Volodymyr Kuznietsov, Communication Expert, Programme for the Prevention, Preparedness and Response to Man-made and Natural Disasters in the ENPI East Region and the European Union.