

Working Group on Implementation

**Thirteenth meeting
Bootle, 12-13 April 2010**

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING¹

Introduction

1. The thirteenth meeting of the Working Group on Implementation was held in Bootle (United Kingdom) on 12-13 April 2010 at the invitation of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).
2. The following members of the Group attended the meeting: Mr. Gunnar Hem (Norway) chairman, Mr. Vadim Lozhechko (Belarus), Mr. Hrvoje Buljan (Croatia), Mr. Pavel Forint (Czech Republic), Mr. Massimo Cozzone (Italy), Mr. Tomas Trcka (Slovakia), Ms. Svetlana Stirbu (Republic of Moldova), and Ms. Sandra Ashcroft (United Kingdom). Ms. Elisabeth Schofield and Mr. Paul Edwards from HSE as well as Mr. Lukasz Wyrowski, officer in charge for the Industrial Accidents Convention and Ms. Virginia Fusé, secretariat also attended.
3. Ms. Anahit Aleksandryan (Armenia) and Mr. Francisc Senzaconi (Romania) did not attend.

I. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

4. Mr. Hem opened the thirteenth meeting. He then thanked Ms. Ashcroft and the HSE for inviting the Group to Bootle and for hosting the meeting.
5. The Working Group adopted the agenda for its thirteenth meeting. Mr. Hem expressed his gratitude to the members present to have agreed with the proposed work distribution for evaluation of the national reports.

II. Status of the fifth round of reporting on implementation

6. Mr. Wyrowski informed that the secretariat initiated the fourth reporting round on the Convention's implementation by letter of 9 October 2009, accompanied by the reporting format in English, French or Russian. The deadline for submission of the national implementation reports was set for 31 January 2010. Countries that did not meet the deadline were sent several e-mail reminders from the secretariat. Official letters were sent to Finland and to the Russian Federation on 18 March since they had not submitted the report by that date, nor contacted the secretariat with information on it. Following the letters, Finland submitted a national implementation report. The Russian Federation did not provide its report at the time of the meeting.

¹ Prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the Chairman of the Working Group on Implementation.

7. Also Italy had not submitted its implementation report. Mr. Cozzone informed that the focal point of Italy was in constant contact with the secretariat and that the report would be submitted as soon as possible. He also explained the reasons of the delay.
8. National implementation reports were submitted from:
 - a) 36 out of 40 Parties (Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Republic of Moldova, Monaco, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom). European Commission submitted an update on Competent Authority².
 - b) Of the 6 countries of Eastern-Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) and South-Eastern Europe (SEE) not yet Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan) as well as Montenegro (has accessed to the Convention in 2010), should have submitted the national reports, in accordance with their commitment expressed at the High-level Commitment meeting, only Ukraine submitted the report;
9. The reports submitted by Denmark, Finland and Luxemburg contained only very limited information with the majority of the questions left unanswered.
10. The reports submitted in French or Russian languages were translated into English. An external translator was hired to translate 4 reports from Russian, and the 3 reports from French.
11. The Working Group expressed its satisfaction that 36 Parties as well as Ukraine made their reports available in time for the evaluation. At the same time the members expressed its concern that the Russian Federation had not submitted the report prior to the meeting. They also expressed dissatisfaction about the reports received from Denmark, Finland and Luxemburg.
12. The Working Group thanked Mr. Cozzone for having informed on the problems faced with finalizing the report in Italy and requested that it would be submitted without any further delay.

III. Review of individual country implementation reports

13. The members of the Group, in preparation to the meeting, agreed to analyse the national reports on the basis of the following work distribution: Policy for implementation of the convention – Mr. Pavel Forint (Czech Republic) and Mr. Gunnar Hem, Identification of hazardous activities – Mr. Hrvoje Buljan (Croatia) and Mr. Massimo Cozzone (Italy), Prevention of industrial accidents – Ms. Svetlana Stirbu (Republic of Moldova) and Ms. Sandra Ashcroft (United Kingdom), Emergency Preparedness – Mr. Vadim Lozhechko

² Serbia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia that ratified the Convention respectively in 2009 and 2010 did not have the obligation to report on the implementation for the period for which they have not been yet Parties to this agreement. It is to be noted however that both countries expressed commitment to submitting reports on implementation when they joined the Assistance Programme at the High-level meeting in 2005.

(Belarus) and Mr. Francisc Senzaconi (Romania) Scientific and technological cooperation and exchange of information /Participation of the public – Mr. Tomas Trcka (Slovakia) and Ms. Anahit Aleksandryan (Armenia), Decision-making on siting – Mr. Gunnar Hem in consultation with the secretariat.

14. According to the agreed organisation of work the members presented their evaluation of the respective parts of the national reports. The part on Emergency Preparedness had not been presented since Mr. Francisc Senzaconi was absent and did not send his contribution before the meeting. In addition, Mr. Lozhechko did not finish the assessment on time for the meeting. The members made their assessment based on the guidelines for the new reporting format and, where applicable, comparing the information with the reports received within the fourth round on implementation.
15. Evaluations of the respective parts of the national reports were discussed in the meeting and the Group drew a number of conclusions, which would be reflected in the Fifth overall report on implementation, nonetheless the first conclusion was that the general quality of reporting was better than in the previous rounds.
16. Some members drew attention to the possible need for more guidance to the persons in charge of preparing the individual report. In this regards, Mr. Hem suggested that the indicators and criteria in preparation for the implementation of the Strategic Approach could be referred to in the guidelines for the reporting on implementation.
17. It was also noticed with satisfaction that a number of countries provided references to the activities under the Assistance Programme and to their usefulness in strengthening the implementation of the Convention. It was agreed that these examples would be contained in Fifth report.

IV. Structure of the Fifth report on implementation

18. The Group also discussed how to best present the findings of the assessment of the national reports in the Fifth report on implementation. The Group agreed that the structure of the detailed assessment to be contained in the Fifth report on implementation should follow the changes of the reporting format. The report should also be more synthetic than the previous ones. In addition, it was agreed that the report should most of all draw the attention of the reader to the overall assessment of the national reports, which is not the case if this is found only at the end of the document. It was therefore decided that in the main body of the report consisting of a few pages there would be an introduction, the reporting status and the overall assessment whereas the detailed analysis per reporting format's questions would be contained in an annex.
19. It was also agreed that high relevance in the Fifth report should be given to good practices from countries, links and references to the Assistance Programme as well as issues being given focus by Parties for the years to come.

V. Organisation of further work

20. The members of the Group agreed to prepare draft texts of their respective sections and submit them to the chairman and the secretariat. Based on the contributions, the chairman supported by the secretariat would compile the first draft of the report.
21. The Group agreed on the following timetable for the preparation of the fourth implementation report:
 - a) 30 April – submission of general contributions by the members;
 - b) 21 May – circulation of the preliminary first draft of the report for comments;
 - c) 5 June – submission of comments to the preliminary first draft of the report by all the members to the secretariat;
 - d) 12 June – submission of the advanced draft to the Bureau.

VI. Future reporting on implementation, changes to reporting format

22. The Group agreed that it was too early to recommend changes to the reporting format after just one round of reporting. Nonetheless, it recommended reviewing the guidelines in particular on the parts where the members felt that the answers provided in national reports did not meet the expectations. It was also suggested that the guidelines should include examples of good practices from the reporting round 2008-2009. Such good examples can be helpful to show how to avoid repeating of information in policy and prevention questions. In the future, good practices could also be the basis to reformulate questions in the reporting format. The indicators and criteria, under elaboration at the time of the meeting, could be in the future useful to better shape the guidelines and the reporting format.
23. The Group requested its chairman to report to the Bureau at its meeting preparatory for the Conference of the Parties on the main findings of the evaluation of the national reports of implementation and present the advanced draft of the Fifth report.

VII. Closing of the meeting

24. Mr. Hem summarised the findings of the meeting and expressed his satisfaction on the progress made in the preparation of the fourth report on implementation. He repeated his request to Mr. Lozhechko and to Mr. Senzaconi to provide the evaluation of the national reports on emergency preparedness.
25. Mr. Hem thanked Ms. Ashcroft and the HSE for hosting the meeting and for the excellent arrangements and closed the meeting.