

The European Union's Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA)

Regional Environmental Network for Accession (RENA)

*Regional Workshop
Approaches to transposition
of EIA/SEA directives.
Application of EIA/SEA and
IPA projects
WG 3 – Activity 3.1 EIA/SEA
(06 – 08 June 2011)*



This project is funded by
the European Union



A project implemented by a
Consortium led by Hulla & Co.
Human Dynamics KG

Regional Training of the EIA/SEA Sub-Group

Approaches to transposition of EIA/SEA directives.

Application of EIA/SEA and IPA projects.

06 – 08 June 2011, İstanbul, Turkey

Table of Contents

1.	<i>Introduction</i>	1
1.1	Background	1
1.2	Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment	1
1.3	Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment	2
2.	<i>The Workshop</i>	4
2.1	Overview	4
2.2	Proceedings 6 June 2011	4
2.3	Proceedings 7 June 2011	6
2.4	Proceedings 8 June 2011	7
2.5	Workshop conclusions	8
3.	<i>Evaluation of the meeting</i>	9
	<i>Annex 1: Participants</i>	10
	<i>Annex 2: Agenda</i>	13
	<i>Annex 3: Workshop Sheets under separate cover (www.renanetwork.org)</i>	17
	<i>Annex 4: Evaluation of the training</i>	18



1. Introduction

1.1 Background

RENA comprises four Candidate Countries and four potential Candidate Countries¹, out of which one may be granted Candidate Country status in 2011-2012. As the formal structures for legal approximation vary considerably, much still remains to be done. RENA WG 3 focuses on matters related to the cross-border cooperation and multilateral environmental agreements, and more specifically (under its activity / sub-group 3.3) on EIA (i.e. Environmental Impact Assessment) and SEA (i.e. Strategic Environmental Assessment). Both EIA and SEA are addressed by relevant EU Directives (see further sub-chapters 1.2 and 1.3) and thus they are important part of environmental *acquis* to be transposed and implemented in the project target countries.

Relevant activities within the RENA project shall create a forum of officials from the candidate and potential candidate countries to exchange experience on issues of transboundary relevance including transposition, implementation and enforcement of EU legislation on EIA/SEA. As defined by the EIA/SEA sub-group's specific objective it shall strengthen cooperation on issues of transboundary importance through the development of best practice documents and/or carrying out pilot projects, which build capacity for EIA/SEA.

The 1st annual meeting of the EIA/SEA sub-group, held in Sarajevo on 19 January 2011 decided that altogether four training workshops should be organized in 2011 and 2012. In order to provide a base of further activities of EIA/SEA sub-group, the first training should be dedicated to the transposition of the Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment, and the Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.

1.2 Directive 85/337/EEC on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment

Generally, EIA can be defined as a systematic process to identify, predict and evaluate the environmental effects of proposed development actions and projects. The primary aim of EIA is to reduce or avoid adverse environmental effects, which might be caused by development proposals. It means that based on the analysis of likely environmental impacts EIA should suggest appropriate measures for mitigating these potential impacts. EIA is supposed to provide information for decision-making on the environmental consequences of proposed actions and as such it should be applied prior to the decision (i.e. approval of development action or project) is being made. EIA also provide a platform for participation of public and other stakeholders in the decision-making process. Thus, if applied efficiently, EIA shall contribute to better decision by ensuring that environmental concerns as well as public opinion are taken into account.

The EIA Directive, which was adopted already in 1985 and amended three times so far (in 1997, 2003 and 2007), stipulates basic and minimum requirements for EIA procedure to be met by the EU Member States. It identifies main actors involved in EIA process – project developers, public and public concerned, environmental and competent authorities and defines their role in the process. It prescribes information to be submitted by the project developers as well as information to be provided to the environmental authorities and public. In its Annex I and II it lists projects, which should be a subject of EIA – Annex I includes projects likely significant environmental effects and thus EIA should be applied obligatorily, while in Annex II there are projects for which the “screening” should be applied in order to decide if EIA is needed or not (taking into account criteria laid down in Annex III of the Directive).

¹ Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR of Macedonia, Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99, Montenegro, Serbia, and Turkey.

The Directive also stipulates provisions on transboundary assessment i.e. if the project might lead to the significant environmental impacts going beyond administrative borders of the country (Member State), where it is going to be implemented and thus affect territory of another Member State. In such case the country, where the project is going to be implemented (i.e. “country of origin”), has to inform potentially affected country, which shall indicate its interest in participating in further EIA procedure. If so, the country of origin has to provide relevant information on the likely environmental impacts (the scope of information is defined by the Directive) in order to ensure that public concerned and environmental authorities in the potentially affected country have an opportunity to express their opinion.

In accordance with the Directive, results of consultations with public and environmental authorities (including transboundary consultations) and information on likely significant environmental impacts have to be considered in decision on the project. Final decision (i.e. granting or refusal of the project) has to be made publicly available together with information on how opinions expressed by the public concerned have been taken into account, the main reasons and considerations on which the decision is based (including information about the public participation process) and a description of the main mitigation measures.

1.3 Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment

Similar to EIA, SEA is widely understood as a systematic and anticipatory process, undertaken to analyse environmental effects of proposed plans, programmes, policies and other strategic actions and to integrate findings into decision-making. It is considered as one the key instrument for integrating environmental concerns and sustainable development principles into the strategic planning and decision-making as well as it is an internationally recognized tool for participatory planning used to analyse and incorporate environmental and health concerns into proposed policies, plans and programmes. In particular, the SEA process assists authorities responsible for plans, programmes and strategies, as well as decision-makers, to take into account likely environmental consequences, relevant mitigation measures and views and information from relevant authorities, the public and – as and when relevant – potentially affected countries.

The SEA Directive is in force since 2001 and should have been transposed by July 2004 by all EU Member States. Its requirements have had to be integrated in the national legal frameworks. It promotes SEA as an important tool for integrating environmental considerations into the preparation and adoption of certain plans and programme, which shall ensure that environmental effects of implementing plans and programmes are taken into account during their preparation and before their adoption. The Directive recognizes as one of the main benefits that the inclusion of a wider set of factors in decision making should contribute to more sustainable and effective solutions. It also call for consultations with public and environmental authorities and stipulates that when a plan or programme is adopted, the relevant authorities and the public are informed and relevant information is made available to them.

The Directive defines four elements of SEA – (i) preparation of an environmental report, (ii) carrying out of consultations, (iii) taking into account of the environmental report and the results of the consultations in decision-making, and (iv) providing information on the decision.

According to the Directive, SEA shall be applied to plans and programmes, which:

- are subject to preparation and/or adoption by an authority at national, regional or local level or which are prepared by an authority for adoption, through a legislative procedure by Parliament or Government,
- are required by legislative, regulatory or administrative provisions.
- are prepared for agriculture, forestry, fisheries, energy, industry, transport, waste management, water management, telecommunications, tourism, town and country planning or land use

- set the framework for future development consent of projects listed in Annexes I and II to Directive 85/337/EEC
- require an assessment pursuant to Article 6 or 7 of Directive 92/43/EEC

Plans and programmes which determine the use of small areas at local level and minor modifications to plans and programmes shall require SEA only if they are likely to have significant environmental effects. Plans and programmes the sole purpose of which is to serve national defence or civil emergency and financial or budget plans and programmes shall be excluded from SEA application.

The Directive stipulates that the purpose of the environmental report is to identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme, and its reasonable alternatives. The environmental report should take into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme, current knowledge and methods of assessment, the contents and level of detail in the plan or programme and its stage in the decision-making process. The Annex I of the Directive further specifies information to be included in the environmental report.

Outcomes of SEA i.e. (i) environmental report, (ii) opinions on the draft plan or programme and environmental report expressed by environmental authorities and public, and (iii) transboundary consultations shall be considered during the plan or programme preparation and before its adoption or submission to the legislative procedure. After relevant decision is made, the environmental authorities and public shall be provided by the plan or programme as adopted together with a statement summarising how environmental considerations, opinions on the draft plan and programme and environmental report, and results of transboundary consultations have been integrated in the plan and programme as approved. This statement shall also explain the reasons for choosing the plan and programme as adopted and relevant monitoring measures.

2. The Workshop

2.1 Overview

On **06-08 June 2011** a RENA training workshop on **Approaches to transposition of EIA/SEA Directives** was held at Miapera Hotel in İstanbul, Turkey. The workshop focused on the transposition of EIA/SEA directives and application of these as well as IPA projects.

This is the first in a series of four training workshops which will address various aspects of EIA and SEA with special emphasis on transboundary consultations. All trainings are supposed to provide a platform among relevant officials for exchange of information on approaches to implementation of EIA and SEA Directives. The following training workshops are planned:

- 2nd training workshop: EIA/SEA differences and common features
- 3rd training workshop: SEA cross-border procedures, including consultation and interpretation of cross-border impacts
- 4th training workshop: EIA cross-border procedures, including consultation and interpretation of cross-border impacts

The 06-08 June meetings' purpose was to present and discuss possible approaches to the transposition of EIA/SEA Directives in order to identify the key gaps between requirements of SEA/EIA Directives and national legislation in participants' countries and provide recommendations on possible approach to overcome these gaps. It shall also provide a very useful basis for next workshops, where exercises can be focused on main challenges in further development of the national SEA/EIA systems as identified within the 1st training. The target group for the meeting were ministries of water, environment, physical planning; State Ministry of foreign trade and economic relations for BiH, regional environmental and/or water authorities.

The RENA facilitators were Cynthia Whitehead, RENA WG 1 Coordinator, Key Expert 2, and Martin Smutny, RENA Expert. The list of participants is attached in Annex 1. The agenda of the workshop is attached in Annex 2. Annex 3 contains Workshop Sheets; Annex 4 contains the formal evaluation.

All presentations and supporting documentation are available for download from the RENA website at www.renainetwork.org.

2.2 Proceedings 6 June 2011

Mr Martin Smutny, RENA Expert, welcomed the participants, experts and the representative of the EC. Representative of Turkey, Ms Evren Sapmaz Veral expressed that Turkey is pleased to host this event, which she hoped would provide insight knowledge and enable exchange of experience among participants. **Mr Octavian Stamate** welcomed participants on behalf of the EC and wished participants successful event. Following his welcome speech he presented the key principles of EIA and SEA from the Commission's point of view.

The first day of the workshop was dedicated to SEA with sessions included in the agenda:

- Key requirements of SEA Directive and examples of its transposition from UK and/or the Czech Republic (Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA)
- Transposition of SEA Directive in Croatia: current status and key issues (Ana Kovačević, Ministry of Environment Protection, Physical Planning and Construction, Croatia)
- Transposition of SEA Directive in Montenegro: current status and key issues (Tamara Brajovic and Brankica Cmiljanovic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Montenegro)
- Transposition of SEA Directive in Turkey: current status and key issues (Nihan Sahin Hamamci, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Turkey)

- SEA legislation and existing practices – presentation of other countries i.e. Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo², FYR Macedonia, and Serbia

The group work exercise was conducted after the presentations' session. Representatives of each country were asked to compare main requirements of the SEA Directive with existing national legislation in following aspects:

- Scope of application (i.e. documents to be a subject of SEA) – Art. 2(a) and 3
- Structure and content of environment report – Art.5 and Annex I
- Consultations – Art. 6
- Transboundary consultations – Art. 7
- Decision-making – Art. 8
- Information on decision – Art. 9
- Monitoring – Art. 10

Based on comparison the participants were asked to answer question bellow and briefly present it at the plenary session. Questions for the group exercise were formulated as follows:

- Is the national legislation fully in accordance with the SEA Directive?
- If not, what are the major gaps?
- What provisions should be integrated in the national legislation in order to cover these gaps?
- Does the national legislation go beyond requirements of the SEA Directive?
- What challenges and practical problems can be assumed when making the national legislation compatible with the SEA Directive?

The presentations and following discussion can be summarized as follows:

- Albania: The SEA Directive is not fully transposed in Albania yet – e.g. land-use plans are not included in SEA application, required consultations are below the scope stipulated by the SEA Directive, also provisions on monitoring are still lacking. However, the content of SEA report is in accordance with the SEA Directive as well as provision on making final decision on the plan or programme publicly available have been included in the legislation. Albania has already experience with transboundary consultations with Montenegro.
- Bosnia and Herzegovina: The SEA Directive is not fully transported in BiH yet (there are only some relevant provisions in the Law on Spatial Planning), while Espoo Convention has been already ratified. Rather complicated set-up in the country can be seen as one of the reasons for limited progress so far.
- Croatia: The SEA Directive has been fully transposed in the legal system in Croatia and it goes beyond its requirements (mandatory public participation in scoping stage). However, a lack of practical experience and availability of relevant education (for SEA experts) can be mentioned as a main challenge for further development.
- Kosovo: The SEA Directive has been fully transposed in the legal system in Kosovo, which in some aspects it goes beyond the Directive (e.g. the list of sectors includes also “plans for nature protected zones”, provisions on transboundary consultations are more detailed compare to the Directive). Main problems with practical application of SEA relate to a lack lack of human capacities and expertise.
- FYR Macedonia: The SEA Directive has been fully transposed in the national legal systems. Cooperation among environmental and other governmental authorities regarding SEA-related issues is not fully satisfying, thus further strengthening and capacity building would be needed.
- Montenegro: The SEA Directive has already been fully transposed in Montenegro; existing national legal framework goes beyond the Directive's requirements in several aspects (e.g. SEA is applied for “document”, which includes not only plans and programmes, but also other documents of a strategic nature). The capacity building is essential for further development of SEA application in the country.

² Kosovo under UNSCR 1244/99

- Serbia: The SEA Directive has been almost fully transposed in Serbia (with only few minor provisions missing), the national legal framework goes beyond the Directive's requirements in several aspects – e.g. SEA has a stronger mandate than supposed by the Directive, since the final SEA statement (to be issued by environmental authority) has to be followed by the governmental body, when approving the plan or programme.
- Turkey: The national legislation for SEA is still in its draft version, but almost in accordance with the SEA Directive – the only articles which haven't been transposed are those related to the EU MSs, also provisions regarding the Habitat Directive (i.e. Natura 2000) are missing (but the draft law addresses nature protected areas). It stipulates application of SEA for “plans and programmes”, however the National Development Plan is excluded from the draft SEA law. Provisions regarding the transboundary consultations will be transposed after accession of the country to the EU, but negotiation on the bilateral agreement is already in progress. The SEA Guidance should be developed to support efficient SEA practice.

Within the wrap-up discussion, facilitated by **Mr Martin Smutny** and **Ms Cynthia Whitehead**, the participants agreed on following key factors for efficient SEA practice in their countries:

- Sufficient capacities within environmental authorities
- Good communication and cooperation among governmental authorities
- Sufficient expertise for SEA
- Detailed arrangements / agreements for transboundary consultations
- Political ownership at high level
- Existence of relevant environmental policies providing guidance for SEA objectives

The participants also concluded that transposition and existence of the legal framework is only one (even if highly important) of the preconditions for successful implementation. For efficient practice and further development of SEA practice the support is needed for:

- Practical application of SEA – pilot application introduces the SEA concept in the country and can also serve as a learning and awareness raising opportunity. Optimally, it illustrates outcomes and benefits of SEA, and experience gained can be further used when preparing the legal framework, developing a training schemes etc.
- Raising awareness on SEA
- Providing guidance on SEA application, which will utilize the experience gained through pilot SEAs
- Creating the institutional framework (SEA competent authorities, expert etc.)

Well established legal framework should actually reflect experience gained through practical application of SEA.

2.3 Proceedings 7 June 2011

Mr Martin Smutny and **Ms Cynthia Whitehead** welcomed the participants on the second day of the training and summarized conclusions from day 1. Reflecting the discussions regarding SEA, **Mr Martin Smutny** briefly described main differences between SEA and EIA.

The second day of the workshop was focused on transposition of the EU EIA Directive, thus **Mr Martin Smutny** in his presentation introduced main requirements of the EIA Directive. He stressed out the key principles of EIA promoted by the Directive – importance of EIA in providing information for the project approval, role of EIA regarding the consultations with environmental authorities and public, the issue of transboundary consultations. He mentioned described main actor to be involved in EIA processes and their roles, and mentioned also possible approaches to screening. He presented the structure of information to be supplied by the project developer and explained the link between EIA and decision-making. He emphasized importance of provisions on access to justice as stipulated by the Directive. The final part of presentation compared a way of transposition of the Directive in the UK and the Czech Republic. **Mr Muhittin Aslan**, representative of the MoEF of

Turkey, presented the current status of transposition and implementation of the EIA Directive in Turkey.

The group work started after the introductory presentations. Similar to day 1, the participants were asked based on comparison of the main requirements of the EIA Directive (i.e. Scope of application – Art.3, Information to be provided – Art.4 and Annex I, Consultations with authorities – Art.6(2), Public consultations – Art.1(2), i.e. definitions + 6(2) to 6(6), Transboundary consultations – Art.7, Project approval – Art.8, Information on decision – Art.9, Access to justice – Art.10a) and based on relevant provisions of national legislation to prepare and present answers to the following questions:

- Is the national legislation fully in accordance with the EIA Directive?
- If not, what are the major gaps?
- What provisions should be integrated in the national legislation in order to cover these gaps?
- Does the national legislation go beyond requirements of the EIA Directive?
- What challenges and practical problems can be assumed when making the national legislation compatible with the EIA Directive?
- How do you find the scope of application – OK, too narrow, too broad?
- Do you think that EIA fulfils its basic role i.e. to achieve a better decision?

The presentations and following discussion can be summarized as follows:

- Albania: The EIA Directive has been almost fully transposed; however challenges can be seen in its implementation. Too broad application of EIA was mentioned as one of the problems – due to a lack of screening stage in EIA process, EIA is mandatory for both annexes to the Law on EIA i.e. for a long list of projects. It leads to overloaded capacities of key actors involved in EIA processes – environmental authorities, experts, public, which causes e.g. low efficiency of consultations. Practical arrangements need to be developed for transboundary consultations.
- Bosnia and Herzegovina: The EIA Directive has been almost fully transposed, and EIA processes are already established. However, further capacity building would be needed.
- Croatia: The EIA Directive has been fully transposed, and there is a long history of EIA in Croatia. EIA is applied to 80 – 100 cases per year in average. The scope of application is broader compare to the Directive – i.e. annexes include also other types of projects and stipulate stricter thresholds. Also a legal mandate of EIA is stronger.
- Kosovo: The EIA Directive has been fully transposed; the national legislation goes beyond its requirements regarding the public consultations. However, a lack of human resources was mentioned.
- FYR Macedonia: The EIA Directive has been fully transposed in the country. However, mechanisms and arrangements for transboundary consultations should be developed in order to ensure full implementation.
- Montenegro: The national legislation is almost in fully accordance with the EIA Directive.
- Serbia: The EIA Directive has been fully transposed in Serbia. Public consultations are mainly conducted through “technical meetings”, which might be considered as not fully appropriate for all EIA cases.
- Turkey: Provisions on transboundary consultations need to be transposed to achieve full accordance of the national legislation with the EIA Directive. The scope of EIA application is broader compare to the Directive, but can be considered as appropriate, as well as a scope of consultations with public (public hearing has to be organized within the scoping stage). Access to justice is stipulated by a specific law i.e. it is not covered directly by EIA regulations. Several problems were mentioned regarding the implementation – especially difficulties in efficiency of public consultations and ensuring access to information on environmental matters.

2.4 Proceedings 8 June 2011

Mr Martin Smutny opened the last day of the training. Summarizing the discussion from day 2 he mentioned that efficiency of public consultations, appropriate scope of EIA application and sufficient

capacities within environmental authorities and experts can be considered as the most important factors for efficient EIA practice.

In order to provide basis for further discussion on application of SEA within IPA, Mr Martin Smutny presented experience with SEA from new EU Member States. Among others he mentioned that application of SEA for programme to be prepared for pre-accession funds as well as for the programming period 2007 – 2013 was a great opportunity for development of SEA systems in respective countries.

Ms Ana Kovacevic presented experience with SEA for IPA in Croatia. She mentioned that the project on capacity building for SEA will be initiated, and there are 3 SEAs running at the moment for IPA programmes.

Representatives of Montenegro, **Ms Tamara Brajovic**, **Ms Brankica Cmiljanovic**, and **Mr Sava Vuletić** described situation regarding IPA and SEA in Montenegro.

In following discussion participants concluded that it is very important to start SEA as early as possible in the programming process and full accordance with the SEA Directive should be required (even if the national legislation doesn't fully transpose the SEA Directive). **Mr Martin Smutny** stressed out that IPA should be used for promoting approach to SEA, which would follow a good international practice (it can be stipulated in respective ToRs, SEAs can use Handbook on SEA for EU Cohesion Policy etc.) and SEAs for OPs should be used as a learning and awareness raising opportunity.

2.5 Workshop conclusions

The meeting was concluded with a plenary discussion facilitated by **Mr Martin Smutny** and **Ms Cynthia Whitehead**. From the lively discussions it can be concluded that transposition of the EU Directives is one of the key preconditions for efficient EIA/SEA practice, however further activities are needed to support efficient implementation of EIA and SEA.

Participants mentioned that further trainings within RENA should include presentation of practical cases on operation of EIA and SEA. They also suggested that the workshop should be organized dedicated to application of SEA for IPA's operational programmes, since this can be considered as an urgent issue (some SEA are already in process, others will be initiated soon). Such workshop should be focused on practical application (2 – 3 days long). Further discussion within the project management is needed, whether this workshop can be additional to four events to be organized for EIA/SEA sub-group or if it shall replace one of four workshops planned.

A need for ToR for SEA was mentioned, which could be actually developed as one of the sub-group outputs.

The workshop concluded that at present all RENA countries have made a significant progress in transposition of EIA/SEA Directive, however further support and capacity building is needed to ensure efficient implementation of EIA/SEA processes. Participants indicated that they welcome this first RENA EIA/SEA workshop as a base for further trainings to be organized within EIA/SEA sub-group.

3. Evaluation of the meeting

The results of the evaluation of the event on 06-08 June 2011 are shown hereunder (reference is made to **Annex 4**). 25 out of 32 participants filled the evaluation form. The Evaluation showed that the expectations of the participants as regards the contents of the workshop were met:

- 100% of the participants indicated that the objectives of the workshop were met (rated between good and excellent);
- 96% of the participants indicated that the content of the workshop was well suited to their level of understanding and experience (rated between good and excellent); 4% indicated that the workshop was relevant and informative (rated between average and acceptable);
- 100% of the participants indicated that the workshop facilitators were well prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter. In addition 100% indicated that attending the workshop was time well spent (rated between good and excellent);
- Three participants suggested that workshops could have been longer and two participants suggested that the workshops have been a little bit long;
- Five participants suggested to have specific trainings on EIA/SEA and Environment OP planning, especially EIA/SEA for OP (III).

Aspect of Workshop	Excellent	Good	Average	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
1 The workshop achieved the objectives set	56%	44%				
2 The quality of the workshop material given to me was of a high standard	36%	36%	8%	4%		
3 The content of the workshop was well suited to my level of understanding and experience	56%	40%		4%		
4 The practical work was relevant and informative	64%	24%	8%			
5 The workshop was interactive	64%	24%	8%		4%	
6. The mix between theory and practise allowed sufficient opportunity to implement acquired knowledge and skills	48%	44%	8%			
7 Trainers were well prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	68%	32%				
8 The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	28%	36%	12%	16%		
9 The logistical arrangements (venue, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	68%	24%	4%	4%		
10 Attending this workshop was time well spent	66%	44%				

Annex 1: List of Participants

RENA 1st Regional Training under Activity 1.2 RISP – Environmental Crime and Environmental Liability			
Name	Institution	Tel/Fax	E-mail
Ilda Cela, Albania	Specialist of Legal Directory, MoEFWA	+355 68 20 81 232m	icela@moe.gov.al
Evis Melonashi, Albania	Specialist of Environmental Impact Assessment Sector, MoEFWA	+355 4 22 24 996, +355 67 20 89 345	emelonashi@moe.gov.al, evis.78@hotmail.com
Klodian Aliu, Albania	The Head of Environmental Impact Assessment Sector, MoEFWA	+355 67 20 52 071	klodialiu@yahoo.com
Azra Rogović-Grubić (BiH)	Focal Point for BiH	+387 387 33 552 366, + 387 33 663 863 ext. 432 009	Azra.Rogovic- Grubic@mvteo.gov.ba
Nermina Skejović - Hurić, BiH	Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BiH	+387 33 552 365, +387 61 323 226m	Nermina.Skejovic- Huric@mvteo.gov.ba
Jasmina Katica, BiH	Ministry of Federal Ministry of Physical Planning	+38733218207, +38761205805m	jasmina_katica@yahoo.com
Hanka Mušibegović BiH	Ministry of Federal Ministry of Physical Planning	+38733214028, +38761481389m	hanka.m@fmpu.gov.ba
Vesna Montan (Croatia)	Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction	+385 1 3782 108, +385 98 1766 560m	vesna.montan@mzopu.hr
Ana Kovačević Croatia	Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction	+385 1 3782 101, +385 98 809 984m	ana.kovacevic@mzopu.hr
Mileva Tagasovska, (fYR Macedonia)	Ministry of Environmental Protection, Physical Planning and Construction	+389 2 3220 165, +38976 44 60 65m	mtagasovska@yahoo.com, M.Tagasovska@moepp.gov.mk
Kosta Trajkovski, (fYR Macedonia)	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning	+389 2 3251-403, or 3251- 454, +389 76 446-921m	K.Trajkovski@moepp.gov.mk
Husni Tachi, (fYR Macedonia)	Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning	+389 2 3251-403, +389 76 455-448m	h.thachi@moepp.gov.mk
Ismail Hetemaj, Kosovo	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning	+38138 200 33 237, +377 44 192 706m	Ismail.Hetemaj@ks-gov.net
Enver Tahiri, Kosovo	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning	+381 38 200 32709, +377 44 172 728m	Enver.Tahiri@ks-gov.net
Shukri Shabani, Kosovo	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning	+377 44 230 971m, +381 38 200 32 706	Shukri.Shabani@ks-gov.net
Tamara Brajovic, Montenegro	Environmental Protection Agency	+38220618371, +38269308378m	tamara.brajovic@epa.org.me
Brankica Cmiljanovic, Montenegro	Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism	+382 20 446 283, +382 67 500 228m	brankica.cmiljanovic@mrt.gov.me
Sava Vuletić, Montenegro	Environmental Protection Agency	+382 20 618 370, +382 69 400 214m	sava.vuletic@epa.org.me

Slobodan Sremčević, Serbia	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning	+381 11 267 0977, +381 285 6138, +381 64 1766387m	Slobodan.Sremcevic@ekoplan.gov.rs
Biljana Jezdic, Serbia	Ministry of Infrastructure and Energy	+381 11 3131355, +381 6481 66316m	Biljana.Jezdic@ekoplan.gov.rs
Evren Sapmaz Veral, Turkey	Focal Point - Department of Foreign Relations and EU, MoEF	+90 312 207 53 99, +90 5323764153m	esveral@yahoo.com, esveral@cob.gov.tr
Nihan Şahin Hamamcı, Turkey	General Directorate of EIA and Planning, MoEF	+90 312 207 61 88, +90 505 255 14 54m	nihansahin@yahoo.com
Muhittin Aslan, Turkey	General Directorate of EIA and Planning, MoEF	+90 312 207 63 71, +90 506 750 13 30m	malsan@cob.gov.tr
Fırat Mete, Turkey	General Directorate of EIA and Planning, MoEF	+90 312 207 6412, +90 535 736 8530m	firatmete@gmail.com
Ece Olgun, Turkey	General Directorate of EIA and Planning, MoEF	+90 312 207 61 55, +90 530 207 98 28m +90 312 207 63 70,	eceolgun@gmail.com
Eda Alagöz, Turkey	General Directorate of EIA and Planning, MoEF	+90 535 925 08 04m +90 212 284 8006,	ealagoz@cob.gov.tr
Yeşim Erkan, Turkey	TEMA	90 535 399 4643m	yesim.erkana@tema.org.tr
<u>Speakers</u>			
Octavian Stamate	European Commission – DG ENV E1, Speaker	+32 229 51524, +32 474 58 1010m	Octavian.stamate@ec.europa.eu
Cynthia Whitehead	RENA WG 1 Coordinator, Speaker	+32 495 503 937	cynthiawhitehead@sustainablelaw.net
Martin Smutný	RENA Short-Term Expert	+420 724 110 779	martin.smutny@integranet.cz
Gürdoğar Sarıgül	EUD, Turkey		Gurdogar.SARIGUL@eeas.europa.eu
<u>RENA Secretariat</u>			
Ayşe Özden	RENA ST expert	+90 312 219 77 55	ayse.ozden@wyg.com.tr
Ruža Radović	RENA Secretariat		Ruza.radovic@humandynamics.org

Annex 2: Agenda

AGENDA

Approaches to transposition of EIA/SEA directives. Application of EIA/SEA and IPA projects.

Regional Environmental Network for Accession

First Training of the EIA/SEA Sub-Group

Place: Miaperahotel, Istanbul / TÜRKİYE

Date: June 6-8, 2011

Target group: Ministries of water, environment, physical planning; State Ministry of foreign trade and economic relations for BiH, regional environmental and/or water authorities. Three persons per country.

The main output of the workshop will be identification of the key gaps between requirements of SEA/EIA Directives and national legislation in participants' countries, as well as recommendations on possible approach to overcome these gaps. It will also provide a very useful basis for next workshops, where exercises can be focused on "weak" points of the national SEA/EIA systems.

1st Day, June 6.	
<i>09:00 – 09:30</i>	<i>Registration, coffee</i>
09:30 – 10:00	Welcome. Introduction. Objectives of the workshop Evren Sapmaz Veral, Director of EU Affairs Division, Department of Foreign Relations and EU, Ministry of Environment and Forestry Gurdogar Sarigul, representative of the EC Delegation to Turkey Cynthia Whitehead, Key expert, RENA Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
10:00 – 10:30	Commission's word Octavian Stamate, Policy Officer, EC DG Environment Directorate E Unit E1. International Relations and Enlargement
10:30 – 11:00	Key requirements of SEA Directive and examples of its transposition from UK and/or the Czech Republic Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
<i>11:00 – 11:30</i>	<i>Coffee break</i>
11:30 – 12:00	Transposition of SEA Directive in Croatia: current status and key issues Ana Kovačević, Ministry of Environment Protection, Physical Planning and Construction, Croatia
12:00 – 12:30	Transposition of SEA Directive in Montenegro: current status and key issues Tamara Brajovic and Brankica Cmiljanovic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, Montenegro
<i>12:30 – 13:30</i>	<i>Lunch</i>
1st Day, June 6.	
Afternoon training session	

13:30 – 14:00	Transposition of SEA Directive in Turkey: current status and key issues. Nihan Sahin Hamamci, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Turkey
14:00 – 15:00	SEA legislation and existing practices – presentation of other countries (10 minutes per country) Country representatives
15:00 – 15:20	Summary of key issues in transposing SEA Directives – facilitated discussion Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
15:20 – 15:50	<i>Coffee break</i>
15:50 – 16:40	Group work: Comparing requirements of SEA Directive with national legislation for key issues (e.g. scope of SEA application, public participation and decision-making)
16:30 – 17:30	Presenting results from group work and wrap-up discussion
	Dinner

2nd Day, June 7	
Morning training session	
09:00 – 09:30	Summary of Day 1 Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
09:30 – 10:15	Key requirements of EIA Directive and examples of its transposition from UK and/or the Czech Republic Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
10:15 – 10:45	Implementation of EIA Directive in Turkey: current status and key issues. MUHITTIN ASLAN, Representative of MoEF of Turkey
10:45 – 11:15	EIA legislation in participants' countries – Session 1 Country representatives (15 minutes per country)
11:15 – 11:30	<i>Coffee break</i>
11:30 – 12:30	EIA legislation in participants' countries – Session 2 Country representatives (15 minutes per country)
12:30 – 13:30	<i>Lunch</i>
2nd Day, June 7	
Afternoon training session	
13:30 – 14:30	Summary of key issues in transposing SEA Directives – facilitated discussion Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
14:30 – 15:30	Group work: Comparing requirements of EIA Directive with national legislation for key issues (e.g. scope of EIA application, public participation, quality control, reporting, decision-making)
15:30 – 16:00	<i>Coffee break</i>

16:00 – 17:00	Presenting results from group work and wrap-up discussion
	Dinner

3^d Day, June 8	
Morning session	
09:00 – 09:30	Summary of Day 2 Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
09:30 – 10:00	SEA for EU SFs' programmes for period 2007 – 2013: experience from new MSs Martin Smutny, senior short-term expert, RENA
10:00 – 10:30	SEA/EIA for IPA – experience from Montenegro and Croatia Country representatives
10:30 – 11:00	SEA/EIA for IPA – key issues for practice: facilitated discussion
11:00 – 12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concluding discussion on all topics addressed within workshop (SEA, EIA, IPA) • Workshop evaluation • Planning next steps • Closing session.
12:30 – 13:30	<i>Lunch</i>
3^d Day, June 8	
Afternoon session, if needed, on bilateral discussion	

Annex 3

Sheets

(Under separate cover)

Presentations to be found on www.renaneetwork.org

Annex 4

Evaluation

POST-WORKSHOP EVALUATION

FULL TITLE OF THE TRAINING: *Approaches to transposition of EIA/SEA directives. Application of EIA/SEA and IPA projects.*

LOCATION OF THE TRAINING: *Miapera Hotel, İstanbul, Turkey*

DATES: *06-08 June 2011.*

1. Statistical Information

1.1 Name and Surname of Participants (evaluators)

As per participants' list.

2. Your Expectations

Please indicate to what extent specific expectations were met, or not met:

My Expectations	My expectations were met		
	Fully	Partially	Not at all

3. Workshop and Presentation

Please rate the following statements in respect of this training module:

Aspect of Workshop	Excellent	Good	Average	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
1 The workshop achieved the objectives set	14	11				
2 The quality of the workshop material given to me was of a high standard	9	9	2	1		
3 The content of the workshop was well suited to my level of understanding and experience	14	10		1		
4 The practical work was relevant and informative	14	10	1			
5 The workshop was interactive	14	10	2		1	
6. The mix between theory and practise allowed sufficient opportunity to implement acquired knowledge and skills	12	11	2			

Aspect of Workshop	Excellent	Good	Average	Acceptable	Poor	Unacceptable
7 Trainers were well prepared and knowledgeable on the subject matter	17	8				
8 The duration of this workshop was neither too long nor too short	7	9	3	4		
9 The logistical arrangements (venue, refreshments, equipment) were satisfactory	17	6	1	1		
10 Attending this workshop was time well spent	17	8				

4. Comments and suggestions

I have the following comment and/or suggestions in addition to questions already answered:
