

---

## SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP: EUROPE REGIONAL NETWORK MEETING

Facilitators: George Kremlis  
Krzysztof Michalak  
Rapporteurs: Machteld Brokerhof  
Ladislav Miko

### GOALS

All regional meetings will address the following issues:

- Critical environmental challenges.
- Critical institutional challenges.
- Network challenges:
  - Partners: Identify existing regional networks for INECE to partner, including key contacts, relevant strengths, geographic range.
  - Information exchange: Explore elements of effective Regional Web page on INECE site, the maintenance of country contacts and database support, the development of best practices and a system to assess information management needs.
  - Other instruments and network improvements.
- Enforcement indicators:
  - Identify any existing projects on enforcement indicators that are occurring on national or regional level in your region, and note any organizations or individuals who might be interested in participating.
  - Discuss key needs within the region for indicators.
  - Discuss the proposed methodology and solicit comments and suggestions.
- INECE proposed projects:
  - Review the list of proposed INECE projects for regional linkages.
  - Prioritize regional needs.
  - Identify potential regional partners to help carry out projects, and/or to work with INECE on projects.

### 1 INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the meeting George Kremlis noted that this was a unique opportunity for the 4 existing networks in the European region to meet for the first time:

- IMPEL: 15 EU Member states.
- AC-IMPEL: 12 Accession Countries.

- NISECEN: 12 countries in Eastern Europe & Central Asia.
- BERCEN: 8 countries in the Balkan region.

### 2 CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES

On a global level it is obvious that the climate change is an important issue.

On a regional level the meeting identified the following challenges:

- Availability and quality of water.
- Waste including waste shipments.
- Resource consumption management.
- Environmental impacts of transport and agriculture.
- Historic pollution legacy.
- Sustainable economic rebuilding (e.g. in the Balkan area).

### 3 CRITICAL INSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGES

The following challenges were identified:

- Effective legal framework and regulations (up-to-date and upgraded).
- Effective institutional structures.
- Adequate and efficient resourcing (quantity and quality).
- Policy coherence.
- CCC (communication, co-ordination, cooperation) between authorities and countries.
- Transparent procedures and administrations.

### 4 NETWORK CHALLENGES

Regarding the 4 networks (in the future 3 when AC-IMPEL will be integrated with IMPEL) within the European region further initiatives will be undertaken to improve the mutual cooperation. The suggestions include:

- Regular meetings between the network coordinators (every 3 months?).
- Joint meetings of all network participants on selected issues.
- Experts exchange programmes and study tours.
- Joint projects and mutual invitations for

projects of the separate networks (à la carte), e.g. the possibility of participants from NISECEN and BERCEN at the European (AC-)JIMPEL conference in 2003 (Maastricht).

- Electronic exchange of information (reports, website links, e-mail).
- A Pan-European contact list.

George Kremlis stated that the European Commission is willing to stimulate and facilitate these initiatives.

### 5 LIST OF INECE PROPOSED PROJECTS (INCLUDING ENFORCEMENT INDICATORS)

All the participants agreed on the fact that the needs that are being specified by developing countries should drive the INECE agenda. The European networks can support the activities within this agenda especially concerning technical assistance and sharing the experiences of building networks. There should also be more attention for geographic cooperation like for instance in the Mediterranean region.

- Regarding the list of proposed projects, the meeting came up with some general remarks:
- Criteria should be developed concerning the selection and adoption of projects.
- There is not enough focus on projects with practical outputs.
- Duplication with ongoing work (e.g. MEA Secretariats, RIO updates, etc.) should be avoided.
- The priorities of developing countries should be more reflected in the work programme.
- Substantive projects needs to be separated from the "maintenance" of INECE.

The contribution of the European networks to the work programme can be found in:

- Minimum criteria for inspections and/or inspectors.
- Distance learning.
- Building other networks.
- Dissemination of information/publications/etc.

## **6 CONCLUSIONS**

Within the European continent a variety of environmental and institutional challenges were identified. These challenges will be faced in a positive and practical way by closer cooperation between the existing networks. The expectations regarding the input and output of INECE focusses on the assistance that Europe can provide to other regions based on the needs of these regions and the available knowledge in Europe. Furthermore the regional meeting pointed out some crucial points of interest regarding the development of the list of proposed projects that may enable the Executive Planning Committee and the Secretariat of INECE to refine the strategy and multi annual work programme.