



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

CEP/1999/6
14 July 1999

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

(Sixth session, 20 - 24 September 1999)
(Item 8 of the provisional agenda)

**REPORT OF THE EPR EXPERT GROUP
TO THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY**

(as adopted at the fourth meeting of the EPR Expert Group, Kyiv, 21 May 1999)

I. Mandate, composition and organization of the EPR Expert Group

1. The Committee on Environmental Policy adopted the terms of reference (reproduced in annex I) of the Ad Hoc ECE Expert Group on Environmental Performance Reviews (EPRs) at its fourth session (26-27 May 1997), and established the Group for two years with the dual purpose of:

- Providing guidance to the ECE secretariat and the Committee on all substantive and organizational matters arising in the implementation of the ECE Programme of Environmental Performance Reviews (see chapter II below), and
- Assisting the ECE secretariat in coordinating the ECE programme of EPRs, with processes under way in other international institutions that have a bearing on it, notably the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Environmental Performance Review Programme (see chapter III below).

2. The Group was composed of members from 10 ECE countries elected by the Committee on Environmental Policy. They were Mr. Arian GACE (Albania), Ms. Vania GRIGOROVA (Bulgaria), Mr. Harry LIIV (Estonia, Chairman), Mr. Karl TIETMANN (Germany), Mr. Massimo COZZONE (Italy), Ms. Maira ZHUNUSOVA (Kazakhstan), Ms. Ilona TESNOVA (Latvia), Mr. Adriaan OUDEMAN (Netherlands), Ms. Sibylle VELISEK (Switzerland) and Mr. Vyacheslav OLESHCHENKO (Ukraine). The secretariat invited international institutions pursuing related work to participate in the EPR Expert Group.

GE.99-32152

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) accepted the invitation.

3. The EPR Expert Group held four meetings (9-10 December 1997, 17 March 1998, 28 September 1998, 20-21 May 1999). It determined its rules of procedure at the first meeting. The conclusions were adopted at the end of each meeting. The elected Chairman of the Group reported orally to the Committee on Environmental Policy on the Group's activities at the fifth session, on the basis of the conclusions reached at the Group's first three meetings. The present final report of the Group was agreed at its fourth meeting for submission to the Committee at its sixth session.

II. Guidance in substantive and organizational matters

A. Opportunities and requirements for improving the conduct of the EPRs

4. The Group regularly obtained information on the evolution of secretariat practices in conducting EPRs. In particular, it considered the results of two surveys that the secretariat had undertaken. The first survey was carried out among experts that had participated in an EPR project of ECE (see annex II, also including the results of the survey); the second among Committee members on the use of EPRs undertaken by ECE (see annex III).

5. In preparation of the Committee's selection of countries for review by ECE, the Group considered the requests of Armenia, Kyrgyzstan and Romania at its third meeting, and the request of Uzbekistan at its fourth meeting. The Group's recommendations concerning the first three countries were approved by the Committee at its 1998 session. The Group's recommendation regarding Uzbekistan is included in chapter IV below.

6. The establishment of a roster of experts that can be called upon when experts are needed for specific EPR projects is a method that has been successfully tested in project preparation. At present, 55 experts representing 23 countries are on the roster. The roster will become even more useful as more countries contribute to it. The payment of consultancy fees varies between experts included in teams, depending on their country of origin and their source of finance.

7. The national partner in the country under review must be exhaustively informed of its obligations and role early in the EPR process. The national authorities should assume the corresponding responsibilities in such a way that fruitful contacts can be made over the entire EPR process. The EPR team of ECE should remain at the disposal of the country under review to support all measures to increase the impact that the EPR results will have there. The gathering of up-to-date and complete information, particularly on the legal instruments in use and on the related institutional arrangements, ahead of the review mission has been successfully explored. The dynamic changes in all countries in transition call for flexibility in preparing this information, making updating necessary between the review mission and the preparation of the final EPR publication.

8. A test was done to see whether sustainability indicators could usefully contribute to the EPR exercise. The Group considered a special study, which had been prepared jointly by the Slovene Ministry of Environment and the secretariat, as a by-product of the EPR of Slovenia. A set of about 60 sustainable development indicators (SDIs) had been tested from the list developed by the Commission on Sustainable Development. The results and conclusions did not demonstrate that the existing list of SDIs could be used as a standard component of all EPRs. Future developments in SDI work should be observed, and the results used for EPR reports when they are adequate. The report of the test was forwarded to the Commission on Sustainable Development's secretariat.

9. The Group agreed that similar papers should be produced in the future, only if there is evidence that the effort contributes substantially to the relevant work of the Commission on Sustainable Development. The ECE should not participate in the conceptual development of sustainability indicators, except by making experience available at low cost.

10. The EPR recommendations may differ in their level of detail. Experience in a number of countries in transition shows that both detailed (close to implementation) and general (strategic) recommendations are needed. The decision on which type is most useful in a particular EPR depends on the subject dealt with, the current priorities in the country under review and the expertise available in the EPR team. While the ambition to be 'as specific as possible' should guide the drafting of recommendations, the level of what is possible should be left to the appreciation of the EPR team in a particular review exercise.

11. At the recommendation of the Group, the Committee on Environmental Policy had approved, at its 1998 annual session, the testing of a new procedure for the assessment and final adoption of the conclusions and recommendations in connection with the EPR of Ukraine. The test essentially consists of two stages. Firstly, an "assessment meeting" was held in Ukraine in May 1999 to discuss an interim version of the draft EPR report and, secondly, the Committee's half-day Peer Review will be organized during its 1999 annual session. The members of the EPR Expert Group attended the "assessment meeting", and drew their conclusions from it at their fourth meeting.

12. The Group recommends that "assessment meetings" should be included as a useful option in the EPR process of ECE. They should pursue the following four objectives:

- (a) Contribute to making the EPR process a continuing process, during which the country under review is steadily accompanied in its development of environmental policy and management;
- (b) Help to involve the operational level of environmental management in the country under review in detail in the EPR process;
- (c) Provide foreign discussion partners to the operational level of environmental management in the country under review;
- (d) Enable the settlement of controversial factual issues, if they cannot be settled otherwise.

13. The Group also reviewed the experiences with the organization of the "assessment meeting" in Kyiv. It suggests that:

- The professional translation of the interim EPR report into the local language and its dissemination well in advance of the assessment meeting are key requirements for the success of the meeting. The English version of the interim report should be made available as soon as it becomes available to those who work in English.
- The local participants in the assessment meetings should be informed in advance of the purposes as well as the full scope of the EPR project. The latter purpose could be achieved either by distributing the full report to each participant, or, at least, by adding the table of contents to individual chapters.
- The relevant international partners, based in the country under review, should be informed of the assessment meeting, and be invited to participate.
- The widest possible participation of the authors of the individual chapters in the assessment meeting is desirable, but has to be balanced with budgetary possibilities. The participation of the EPR Expert Group in the assessment meeting was considered positive.
- The time span between the end of the assessment meeting and the submission of the draft report to print should be extended to enable adequate use of all comments.

14. The Group also noted that the assessment meeting in Ukraine provided an occasion for lively discussions on many aspects of the transition process of environmental administrations, as illustrated by the experiences gained so far in other countries in transition. However, the time available was much too short for a sufficiently in-depth discussion. The Group is therefore of the opinion that ways should be found to provide for such discussions in the framework of the Committee's programme of work.

B. Assessment of environmental trends relevant to the EPR process

15. The Group holds that, with the experience gained in the EPR programme of ECE during its first ten EPRs and given the dynamism of the transition process, the Committee should proceed with a general discussion of the lessons that can be learned from the transition process in environmental management and policies to date.

C. Environmental database development and related services

16. The Group reviewed the practices that have so far been followed in data collection by the EPR team of ECE. Since the inception of the programme, the existing environmental database has been updated for each country included in the EPR programme. However, resources did not exist for proper database maintenance, let alone further development. The EPR programme of ECE has been strengthened with the arrival of a database manager. The issue of database development should therefore be reviewed shortly, after the secretariat strategy for database development becomes clear.

17. The Group noted with interest the initiatives taken by the secretariat to associate private industry with the EPR programme. In general, the Group agrees that the wealth of information obtained in EPR processes is underused. An improvement in this regard may lead to (a) an adaptation of the ECE environmental database to the needs of small and medium-sized enterprises, and (b) a low-cost (in terms of ECE secretariat resources) contribution of the EPR team to international cooperation on environmental issues. The experiences currently being gained by the EPR team in this respect should be monitored with interest.

18. The Group suggested raising the profile of the EPR programme by including the conclusions and recommendations from individual reviews on the relevant Internet homepage. Other measures to achieve this aim should be considered, if this measure does not produce satisfactory results.

D. Follow-up to EPRs

19. Follow-up to EPRs has started and can be expected to grow quickly into a major effort. The Group noted that 'EPR NEWS' contributed to the monitoring of follow-up, but more systematic and comprehensive approaches were certainly needed. The secretariat initiative of seeking a first review of what happened to the EPR recommendations about one year after they were approved by the Committee was a step in the right direction.

20. The Group felt that the detailed monitoring of the implementation of initial EPR recommendations in a country that had been reviewed should be left to a subsequent EPR. In this connection, the Group agreed that the optimal interval between two successive EPRs in a given country ought to be shorter in countries in transition than in traditional market economies, as the speed of transition processes was such that small as well as substantial changes occurred continuously and quite rapidly in the countries in transition. However, the fundamental condition for a reduced EPR is that its implementation should not delay the regular and orderly implementation of the programme of comprehensive EPRs to all countries in transition included in the programme.

21. The question therefore is when to undertake reduced reviews, while respecting the fundamental condition mentioned above. The experience in EPR project implementation is that unforeseen circumstances frequently interrupt projects. In the light of the need to adapt the EPR process better to the circumstances of transition, and to increase the flexibility of the use of EPR resources, the Expert Group was in favour of reduced reviews under certain circumstances.

22. The first condition is that reduced reviews should not endanger the implementation of two to three comprehensive reviews in the year concerned. Furthermore:

- The interval between the comprehensive EPR and the reduced EPR should be at least three years.
- The reduced EPR should contain an assessment of the results of the preceding comprehensive EPR. This assessment should be prepared between the country under review and the secretariat prior to the reduced review. The Expert Group sees the First Interim Report on Follow-up to the Slovene EPR as a first step towards such an assessment.
- In addition to this assessment, a few – normally not more than five – priority issues for environmental management in the country under review should be selected for the reduced review, while leaving the well-established practice of trying to be comprehensive for first reviews.

- These priorities should be identified between the country under review and the secretariat, and should cover both national and international priorities.

E. Format and structure of the peer review process

23. The Group sees the Peer Review Meeting as the central activity around which the process should be organized. The quality of the recommendations included in the draft report is one of the key variables for the success of the process. Another is the participants and their preparation. The discussion at the Peer Review Meeting should concentrate on the most important issues each time. The delegation of the country under review should be composed of high-level decision makers from a variety of ministries, and other national and regional authorities that are involved in environmental policies and management. It is hoped that the Committee on Environmental Policy, when reviewing environmental performance, will benefit from the required expertise in all delegations.

24. The Expert Group explored the possibilities for making more time available for substantive discussions. For instance, in order to concentrate the discussion on key issues, a paper listing the major items proposed for substantive consideration could be issued shortly before the discussion. Any experiment done at future Peer Reviews would have to make sure that the rapid changes of major issues of environmental policy and management in the transition process are recognized.

25. The conclusions from the test undertaken in the context of the Ukrainian EPR (referred to in paras. 11 to 14 above) should be drawn in due course.

III. Assistance in coordination with relevant international programmes

26. In the future, the coordination efforts by the EPR team should concentrate on those willing to cooperate. The Group noted with appreciation the smooth and efficient cooperation between WHO-ECEH and ECE in the EPR programme, leading to fully coordinated activities on questions of environment and health. The focus should be on issues for which cooperation is both required and possible. The proposed list of predominant issues and the potential partners are:

- Maintenance of comparability between the results of reviews undertaken by OECD and ECE, respectively, at a fundamental level (with OECD).
- Development of database cooperation with other international databases, so that the data collected by the different institutions are accessible to all partners (with OECD, secretariats of other conventions, notably through UNEP, and with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change's secretariat, as well as with other international institutions willing to share information).
- Exploration of the possibility of finding a broader basis for the EPR programme currently undertaken under the sole responsibility of the ECE secretariat and for the ECE Committee on Environmental Policy alone (particularly with UNEP).
- Progressive institution of compliance monitoring with regard to international conventions that the countries under review have ratified (starting with the conventions developed in the framework of ECE, extending next to the conventions developed under UNEP leadership).

- Cooperation with other institutions as suitable (with the European Commission, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), possibly the World Bank) with regard to the monitoring of (a) the degree to which EPR recommendations are implemented, and (b) the use of EPR information and recommendations for the purpose of improving the efficiency of international assistance to the countries that are reviewed.
- Exploration of the possibility to organize, jointly with other international organizations, systematic discussions between countries in transition and with interested traditional market economies of experiences gained in the transition of environmental policy and management practices.
- Periodical reviews of possibilities for cooperation with the European Environment Agency.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

27. The Group defined its role in the organizational set-up of the EPR programme of ECE during its initial gatherings. The Group and its meetings clearly helped to (a) raise awareness about both the strategic as well as practical constraints, features and options faced by environmental administrations of European countries in transition to a market economy, (b) clarify the reasonable scope of ambition as well as limits of the Committee on Environmental Policy through the EPR programme to become a valid discussion partner for environmental ministries and other administrations concerned in the transition countries, and (c) provide the ECE secretariat with a necessary backstopping forum in all matters concerning the adaptation of the EPR process to the conditions of transition, and options for improving the efficiency of the programme. The Group therefore feels that it successfully fulfilled the mandate established by the Committee.

28. The Group is of the opinion that the EPR programme of ECE has emerged from its first years of existence as a useful and worthwhile exercise. Differences between the ECE programme and the parallel programme of OECD are justified by the differences between countries in transition on the one hand and traditional market economies on the other. The Group therefore believes that the strategy for the coordination between these two programmes should continue to focus on maintaining comparability of their basic results.

29. The main problems as yet unsolved in the EPR programme of ECE are (a) the optimization of the follow-up to the initial, comprehensive review, (b) the efficient management and use of information obtained in the process, (c) the structuring of the peer review mechanism, (d) the improvement of the use of the information obtained in the process of individual reviews, and (e) the drawing of general inferences from the individual EPR projects for the purposes of providing more adequate (international) support to environmental management in countries in transition.

30. With regard to these issues, the EPR Expert Group recommends the ECE Committee on Environmental Policy:

- (a) To re-establish an Ad Hoc ECE Expert Group on Environmental Performance Reviews (EPR Expert Group) for a period of two years, with the terms of reference included in annex I;
- (b) To include Uzbekistan in the list of countries for Environmental Performance Review by ECE;

- (c) To include “assessment meetings” as a useful option in the process of future reviews;
- (d) To explore the possibilities for organizing systematic discussions in the work programme of the Committee, for the ECE region as a whole or for groups of neighbouring countries, of the general problems faced by environmental administrations in countries in transition between the countries concerned and with the participation of environmental administrations of interested traditional market economies;
- (e) To explore the possibilities for associating other international organizations with the organization of such meetings;
- (f) To authorize the implementation of reduced reviews in accordance with the conditions spelled out in paragraphs 20-22 above;
- (g) To appeal to countries to contribute to the maintenance of the cooperation of the European Centre for Environment and Health of the WHO Regional Office for Europe in the EPR programme;
- (h) To approve this report of the EPR Expert Group as a whole.

ANNEX I

TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE AD HOC ECE EXPERT GROUP ON ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE (EPR EXPERT GROUP)

As adopted at the fourth session of the Committee on 26-28 May 1997.

The Committee on Environmental Policy adopted these terms of reference at its fourth session. It may revise them to suit the changing requirements of the EPR process.

1. The ECE Committee on Environmental Policy establishes the Ad Hoc ECE Expert Group on Environmental Performance for a period of two years for the purposes of:
 - Providing guidance to the ECE secretariat and the Committee on all substantive and organizational matters arising in the implementation of the ECE programme of Environmental Performance Reviews (EPRs), and
 - Assisting the ECE secretariat in coordinating the ECE programme of Environmental Performance Reviews, with processes under way in other international institutions that have a bearing on it, notably the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Environmental Performance Review Programme.
2. The guidance of the EPR process in ECE will include (a) the identification of opportunities and requirements for improving the conduct of the EPRs (including data needs, indicators and methodologies), (b) the assessment of environmental trends relevant to the EPR process, (c) the review and improvement (upgrading) of environmental database development in ECE as well as related services, (d) the drawing-up of proposals for follow-up to EPRs to be submitted to the Committee, taking into account relevant international activities (European Union approximation, developments in the OECD EPR programme, etc.) and the specific needs of countries in transition, and (e) the drawing-up of proposals as to the format and structure of the peer review meeting.
3. The EPR Expert Group is composed of members from ten ECE countries. They are elected by the Committee on Environmental Policy. The secretariat will invite international institutions pursuing related work to participate in the work of the EPR Expert Group.
4. The EPR Expert Group determines its rules of procedure in accordance with the relevant provisions of its terms of reference.
5. The EPR Expert Group will report annually on its activities to the Committee on Environmental Policy, and may raise any issue which it deems necessary for the implementation of its mandate with the Committee.

ANNEX II

EVALUATION OF THE SECRETARIAT PREPARATION OF EPR PROJECTS

By the EPR Team of the ECE secretariat

The secretariat received 11 replies to this questionnaire. They are summarised below.

A. Preparation of the project

- *Did you have difficulties in your job when accepting the invitation - with your workload, your colleagues or else? Which? Could we have helped avoiding them?*

Nine experts (82%) did not experience any difficulty and two experts did. The ECE secretariat should try to send an earlier invitation letter to the experts' employer, preferably 4 to 6 months in advance. The experts' participation in the EPR exercise is extra work, but there is no extra budget for it.

- *Was the material sent to you in preparation of the project excessive - insufficient - well adapted to the work that you did on the project? Which were the deficiencies?*

Six experts (55%) consider the material sent as well adopted, three experts (27%) as excessive, one expert (9%) as insufficient, and one expert did not reply to this question. Remarks: (1) the data sent were rather old; (2) reliability of data depends on local sources; (3) lack of health-related (human exposure) data; (4) the detailed contents of a chapter should be provided to experts before drafting.

- *Did the preparatory material reach you in time ?*

All experts had received the preparatory material in time.

- *Did you prepare yourself as you would have liked? If not - could we have been of more help?*

Eight experts (73%) replied positively and three experts did not reply at all. The following was requested: (1) more background information on the country; (2) more guidance (a) for which issues to focus on; (b) on economics and environmental legislation; (3) a meeting of the expert group in Geneva one week prior to the review mission.

- *Which three preparatory documents did you find most useful **before** the Review Mission?*

Two experts (18%) did not reply. Only the Strategic Action Plan was mentioned in two responses. The following documents were mentioned in the replies once: basic documents on domestic legislation, documents of the environmental Ministry, statistics, general reviews made by other international institutions, country's responses to the EU questionnaire, National Environmental Action Plan, national

state-of-environment report, exposure data from environmental monitoring, the ECE country profile, the ECE description of tasks of a team member.

- *Which three preparatory documents did you find most useful **after** the Review Mission?*

Three experts (27%) did not reply. Four experts (36%) indicated the materials obtained during the mission, in general, were the most useful. Three experts (27%) preferred the official documents of the environmental Ministry. State of environment reports, statistics, and data from environmental monitoring were listed by two experts (18% each). The NEAP, Strategic Action Plan, and basic legislation were mentioned once.

B. The Review Mission

- *Did your plenary meetings - or meetings that you attended together with other experts in the EPR team - satisfy your requirements?*

Two experts (18%) responded negatively. Comments: (1) an expert does not favour EPR team meetings at 22:00 on a Sunday evening; (2) plenary meetings are useful only to receive general information and to obtain an impression of the level of cooperation between responsible authorities; (3) no meetings on health objectives or with environmental health managers; (4) meetings are useful if they involve not more than 5 experts.

- *Did you find it easy to contact national experts? If not, how could we - or the national organisers in the EPR country - have been of more help to you in making such contacts?*

Two experts (18%) responded negatively. Two experts indicated that (1) the knowledge of the Russian language is an advantage, and (2) it would be more efficient if every EPR expert knew his national counterpart in advance. Other comments: (1) fewer plenary meetings in favour of individual expert meetings; (2) contacts should be planned before the mission as to find addresses was difficult, and vehicles could be allocated for meetings held in distant districts or cities; (3) funds are needed for phone calls and travel to distant meeting places; (4) a meeting organizer for the last few days would help organising individual expert meetings.

- *Which type of meeting and/or contact in the EPR country was most helpful for your work (i.e. plenary meeting, specialised meeting with many national experts, individual expert meetings in their offices, meetings with industry or NGOs, or else)?*

Two experts (18%) think that all meetings are equally useful. One expert (9%) prefers plenary, another specialized meetings, and the remaining seven experts (64%) consider individual expert meetings of the highest value. Meetings with NGO participation were noted as useful.

C. Work after the Review Mission

- *How much net working hours for drafting your chapter did you use ?*

Three experts (27%) had a difficulty to estimate the time spent. The replies could be divided into three groups. The first group comprises two responses having spent 5 to 8 hours. The second group includes three replies specifying 30 to 50 hours. The third group comprises also three experts, who have spent between 80 and 120 hours drafting.

- *Were you satisfied with the discussion of changes that were brought to your first draft?*

All experts were satisfied.

- *Was the draft report that was submitted to the Peer Review Meeting adequate for the project? If not, what would you have liked to see?*

One expert (9%) did not reply and another one was of negative opinion. There were several positive replies with remarks attached: (1) inaccurate editing and English language problems; (2) changes introduced should be revised in the presence expert(s) at the Peer Review Meeting.

- *Was your participation at the Peer Review Meeting useful (or would it have been useful, if you had participated)? If not, what should be done?*

Only two experts (18%) were positive about their participation at the meeting. One (9%) evaluated as OK, another one was not sure and two experts did not reply at all. However, five experts (45%) replied negatively. Suggestions: (1) convene plenary meeting of experts to review the draft before the Peer Review meeting; (2) create possibilities for experts to take the floor at the Peer Review.

- *Would you once again be available for participation in an EPR project?*

All experts (100%) would make themselves available

Room for any other comments

- (1) *Too much politics*
- (2) *The mission could be shorter (6-7 days instead of 10 days).*
- (3) *Review the possibility of giving fees to experts.*
- (4) *Describe the ways by which experts can develop knowledge and experience for future studies.*
- (5) *National experts of the country under review should send answers to prior expert questions.*
- (6) *The UNECE secretariat should instruct on the methodology to prepare questions and sequencing while examining a given country.*

ANNEX III

**SURVEY OF THE USE OF ECE ENVIRONMENTAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWS IN
TRANSITION COUNTRIES**

Prepared by the EPR Team of ECE/ENHS

Note: Up to now, the ECE issued five Environmental Performance Reviews (EPRs). Three of such reports (for Estonia, Slovenia, Moldova) are available in their final form in the Environmental Performance Reviews Series (ISSN 1020-4563), while two have so far been issued as drafts (Lithuania and Latvia) for consideration by the UN Committee on Environmental Policy (CEP). The Estonian EPR having been a pilot study, the four other reports can be considered as being fully representative of the established ECE approach to EPRs and should be used as the main references when responding to this survey. This survey is undertaken among CEP delegations of ECE member countries. Its purpose is to obtain input into the discussion, by the EPR Expert Group, of further improvements of the EPR programme of the Committee on Environmental Policy. The results of the survey will be brought to the attention of the EPR Expert Group at their meeting in Kyiv, on 20 and 21 May, 1999.

Please check as appropriate and return this survey to EPR Team of ECE, Palais des Nations, Office 338, CH-1211 Geneva 10, not later than 15 January, 1999

Respondent's details	
Name:	First name
Address	
City	Country
Telephone:	Fax:
E-mail:	

I. Audience of the reports

1. When receiving the EPR reports from ECE, you

- Take note and pass it on to your library
- Read parts/all of it and pass it on to potentially interested colleagues in your administration
- Inform other potentially interested institutions of the availability of the report
- Request feedback from users of the report about its quality and usefulness (i.e. for your preparation of Peer Reviews)

2. You got feedback on the report, whether solicited or not

- From colleagues in your administration
- From colleagues in other governmental institutions
- From the non-governmental sector

3. Do you think that the audience of the EPR reports of ECE in your country is sufficient ?

- Yes
- No

II. Use of the EPR reports

4. You use the reports

- For your own preparation of meetings of the ECE Committee on Environmental Policy
- For your own preparation of other international meetings on environmental issues
Please specify which: _____
- In the context of co-operation between your ministry and the environmental management institution of the EPR country concerned
- In some other work
Please specify which: _____

5. You know of any other use of the reports in your country

- By other governmental organisations
Please specify both organisation and type of use: _____
- By private enterprises
- By the press and/or other media
- By other non-governmental organisations

6. Could the use of the reports be increased in your country ?

- Yes
- No

III. Quality of the reports (you may be contacted later for details)

7. Do you have own suggestions for the improvement of the quality of the reports ?

Yes

Please indicate briefly: _____

No

8. You are aware of comments on the quality of the reports

Concerning the structure of the reports

Concerning the professional quality of the substance of the report

Concerning the conclusions and recommendations
