



**Economic and Social  
Council**

Distr.  
GENERAL

CEP/AC.10/2005/7  
4 April 2005

Original: ENGLISH

---

**ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE**

**COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY**

**Working Group on Environmental Monitoring and Assessment**

(Fifth session, 2-3 June 2005)

(Item 5 of the provisional agenda)

**2007 BELGRADE REPORT: PROJECT DESCRIPTION <sup>\*/</sup>**

Submitted by the European Environment Agency (EEA)

**Introduction**

1. With the financial support of the European Commission and some of its member countries, EEA has produced three pan-European state-of-the-environment reports <sup>1/</sup> for the “Environment for Europe” process. The fifth Ministerial Conference in Kiev in 2003 called upon EEA to prepare a fourth assessment report for the next “Environment for Europe” ministerial conference, building on new partnerships, especially with UNECE and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

**I. THE AIM AND CONTEXT OF THE 2007 BELGRADE REPORT**

2. The general aim of the 2007 Belgrade report should be the same as that of the previous reports in this series: to provide a pan-European, policy-relevant, up-to-date and reliable assessment of the interactions between environment and society and of the state of the environment. Compared to the previous reports there is, however, one important change in the context: in Kiev the Ministers adopted the Environment Strategy for Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) (ECE/CEP/105/Rev.1). That means that for EECCA

---

<sup>\*/</sup> This document was submitted late as it required inputs from parties concerned.

there is now a political framework similar to the Sixth Environmental Action Programme (EAP) for the 25 European Union (EU) member States. Progress in the 12 EECCA countries can now be reported on in the context of a policy strategy, highlighting progress or lack of progress in the areas that policy makers have chosen for action.

3. The 2007 Belgrade report will assess the changes in the environment and how these have been driven by structural socio-economic developments and by policy measures. It will be accompanied by a policy analysis of the implementation of the EECCA Environment Strategy, for which the Task Force secretariat in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has the lead. The resulting "EECCA strategy progress assessment" will evaluate the steps that the EECCA countries have taken to implement the Strategy. The two reports together should (at least for EECCA) provide the best available information on both the progress in policy actions and their effects (if already discernable) on the pressures on and the state of the environment.

4. To evaluate the implementation of environmental policies in the EU and bordering countries, EEA is developing a programme of policy evaluations. Studies have been done on packaging waste and waste-water policies. A summary of work up to 2006 could be the West European counterpart of the EECCA strategy progress assessment.

5. The Working Group may wish to discuss the appropriateness of taking the main strategic policy documents as a starting point for the 2007 assessment.

## **II. THE CONTENTS OF THE 2007 BELGRADE REPORT**

6. A pan-European assessment can never be fully comprehensive; there is a need to focus on the policy topics that will be important in 2007. In addition, the Ministers have repeatedly indicated that they would like to see a slim report, with clear messages on the issues that are important for them.

7. In Kiev, Ministers voiced their concern over: ecologically sensitive areas, floods, energy and nuclear safety (Austria), policy implementation (Cyprus), air pollution and transport, deterioration of environmental infrastructures (Germany), marine environment (Monaco), water security, biodiversity (Portugal), chemicals (Sweden), economic growth going together with environmental protection (Ukraine). Also in Kiev, the Governments of the Central Asian countries submitted the Invitation to Partnership on implementation of the Central Asian Sustainable Development Initiative (ECE/CEP/106/Rev.1), which identified specific goals and indicators for water management in Central Asia. These issues also figured prominently in the EECCA Strategy.

8. Given the context described in the previous paragraph, and following the structure of the EECCA Strategy, the report needs to assess the situation in EECCA for:

- Urban air pollution;

- Water supply and sanitation;
- Waste and chemicals management;
- Water resources management;
- Biodiversity and protection of ecosystems;
- Sectoral integration (in particular in the energy, transport and agriculture and forestry sectors);
- Transboundary issues.

Most of these issues are also important for Western Europe, where, in addition, global issues like climate change and land resources are important for policy makers.

9. There are many options for structuring the information. One option would be to follow the structure of strategic policy documents (EECCA Strategy and 6<sup>th</sup> EAP). Another would be to present the same information in the context of sustainable development around themes like sustainable production and consumption, conservation of resources or technological innovation. There is no need to decide on the structure now, as long as there is a clear idea on the body of data and information that is needed for the report. The Working Group may wish to discuss the pros and cons of various options for structuring the information. A draft list of contents can then be discussed by the Working Group in early 2006.

### **III. THE WORKING PRINCIPLES AND DATA COLLECTION OF THE 2007 BELGRADE REPORT**

10. The 2007 report will be innovative in that it will not only produce a report for a ministerial conference, but also establish the knowledge base to support national and international environmental policy formulation and assessment. The production of previous reports in the series went together with the establishment of procedures for data collection and data exchange (with published guidelines) and the development of databases.

11. The annex below gives the overall model for the knowledge bases and databases to be developed for the 2007 Belgrade report. As in previous years, additional data collection for the report should be limited, to prevent a further reporting burden on the countries.

12. The previous report has demonstrated that the existing EEA data warehouse is a good tool for the production of all socio-economic indicators (see: <http://dataservice.eea.eu.int/dataservice/>; the password-protected part of this database contains many international statistics that EEA is not allowed to redistribute, but which it can use to produce the report). No additional data collection is foreseen in this area.

13. Environmental data are routinely collected in EEA member countries. Switzerland might join EEA in the coming years, and cooperation is increasing. The Balkan countries are covered by a Community Assistance for Reconstruction, Development and Stabilisation (CARDS) cooperation project. It might be necessary to make some additional efforts to collect missing data from Switzerland and the Balkan countries to ensure full coverage. These data feed the EEA core set of indicators.

14. In 2003 and 2004, the EECCA countries discussed a core set of indicators for them. This core set is closely related to the EEA core set of indicators (<http://themes.eea.eu.int/IMS/CSI>). The 2007 Belgrade report provides the opportunity to produce the indicators in this set, both for the national level and for the 2007 report. One of the activities that might be undertaken under a second TACIS-funded monitoring project is the development of these indicators and their compilation in a compendium. The production of the compendium will then be the major data-collection mechanism in the EECCA countries. Mechanisms to enhance efficiency in reporting to international bodies (e.g. the Convention on Long-range transboundary Air Pollution and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, but also the United Nations questionnaire on environment statistics) and using these data for indicators will need to be explored.

15. Finally, the 2007 Belgrade report should benefit from the building of environment and health indicators (Environment and Health Information System (EHIS) and the Implementing Environment and Health Information System in Europe (ENHIS)) project by the World Health Organization (WHO) and various scenario projects (UNEP Global Environment Outlook (GEO) and the OECD outlook) which have their specific data-gathering mechanisms.

16. The UNEP GEO-4 report is planned to be published in 2007 as well, but its actual production is planned to run in advance of the writing of the 2007 Belgrade report. However, EEA and UNEP are cooperating closely to promote the greatest compatibility possible of the processes and results of these two independent activities.

#### **IV. THE FINAL FORM OF THE 2007 BELGRADE REPORT**

17. It is clearly too early to make decisions on the shape and size of the report. EEA is in the course of producing the 2005 EU state-of-the-environment report, which will probably consist of several topic-oriented reports, a popular summary, a policy-oriented summary and a comprehensive source book. This experience needs to be evaluated and discussed before deciding on the 2007 report. The Working Group may wish to comment on various options:

- An indicator-based report, with or without a separately published policy summary (as was done for previous assessments);
- A compendium of several reports (for example: environmental indicators for Western Europe in EEA Environmental Signals, EECCA environmental indicator compendium, 2015-2050 scenarios and an overall summary). See also the ideas put forward in the EECCA strategy progress assessment document (<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/52/19/33686974.pdf>);
- A very slim policy summary;
- Briefings, posters, videos, etc.


Table. Preliminary timeline of activities

<b>Line of work</b>	<b>Activity</b>	<b>Time</b>
Concept development	Expert meeting and the Working Group on Environmental Monitoring and Assessment	May–Oct 2005
	Develop list of contents	Nov 2005-Febr 2006
	Development of guidelines	Nov-Dec 2005
Data collection	Socio-economic indicators: update EEA data warehouse	Jan-April 2006
	EEA indicators: regular production with specific attention to Balkans and Switzerland	Jan-April 2006
	EECCA indicators: TACIS project	Sept 2005-April 2006
Writing	Compilation of EECCA indicator report	April –Aug 2006
	Writing other material	April –Aug 2006
	First editing	Sept 2006
Review and finalization	Consultation on drafts	Oct-Dec 2006
	Final improvements and editing	Jan – Febr 2007
Production	Lay-out and printing, translation of summary	March-May 2007
Launch and dissemination	Launch in countries	June-August 2007
	Launch at the Belgrade Conference	September 2007

Note: Specific data collection and review to be coordinated with EECCA strategy progress report.

Annex

**DRAFT FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSES AND KNOWLEDGE BASES  
FOR THE 2007 BELGRADE REPORT**



<sup>1/</sup> Europe’s Environment, the Dobris Assessment, 1995; Europe’s Environment, the Second Assessment, 1998 (“Dobris+3” was used as its working title) and Europe’s Environment, the Third Assessment, 2003 (“Kiev Assessment” was used as its working title).