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**Global Project on the Implementation of Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTR) as a tool for Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) reporting, dissemination and awareness raising for Belarus, Cambodia, Ecuador, Kazakhstan, Moldova and Peru**

**First Steering Committee Meeting and Inception Workshop**

**Madrid, 26-28 November 2015**

**Summary of results: PRTR Project Phase I (2009-2012)**

1. This document provides information on the activities that were implemented by Cambodia, Ecuador, Kazakhstan and Peru under the first GEF UNEP/UNITAR project on PRTR (2009-2012).
2. All four country projects achieved the project objective to design a PRTR and produced the following deliverables:

* National Feasibility study for implementation of a PRTR
* National Infrastructure assessment for PRTR
* Report on key features for a PRTR at national level
* Pilot trial of the designed PRTR (including POPs)
* Endorsed National Executive Proposal for the implementation of a PRTR

1. However it is important to indicate that PRTRs designed did not specifically focus on POPs, they rather focused on all priority chemicals, in which POPs are included.

**National progress made: key stages of PRTR development**

1. This section will describe the progress made by countries participating in the 1st GEF UNEP/UNITAR PRTR project in designing national PRTRs. For more information, please see Table 1 of this document.
2. Cambodia relied on a multi-stakeholder consultation process to supervise and monitor the project. The Infrastructure assessment indicated that Cambodia has two regimes for environmental reporting, but they are not enforced. The Ministry of Environment lacks capacity to enforce those reporting systems. Cambodia decided to follow the Kiev Protocol to design its PRTR system; however it is important to provide the appropriate framework and guidance for the application of the Kiev Protocol. Concerning the reporting formats during the pilot, Cambodia created off-line forms that were agreed with key stakeholders prior to their applications. The National Executive proposal was endorsed, however national stakeholders indicated that more training and awareness raising was needed to properly implement the proposal.
3. Ecuador has existing chemicals reporting schemes that will be integrated into a centralized PRTR system. The list of priority chemicals includes those regulated under international conventions. The reporting format used during the pilot was on hard copy, no electronic format has been developed. PRTRs will be mandatory and Ecuador is already preparing a legal draft. The National PRTR Executive proposal was endorsed by the government.
4. Kazakhstan’s PRTR is based on existing reporting schemes of releases to air and water, created during the Soviet Union era. However releases to land were not considered in these reporting schemes. Kazakhstan is waiting for the ratification of the Kiev Protocol in order to make the necessary changes in its national chemicals related regulations. However, Kazakhstan has considered the list of chemicals from the Kiev Protocol as the basis for its national PRTRs. Concerning facilities thresholds, Kazakhstan has decided not to apply them; all facilities are likely to report. Kazakhstan considers that PRTRs should be mandatory. The Minister of Environment endorsed the National PRTR Executive Proposal.
5. Peru has existing chemicals reporting systems that are likely to be integrated to the PRTR system. The initial list of chemicals considered under PRTRs is based on chemicals already regulated and those from international conventions. Peru created a reporting format available online and used it during the pilot trial in 2011. Peru was drafting legislation for PRTRs at the end of the first PRTR project. Peru endorsed the National PRTR Executive Proposal.
6. Table 1 provides more detailed information on the progress made by countries according to PRTR development stage. Table 2 describes progress made by countries with respect to key technical elements of PRTR development, such as list of chemicals, legal aspects, reporting format, estimation techniques, etc.

**Table 1: Summary of activities and results from the 1st GEF UNEP/UNITAR PRTR project (2009-2012) according to the UNITAR methodology to design PRTRs**

| **Milestone** | **Status** | **Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Establishing goals and objectives of a national PRTR | Goals and objectives of PRTRs were identified in all countries. | The goals and objectives of PRTRs were discussed with all stakeholders during inception workshops. All countries included as one of the objectives of the PRTR to comply with reporting requirements of international conventions, including Stockholm Convention on POPs. |
| Assessing the existing infrastructure relevant to PRTRs | Infrastructure assessments were developed in all countries. | Infrastructure assessments were developed by national consultants using UNITAR’s PRTR guidance document (1997). The existing institutional infrastructure and legislation for environmental reporting, as well as any other initiatives relevant to PRTRs were assessed.  Cambodia has regimes of environmental reporting, but they are not enforced. Industrial facilities do not have the custom to report and much more training and awareness-raising is needed to build capacities in this country for implementing a PRTR. Future work in Cambodia should comprehend strengthening of institutional capacities in the Ministry of Environment to enforce the reporting schemes and massive campaigns about environmental reporting.  Ecuador and Peru have existing reporting schemes that they would like to integrate as much as possible for avoiding extra burdens to industrial facilities. The single window approach of Chile seems to be the alternative in this case.  Kazakhstan based its PRTR design on the existing reporting scheme of releases to air and water, which was created under the Soviet Union. This helped to have comparability of data among Eastern European countries. However, more work needs to be done in order to include also reporting of releases to land.  All countries decided with national stakeholders that a mandatory approach should be sought. Ecuador and Peru will move forward in the near future to develop a draft regulation for the PRTR. Kazakhstan prefers to wait until the Kiev Protocol is ratified in order to have the regulation based on this Protocol. Cambodia intended to include PRTRs as one of the main areas of work in the draft Law of Sound Management of Chemicals. Cambodia had plans to develop a national executive decree specific on PRTRs. |
| Designing the key features of a national PRTR | PRTR key features report developed in all countries | Key features varied from country to country. The main elements analyzed in the key features documents are the necessary legislation for PRTR implementation, the selection of chemicals and sectors to report to the PRTR, the procedures to collect data and the procedures to analyze and disseminate this data.  Cambodia and Kazakhstan followed many of the elements of the Kiev Protocol, including list of chemicals and sectors. In Kazakhstan there is a political commitment to ratify the PRTR Protocol. In Cambodia, the elements of the Protocol were very useful as a basis for a PRTR that could be later harmonized with others.  These two countries decided that thresholds of the Kiev Protocol, however, are not appropriate for their national circumstances. As there are many small facilities, thresholds in the Protocol would not be applicable. Therefore, Kazakhstan decided to not have thresholds (all facilities of the priority sectors report and any amount of priority chemical is reported). In case of Cambodia, they decided to use the Protocol thresholds for now, but to adequate later on to the national circumstances, with support of international experts.  In case of Ecuador and Peru, the basis of the designed PRTRs is the list of chemicals that are already regulated under national legislation and international conventions. The approach that Ecuador and Peru are aiming for is a single window approach, where industrial facilities can comply with all their reporting requirements. However, further work is needed to find the most appropriate way to integrate all these requirements (international technical support is needed).  Regarding who should report, in Peru the sectors were selected through a combined criteria of number of employees (more than 10 employees) and earnings (with an annual maximum earning of 150 UIT – taxation unit). In case of Ecuador, the sectors were selected according to the existing list of larger polluters in the national territory. The reporting facilities are defined upon ISIC codes and indicators of size or activities of the facilities.  All countries included as one of their PRTR objectives the compliance of reporting requirements of international conventions. Therefore, all countries included POPs as part of their list of PRTR chemicals.  Kazakhstan already has national reporting schemes on releases to air and water (2-tp air and 2-tp water), which exist since the Soviet Union. It will base the PRTR reporting format on these existing formats, but Kazakhstan modified some sections in accordance to the PRTR requirements. Kayakhstan indicated that that further work will be needed in the reporting formats at the time of PRTR implementation, when the PRTR Protocol is ratified.  Cambodia, Ecuador and Peru created reporting formats according to the information that all stakeholders agreed should be required. However, only Peru developed the reporting format on-line (<http://www.cartotk.com/retc-web/>). Ecuador, Kazakhstan would like to also have an online reporting system, however it has indicated that more resources and time is needed to do this. In case of Cambodia, it was decided that the reporting formats will not be online, as there is not enough access to information technologies for civil society and small industrial facilities.  All countries decided that their PRTR should be mandatory. Ecuador and Peru are currently developing draft legislation. Cambodia, Kazakhstan expressed that more resources and technical assistance is needed for developing PRTR regulations at national level.  As mentioned in previous sections, the process of designing the PRTR was new for countries and an important effort for capacity development was required. Since this is a new concept at national level and capacities are still being strengthened in the environmental authorities, countries decided for now to do efforts on having facilities reporting dioxins and furans releases. However, POPs stocks and contaminated sites are still a challenge for countries to report. Further work will be needed to include these other POPs. However, this can be done only when the PRTRs are effectively implemented and countries are already well aware of how PRTR reporting can be achieved at national level. For now, PRTRs are not fully implemented yet and developing a strategy for reporting POPs stocks and contaminated sites is not evident. |
| Conducting a PRTR pilot test | All countries had pilot trials of their PRTRs | The pilot trials in Cambodia and Ecuador were prepared with technical support from a Mexican expert on PRTRs. The expert provided support to develop a pilot trial workplan, a reporting format and a preliminary guide on estimation techniques.  The national consultant of the PRTR project in Cambodia had to visit each facility and fill in the reporting format with technical officers during the pilot trial, as there is not enough knowledge on these practices in the facilities. In addition, there were gaps in the reporting format and the estimation techniques (e.g. fuels used in Cambodian facilities have different names from those given on international literature. The fuels could not be identified).  In Ecuador, the local government of Quito had an active role in the pilot trial. The contact with industrial facilities was done through this local government.  Only the pilot trial in Peru was done online. |
| Finalizing a PRTR executive proposal and holding a national workshop on PRTR implementation | All countries prepared a national executive proposal with a workplan for PRTR implementation.  All countries presented the proposal in a national workshop.  All countries have an endorsed proposal | All proposals were developed in countries according with the original design proposed in the key features document and lessons learned during the pilot trial.  The endorsement of the proposal in Ecuador was supported by the commitment of the Ministry of Environment to allocate 223,092.16 USD for implementation activities in December 2013.  The endorsement of the proposal in Peru was supported by the Viceminister of Environmental Management and a budget plan was included in that proposal. The project was also considered as one of the best environmental practices at national level.  The proposals in Kazakhstan was developed by an NGO  In Kazakhstan, the proposal is supported by the Ministry of Environmental Protection, but its implementation needs to go together with ratification of the PRTR Protocol. There is commitment in the Ministry to ratify the Protocol, but there needs to be technical assistance for this.  In Cambodia the proposal was endorsed, but stakeholders agreed that more work and technical training needs to be done in order to implement a PRTR. The implementation of a PRTR in Cambodia should start with activities on strengthening capacities in the Government and industrial facilities to do environmental reporting. |

**Table 2: Project baseline on key aspects of PRTR development**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **List of chemicals and sectors of the PRTR** | **Integration/duplication of national reporting systems on pollutant emissions and waste transfer** | **PRTR legal instrument** | **Reporting format** | **Estimation techniques** | **Participation by industry** | **POPs reporting** |
| **Cambodia** | The lists of chemicals was agreed in the National Executive Proposal, including all POPs. | Ministry of Environment agreed to integrate existing reporting systems of emissions to air and water. There need to be various coordinating meetings among the different departments of the Ministry to work on the implementation of this integrated system. | Preliminary elements are ready. Further development is needed, as well as significant socialization for its approval. | A draft reporting format was piloted in Cambodia, which included data and information from existing reporting systems as well as new sections for PRTR data (integration was piloted). The format worked well during the pilot, but inegreation needs yet to be fully endorsed by other departments in the Ministry that currently host existing reporting systems. | Knowledge and capacities on environmental reporting are low. There is no knowledge on how to estimate pollutant emissions.  Esmission estimation guidelines for the pilot trial sectors were developed and piloted, based on existing techniques of AP-42 and CORINAIR. However, more training on how to use those existing techniques and how to make own national estimations is recommended. | Knowledge about enviornmental reporting in industry is low. Need a strong campaign of training and awarness-raising among industry. | All POPs have been included in the PRTR list that will be mandatory in the future stages of PRTR implementation.  Need further guidance and training on how to report POPs in the PRTR system. |
| **Ecuador** | The lists of chemicals was agreed in the National Executive Proposal, including all POPs. | Ministry of Environment agreed to integrate existing reporting systems of emissions to air and to host an integrated reporting system in the SUIA (Unique Information System). There need to be various coordinating meetings among the different departments of the Ministry to work on the implementation of this integrated system and its inclusion in the SUIA. | Preliminary elements are ready. Further development is needed, as well as significant socialization for its approval. | An Excel reporting format was drafted and piloted. This format included information from existing reporting systems and new information for the PRTR. The format that was piloted worked well and the Ministry agreed to integrate existing reporting formats in the PRTR and the SUIA. Now Ecuador wants to work on having this reporting format online, as Peru did. | Existing techniques, such as AP-42, were used during the pilot in Ecuador. Ecuador wishes to develop own national estimation guidelines for each reporting sector, during the PRTR implementation. | Industry was very participative during the PRTR pilot trial and is willing to continue PRTR implementation. | All POPs have been included in the PRTR list that will be mandatory in the future stages of PRTR implementation.  Need further guidance and training on how to report POPs in the PRTR system. |
| **Kazakhstan** | The lists of chemicals was agreed in the National Executive Proposal, including all POPs. | The integration of reporting systems in Kazakhstan is complex, as there are three different agencies involved in reporting of emissions to air and water, as well as waste generation. There is a need to have several meetings with the Minister to decide on the integration of these existing systems and to request support from the other monitoring agencies that have existing reporting systems. | As reporting requirements in Kazakhstan are scattered in three differed agencies, legislation will need to be modified in order to prepare a unique and coherent PRTR legal instrument. | There is already a reporting format integrating the existing reporting requirements of the Ministry of Environmental Protection and the Kiev Protocol. However, the format still needs to include the reporting requirements by other two national agencies. | The industrial sector in Kazakhstan has knowledge on reporting pollution emissions and estimation techniques. Many of these emissions are measured.  However further training is needed on estimating POPs emissions. | Industry was very participative during the PRTR pilot trial and is willing to continue PRTR implementation. | The industrial sector in Kazakhstan has knowledge on reporting pollution emissions and estimation techniques. Many of these emissions are measured.  However further training is needed on estimating POPs emissions as this was not requested to the industrial sector in the previous reporting systems. |
| **Moldova** | The lists of chemicals was agreed in the National Executive Proposal, including all POPs. | Moldova already worked on integrating existing reporting systems in one PRTR. However, as Moldova worked this separately from the other countries in this proposal, the recommendation is to review their PRTR proposal to standardize all PRTRs in this project. | Draft is ready. It was prepared to ratify the PRTR Protocol (signature and ratification expected for 2014). | The reporting format for the PRTR has been drafted and piloted, following requirements of the Kiev Protocol. | Further training is needed on estimating POPs emissions. | Industry was very participative during the PRTR pilot trial and is willing to continue PRTR implementation. | Further training is needed on estimating POPs emissions as this was not previously requested to the industrial sector in the existing reporting systems. |
| **Peru** | The lists of chemicals was agreed in the National Executive Proposal, including all POPs. | Peru already piloted an integrated system, including previous existing reporting systems. However, Peru wants to work further on this following the example of Single Window from Chile. | Draft regulation is ready and has been socialized. Not yet signed by the Minister. | Peru piloted an online reporting format for the PRTR. It was improved after the pilot and is ready to be used for the PRTR implementation. | Peru agreed to prepare automatic estimation calculators for each reporting sector in the PRTR. Calculators for two reporting sectors were already developed and are available online in the PRTR reporting format. More calculators will be prepared in the future for other reporting sectors. | Industry was very participative during the PRTR pilot trial and is willing to continue PRTR implementation. | Further work with industry is needed in order to have reporting of POPs. |
| **Belarus** | The lists of chemicals was agreed in the National Executive Proposal, including all POPs. | It was agreed in the national proposal that the existing national reporting system in Belarus could be used as the baseline for the national PRTR. Further work is needed on a single window approach. | Draft PRTR legal documents have been developed. PRTR legal instrument approach will be clear once a single window structure is agreed between all entities currently involved in environmental reporting obligations. | The reporting format is based in the existing reporting requirements. However, further work is needed on developing a single window and including all elements to comply with the Kiev Protocol. | The industrial sector in Belarus has knowledge on reporting pollution emissions and estimation techniques. Many of these emissions are measured or estimated.  However further training is needed on estimating, in particular POPs emissions. | Industry was very participative during the PRTR pilot trial and is willing to continue PRTR implementation. | The industrial sector in Belarus has knowledge on reporting pollution emissions and estimation techniques. Many of these emissions are measured.  However further training is needed on estimating POPs emissions. |