



## Environment and Security Initiative ENVSEC

**Report of the Advisory Board Meeting**  
held in Bratislava, Slovakia 29–30 September 2005



This report summarizes the Environment and Security Initiative's (ENVSEC) Advisory Board meeting held in Bratislava on 29-30 of September 2005. The meeting brought together the ENVSEC national focal points, donors, partner organisations and other stakeholders. The participants (altogether 108) discussed the progress of the Initiative as well as the future work. The regional priorities and the status of implementation of the ENVSEC work programmes was presented and discussed at a special session on national implementation and at regional working group sessions.

### CONTENTS

<b>Opening session</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>ENVSEC National Implementation</i>	2
<i>Presentations by Advisory Board Members</i>	5
<b>Theme sessions</b>	<b>5</b>
<i>THEME I: Management of Trans-boundary Natural Resources and Impacts on Security</i>	6
<i>THEME II: Trans-boundary Risks of Hazardous Activities and Impacts on Security</i>	8
<b>ENVSEC Future Developments</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Regional Working Groups</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Other international organisations' activities in the field of environment and security</b>	<b>15</b>
Annex 1 Welcome remarks by Ben Slay, Director of UNDP Regional Centre	16
Annex 2 Opening remarks by Frits Schlingemann	17
Annex 3 Perspective of OSCE by Bernard Snoy	21
Annex 4 Perspective of NATO by Suzanne Michaelis	22
Annex 5 Presentation by Georgina Wigley, CIDA	23
Annex 6 Presentation by Massimo Cozzone, Ministry of Environment of Italy	25
Annex 7 Presentation by Ronald A Kingham, Institute for Environmental Security	26
Annex 8 Agenda of the meeting	28
Annex 9 List of participants	34

**Thursday, 29 September**

### **Opening session**

Chairman: Frits Schlingemann, Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board, and Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe

#### **Welcome remarks by Ben Slay, Director of UNDP Regional Centre**

*See annex 1 for the speech*

#### **Opening remarks by Frits Schlingemann, Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board, Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe.**

*See annex 2 for the speech*

#### **Perspective of OSCE by Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities**

*See annex 3 for the speech*

#### **Perspective of NATO by Suzanne Michaelis, Programme Director, Science for Peace Programme, NATO**

*See annex 4 for the speech*

### **ENVSEC National Implementation**

#### **- a moderated session with brief highlights by the National Focal Points<sup>1</sup>**

The majority of the National Focal Points (NFP) started their statements by expressing their country's full support to the Initiative.

#### **The Southern Caucasus**

##### **Armenia, Ministry of Nature Protection**

- Issues of focus: ecology safety, water, sanitary standards, clean air, protection of environment in general, this is the opportunity for trans-boundary cooperation.
- Cooperation between all three countries is essential considering the variety of shared trans-boundary resources.
- Main focus on trans-boundary water resources
- Trans-boundary cooperation on environment might help other sectors

##### **Azerbaijan, Ministry of Ecology and Nature Protection**

- Territory of Apsheron peninsula polluted with oil.
- Focus on protection of forest massifs.
- MoE is preparing a detailed report on the occupied territories.
- The trans-boundary pollution bothers Azerbaijan the most, as the rivers Kura and Aras enter Azerbaijan already polluted, and some 70 % of the population uses their water. This provides a large interest in cleaning them up and the management of the rivers can only be implemented on a regional basis, which is a priority for Azerbaijan. However, there have been dozens of projects

##### **Georgia, Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources**

- In-depth assessments of the frozen zone conflicts are welcome. It is a priority for Georgia to establish a bridge between the people of Tskhinvali region (South Ossetia), Abkhazia, Georgia and remaining parts of Georgia. Projects with real and practical results need to be implemented.

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to time limitations, the national highlights were presented only very briefly by the ENVSEC national focal points and contact persons – for further information please contact respective focal points.

- Environmental Information Centres (“Aarhus centres”) are planned to be established with support of OSCE.
- As there are many ongoing projects concerning Kura-Aras River avoiding duplication of actions and results is important.
- The role and responsibilities of the National Focal Points should be clearly defined

## **Central Asia**

### **Kazakhstan, Ministry of Environmental Protection**

- Young country with many national minorities; focus on environmental safety.
- Many trans-boundary projects on-going; focus on trans-boundary rivers – necessary instruments to carry out water assessments. New bilateral and multilateral agreements are being planned
- Industrial waste problem was recognized as one of the biggest country problems.
- Practical approach and concrete results of the Initiative are important

### **Kyrgyzstan, Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

- Initiatives such as ENVSEC are needed
- Focus on Ferghana Valley: degradation of nature may deepen divides and lead to hostilities
- Interested in defining more concretely the role of the National Focal Points (NFP) and National Coordination Groups (NCG).

### **Turkmenistan, Ministry of Nature Protection**

- Highlighted the importance of the Initiative in the country
- National Plan of Actions
- Focus on soil resources
- Cooperation with international organisations

### **Tajikistan, Ministry of Industry**

- WG established in 2003 with the aim to monitor assessments of the proposals.
- NCG was established; intents of including EnvSec projects into the National Action Plans.
- Main problem: pesticides in the river basin of Amu Darya river which is the main source of potable water.
- Regarding Ferghana valley Tajikistan would like to propose solutions – bi- and multilateral dialogues among the countries in the region.
- Ongoing cooperation with journalists.
- Focus on enlargement of the field of activities and carrying out long-term solutions.
- Programmes on regional level should be prolonged.

### **Uzbekistan, State Committee on Environment**

- Supporting the EnvSec initiative on all levels.
- All visits to metallurgical complexes and other plants are facilitated and all possible assistance is provided, but general impression in Uzbekistan that this country is only part of some process that is planed somewhere else.

## **South Eastern Europe** (Joint statements by the Ministries of Environment and Foreign Affairs)

### **Albania**

- Trying to improve management between between Ministry of Environement and Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- The ENVSEC Initiative is a good opportunity for regional cooperation.
- Conservation project on the lake Ohrid is successfully finalized.

- Ongoing cooperation with the World Bank
- Expressed wish to take part in the development of the agenda, as the meeting is of great importance to the Initiative.

#### **Bulgaria**

- The ENVSEC Initiative is a tool for confidence building; ENVSEC is considered as an opportunity for regional cooperation.
- Bulgaria is ready to give the inputs on the identifying hot spots in the country.
- Defined two main fields of action (to be included in the Initiative):
  - o Management of Hazardous Risks, within which Bulgaria has an initiative on Establishment of the Early Warning Systems with neighbouring countries Turkey and Greece.
  - o Management of trans-boundary water resources, where Bulgaria is exchanging experience in Stara Planina Peace Park – trans-boundary natural resource with Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

#### **Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**

- In process of establishment of a NCG; first meeting took place in September with participation of the following organisations: UNDP, OSCE, WB, private sector; the guidelines for the ENVSEC programme was adopted during the meeting; OSCE is not interested in joining the group (comment: very often field missions do not have a mandate for such a things or they are not dealing with environmental issues).
- The Prespa lake and park –project and the 'Feasibility Study for Lojane Mine Cleaning and Closure' are ongoing projects within the initiative; many natural resources are shared with neighbouring countries (lakes, rivers, national parks).
- Hot spots in the country are identified in the National Environmental Action Plan

#### **Romania**

- MoE is re-grouping soil, sub-soil and natural resources activities in one department; activities on soils are new and suggestion to ENVSEC would be to organize one conference only regarding problems of the soil with local stakeholders.
- MoE has developed the Concept on ecological safety

#### **Serbia and Montenegro**

##### **Republic of Serbia**

- Interested in all kinds of trans-boundary cooperation.
- Emergency Response Centre should be operational within one-year time.

##### **Republic of Montenegro**

- Important to implement goals within ENVSEC.
- Strengthening cooperation and communication with Partners and donors.
- Important to solve problems of environment, to establish priorities, to harmonise laws with EU standards, to strengthen regional cooperation, to make fund-raising strategy.
- For Montenegro financial support is very important in this period of time.
- Focus on Mojkovac mine, mining hot spot.

#### **Kosovo (territory under UN interim administration), Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning** *(The NFP of Kosovo was not present but had sent a message to the organisers of the meeting.)*

- Efforts in Kosovo over the past two years have concentrated primarily on establishing the necessary legal frameworks for supporting environmental sustainability and addressing the legacy of environmental neglect and wide-spread industrial pollution of the past. Cross-boundary cooperation with counterparts in the region remains weak.
- For the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning (MESP) the priorities are: remediation projects in the mining sector and preservation of biodiversity. Biodiversity is one of Kosovo's greatest environmental assets.

- The MESP strongly feels that at the regional level, priority should be placed on the establishment of a regional environmental monitoring system
- The MESP will take steps to strengthen its relationships with counterparts in neighboring countries to establish the trans-boundary 'Peace Park' in the South-West of Kosovo in the Cursed Mountains range.
- The MESP have prepared a proposal in cooperation with the Trepca Industrial Company to conduct an assessment to remediate two (2) mining sites, the first in the municipality of Mitrovica and the second in the municipality of Novo Brdo/Novo Berde
- Proposals for these projects have been prepared and submitted to the EnvSec Board of Directors for consideration.

## **Eastern Europe**

### **Belarus, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection**

Belarus started consultations on the initiative with OSCE and the UN in 2004. Environment and security relevant issues such as transboundary rivers, waste management and air pollution have been identified. Storage of waste from the Ignalina nuclear power plant across the border is an emerging concern. A number of projects with the ENVSEC partner organisations are already on going (Aarhus centre, GreenPack, SEA). Belarus hopes to see concrete action follow the planned assessment.

### **Moldova, Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources**

The Government supports the initiative and expects that it can help find solutions to existing conflicts in the region as well as to increase regional stability and security. The issues of environment and security are being addressed by national Security Council, including the development of a national programme and action plan. Important issues are transboundary cooperation and monitoring, identification and mapping of environmental risk factors (including hazardous waste and chemicals), regional harmonisation of environmental policy and law. Issues of cooperation with Pridnestrovie have been raised.

### **Ukraine, Ministry of Environmental Protection**

The law on national security refers to such risks as technological pressure on the environment and unsound use of mineral resources. Concerns also include the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, deteriorating water quality and transboundary pollution, hazardous waste, consequences of military and other hazardous activities. Joining ENVSEC will help systematise existing problems and look for solutions (including funds) for some of them.

## **Presentations by Advisory Board Members**

### **Presentation by Georgina Wigley, Canadian International Development Agency**

*See annex 5 for the presentation*

### **Presentation by Massimo Cozzone, Ministry of Environment of Italy**

*See annex 6 for the presentation*

## **Theme sessions**

## **THEME I: Management of Trans-boundary Natural Resources and Impacts on Security**

**Chairman: Ben Slay, UNDP, Moderator: Marc Baltés, OSCE**

### **Reducing Transboundary Degradation in the Kura-Aras River Basin (by Jürg Staudenmann, UNDP)**

The project on reducing the transboundary degradation in the Kura Aras river basin is a project that has been developed in cooperation with the Environment and Security programme for the Southern Caucasus.

There are three components of the Kura-Aras project: UNDP-GEF lead component: Addressing regional issues, including development of the Transboundary Diagnostic Assessment (TDA) and Strategic Action Programme (SAP), UNDP Governance Project: Addressing Public Involvement issues, including and delivery of a Stakeholder Analysis and establishment of a NGO forum, and UNDP – SIDA (The Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation) component: Addressing Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) and development of National Action Plans in the riparian countries.

The long-term objective of the lead UNDP/GEF project is to ensure that water quality and quantity throughout the Kura and Aras basins meet short- and long-term requirements of communities & ecosystem functions, thus reducing contaminant load into the Caspian Sea and improving water quality. It is expected that the project will come up with the outcomes, such as fostered regional information exchange and cooperation for enhanced river basin management; increased regional and national capacities regarding IWRM & Water Q&Q issues; key improvements at selected points in the river basins; sustainable institutional and financial coordination arrangements; and reforms initiated/promoted in economic sectors that cause pollution, water shortage and habitat degradation.

In conclusion, it was mentioned that the UNDP/GEF project is the first transboundary initiative to involve four of the five Kura/Aras basin countries. The project will develop a (cross-border) sustainable development vision for a significant area of Southern Caucasus, including a Strategic Action Plan for priority interventions during a second phase. Although entitled a “GEF international waters” project, it addresses the whole basin environment including water, land and biological resources, as well as socio-economic aspects. Using environment and natural resources as an entry-point, it promotes a multi-stakeholder dialogue – inside & across borders. If acceptable to the countries, the project may initiate discussions on a multi-lateral agreement and management framework for the protection of the Kura-Aras environment. The project will continue building up close cooperation and coordination with the Environment and Security programme to enhance security and living conditions for population in the two River Basins, while benefiting the environment.

### **Improved Land and Water Resource Management in the upper Syr Darya Basin (by Inkar Kadyrzhanova, UNDP)**

Upper Syr Darya basin is the most fertile and densely populated area in Central Asia. Due to the combined effects of rapid and often poorly planned irrigation intensification programs of the latter Soviet period, pollution from industrial and mining hot-spots, deforestation, habitat destruction and ever increasing population growth the basin today is facing tremendous social and environmental challenges. Water problems and land degradation pose some of the most serious threats, including water mineralization, pesticide contamination, intensive pollution with phenols and oil products, fertilizers and heavy metals. This situation is made more challenging due to increasing populations in the river basin drawing on water resources at non-sustainable rates. This combination of poverty, a predominantly young population and low health conditions suggests that without intervention increased demands on environmental resources will soon outstrip the ecosystems ability to replenish itself, or provide sustenance to future generations.

It is assumed that failure to address these issues, though integrated land and water management will result in continuing to develop along its current path with potentially negative results for both the population and the ecosystem as a whole. It is also assumed that in order to induce positive change in the region, that stakeholder involvement combined with country ownership will be critical to sustainable success.

The immediate project objectives are: assessment of priority transboundary environmental issues taking account of socio-economic conditions and trends; definition of set of Eco-system Quality Objectives (EQO) and targets for the Upper Syr Darya basin and its sub-basins and development of a vision for its sustainable development; creation and testing of guidelines for the implementation of the sustainable development vision at the community level and transboundary locations, and programme of action for improved land and water management in the Upper Syr Darya basin. The outcomes will be: improved expert dialogue between the basin states and community level stakeholders, on the governance of the land and water resources; agreement upon sustainable use of resources and mechanisms for applying EQOs at the community level in transboundary and in-country locations; an endorsed Strategic Action Programme and component National Action Plans to tackle priority transboundary and shared environmental issues; and proposals for legal and institutional frameworks for implementation of the action plans.

### **Enhancing Transboundary Biodiversity Management in South Eastern Europe (by Jasmina Bogdanovic, UNEP)**

The project has started in July 2005 and it will consist of two phases. In the first phase the assessment (on-going) of the state of trans-boundary mountain ecosystems, main threats and current management practices will be developed by December 2005 and, in combination with field trips, major critical sites in the region will be defined. The priorities will be further discussed with local stakeholders during a regional workshop, which is planned to be held in March/April 2006.

During the second phase, the project will support ongoing initiatives of trans-boundary cooperation on biodiversity and protected areas management, and facilitate collaborative and consultative processes (e.g. "Peace Park"). Furthermore, the project will support the establishment of the network of protected areas, using similar experiences such as the Alpine and Carpathian Networks of Protected Areas, and build capacity on selected topics at the sub-regional level. The second phase will be finalized by the presentation of results on the 6<sup>th</sup> Ministerial conference "Environment for Europe" that will take place in Belgrade in 2007.

The project is a component of the regional programme for South Eastern Europe and it falls under the priority on transboundary resource management and human security risks. The objectives of the project are to encourage regional cooperation for development of integrated management plans for trans-boundary protected areas, and to establish a regional network of protected areas. The following protected areas will become parts of the regional network: Sharr/Sara Mountain National Park, Bjeshket e Nemuna / Prokletije / Cursed Mountains (Peace Park process), Korab Massif, Durmitor, Koritnik, Pastrok, Stara and Suva Mountains, etc. A regional workshop to review the results of national desk assessments will be held in March 2006.

**Discussion:** The main point of the discussion was to ensure better coordination and information exchange between the ENVSEC programme and other regional activities implemented by international organisations, especially in Central Asia. The operational and viable institutional arrangements and capacities for transboundary activities are crucial for meaningful long-term process of resource management, especially in the regions such as Ferghana Valley. National ownership and capacities to embrace numerous regional processes promoted by international organisations is limited and often overstretching, and this suggests improved coordination among national and international actors, as the same an issue of value added by each new undertaking should be assessed. Transboundary peace parks have been established in South Ossetia and the participants expressed interest in a network of Protected Areas in South Eastern Europe, especially in Cursed Mountains Peace Park process.

## **THEME II: Trans-boundary Risks of Hazardous Activities and Impacts on Security**

**Chairman: Frits Schlingemann, UNEP, Moderator: Otto Simonett, UNEP**

### **Presentations:**

**“Mining for Closure” and Anticipated Activities at Pilot Sites in South-eastern Europe** (by Philip Peck, consultant, UNEP/GRID-Arendal)

**The presentation had two major parts; to present the document Mining for Closure, South-eastern Europe pilot projects for mine remediation pilot studies.**

The book “Mining for Closure - Policies and guidelines for sustainable mining practices and closure of mines” is a generic document, to support the articulation and adoption of policies, practices and guidelines for sustainable mining and closure of mines to reduce environment and security risks particularly in South Eastern Europe, but also other jurisdictions. In addition, it includes finance and insurance industries, as these are essential actors in the mining legacy projects.

The document focuses on operation of existing mines to ensure cost-effective and safe closure, re-mining or valorising legacy sites, and closure including remediation and turning sites safe.

The projected pilot projects are selected with the aspects in mind that EnvSec can cover not all hot spots in the region, and that successful pilots are necessary both to provide examples for remediation and for a for information exchange regarding remediation work. In addition, they are needed to serve as examples to the public, demonstrating that the reversal of adverse effects on nature is possible, thereby maintaining momentum, credibility and legitimacy for all actors involved.

To achieve this, the required outputs from the pilots are: Insights into the environmental & human conflict parameters of hotspots; information surrounding hotspots that captures the attention of politicians and institutional actors – particularly regarding high risks; information surrounding hotspots that captures the attention of, helps understanding & builds confidence among other social actors; capacity building; institution strengthening; and confidence building (e.g. concrete progress on the ground).

### **Rocket Fuel Component (melange) Disposal** (by Raul Daussa, OSCE)

The rocket fuel, also known as melange, is designed for Cold War era missiles, and these are now obsolete in most cases. Therefore these materials are now declared wastes and should be safely disposed of. The danger lies in the storage conditions, which are in moderate to extremely deteriorated condition over the range of storage sites. This is causing the risk to public health and safety and the environment to grow to a critical state, as significant corrosion is well documented at all sites examined. No definitive data are available, but evidence strongly suggests that soil and groundwater contamination is already occurring at many sites. In case of a tank rupturing, the affected area has a projected possibly deadly radius of 1,2 kilometres, and causing serious respiratory problems in a radius of 25 km. Winds can carry the melange up to 80 km.

Projects on neutralising melange are ongoing or completed in Armenia, Georgia and Moldova, and Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan are pending. The EnvSec has co-funded the Phase I Assessment in Armenia with 15.000 USD, facilitating a final project of melange destruction worth 1.5 M USD, and also co-funded the joint OSCE-NATO workshop on melange and the Phase I assessment in Ukraine with 15.000 USD. NATO is investigating the possibility of utilising a mobile plant for the destruction of melange, which would bring cost-efficiency to the process.

**Rapid Environment and Health Risk Assessment** (by Bruno Frattini, Managing Director, ICARO; Massimo Cozzone, Ministry of Environment, Italy)

The Rapid Environmental and Health Risk Assessment project in Central Asia involves the Kanibadam pesticides dump in Tajikistan, the Hadiarken mercury plant and Kadamjaj antimony plant in Kyrgyzstan, and the Ferghana City oil refinery in Uzbekistan. The project is being implemented through local resources, with a team of local experts to support the institutional strengthening in monitoring and management of industrial risks.

The Kanibadam pesticides dump contains some 4000 tonnes of pesticides and 3000 tonnes of chemicals. The Hadiarken mercury plant has a 4 million m<sup>3</sup> waste pond, and the Kadamjaj antimony plant has seven tailing ponds located 500 metres from the Uzbek border. These sites are polluting the soil and groundwater, erosion is posing risks of leakage and tailing dam failure, dust pollution in the air is prevalent, and many of the dumpsites and ponds are not closed off to public access.

Ways of resolving the matters differ from site to site. The Hadiarken waste pond is unfeasible to clean or remediate, but it would rather be a case of containing the pollutants. The tailing ponds at the Kadamjaj antimony plant need to be protected from rainfall to avoid erosion, and also need containment in order to stop pollutants entering the groundwater table. In the case of the Khanibadam pesticides dump, remediation of the site might be possible, either by burning the waste or cleaning the soil.

**Discussion:** A point of view raised during the discussion, was that the delivered presentations showed what is being done when it comes to risks already present, however preventive measures regarding potential risks were less included. In reply, it was clarified that the work that ENVSEC does is of a preventive nature; Mining for Closure is aimed at mining activities, but also to prevent accidents at particular sites. Also REHRA is distinctively preventive in nature, in assessing health risks of a particular site before an incident has occurred. The ENVSEC work is intended to provide information for decision-making, through conducting outside and impartial assessments of sensitive issues.

### **ENVSEC Future Developments**

#### **Introduction by Frits Schlingemann, UNEP**

- Institutional arrangements (national and international)
- Regional scope of the Initiative
- Financial situation and needs
- Future orientation and focus of the initiative
- Potential cooperation in supporting investment projects

#### **Discussion**

Jukka Siukosaari from the Finnish Ministry of Environment raised concern about growing too fast when various new projects are being implemented simultaneously while expanding geographically to new regions. This so-called „death-valley” phenomenon often threatens companies and programmes that grow fast both geographically and by products without adequate resources to manage to growth. Siukosaari suggested that the ENVSEC partners would carry out evaluations and mid-term reviews of their programme. Also a practical suggestion was given to add time schedules of the projects to the Progress report’s project directory.

Vera Narodnitskaia from the University for Peace highlighted the importance of education the environment and security work. As a practical suggestion she said that the ENVSEC reports could be included to textbooks of schoolchildren.

Timur Tillyaev from the State Committee on Environment of Uzbekistan made a point regarding the roles of governments, NFPs and the management of the Initiative stressing that it is important to keep the participating governments involved in overseeing the ENVSEC activities in the country.

Cedric Janssens de Bisthoven from the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs expressed Belgium's support to the cost-efficient model of the ENVSEC secretariat („small and cheap”) and congratulated the initiative on the quality of its publications („each edition is better than a previous one”) and the ENVSEC website which he finds as a very useful tool. ENVSEC reports are instrumental for discussions within countries and governmental agencies. Belgium is pleased that UNECE and REC CEE have considered joining ENVSEC and Belgium also supports also the idea on collaborating with the investment banks. In Europe ENVSEC has probably reached its geographical limit; it may be time to ask whether other regions of the world could benefit from its experience (e.g. the Mediterranean basin, African Great Lakes), although certainly ENVSEC as such will not be in a position to do it itself.

Sandra Wibmer from the Austrian Development Agency congratulated the initiative on its progress and confirmed Austria's strong interest in South-Eastern Europe. The current management structure is very light, cost-efficient and needs to be kept as such, however there is a question of whether the current structure will be able to accommodate the expected growth.

Massimo Cozzone, Italian Ministry of Environment and Territory suggested that ENVSEC should benefit from international sources of funding such as the European Commission with its new 'neighbourhood policy' and approach to EECCA. A stronger link to the Project Preparation committee of the 'Environment for Europe' process may also be appropriate. Having reached its limits of the 'enlargement', ENVSEC should now focus on specific projects.

In relation to the discussion on financial needs and possible funding sources, Dusan Vasiljevic of OSCE Serbia & Montenegro suggested to explore the aspects for sustainability of promoting "clean production".

In replying to the issues raised from the floor, Ben Slay, UNDP underlined the Kyoto Protocol as another aspect of the discussion. UNDP is making efforts to help countries take advantage of the possible benefits of carbon emissions trading. In reply to the growth challenges of the EnvSec Initiative, he advocated the view that the growing scope of the Initiative is a good reason for new partners.

The discussion on ENVSEC's potential collaboration with International Funding Institutions (IFI) was opened by Bernard Snoy, OSCE who stressed that IFIs are not uninterested in ENVSEC-type processes and activities, quoting the World Bank financing safeguarding of uranium tailing in Mayлуу-Suu in Kyrgyzstan. Specific insights into the perspective of investment bodies were given by **Dariusz Prasek**, from the Environment Department, of the **European Bank for Reconstruction and Development** and **Kajetan Hetzer** from the **SNS Bank**.

Finally, **Bo Libert**, **UNECE** and **Stephen Stec**, **REC CEE** in view of the discussion of UNECE's and REC CEE's possible association, introduced their past and current activities, processes and experience relevant to ENVSEC and the regions represented at the meeting.

**Friday, 30 September 2005**

**Chairman: Frits Schlingemann, Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board, Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe**

## **Regional Working Groups**

### **Latest developments, key projects and issues in the region**

#### **1. Caucasus**

**Facilitator Frits Schlingemann, UNEP**

##### Conclusions of the working group:

Some **coordination and communication** problems have been identified between the ENVSEC partner organisations and the NFPs as well as at the national level. Information flows should be improved and responsibilities of different organisations need to be clarified in general. The ENVSEC partners will pay attention to clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the different organisations and improving the collaboration and coordination between parties involved. The Armenian NFP suggested establishing a regional network of the ENVSEC NFPs in the Southern Caucasus region. The ENVSEC partners welcomed the idea and encourage the NFPs to start active communication and coordination with each other.

At the national level UNDP & OSCE offices should link to the NFPs and relevant ministries and coordinate with each other. The UNDP Regional Office and UNDP country office coordination questions should be internally taken care of by the UNDP offices in question. Regarding the Kura-Aras project UNEP and UNDP have identified the coordination problem and will collaborate closely together in order to avoid further confusion. The collaboration will be improving significantly also by implementing the MoU between UNEP and UNDP. Georgia has established an ENVSEC Advisory Board to support and coordinate ENVSEC activities at the National level.

**The substantive scope of the initiative** and the need to define the scope more clearly were discussed. It was noted that different understanding of the environment and security concept might lead to misunderstandings of what is going to be implemented under the ENVSEC initiative. The focus of the ENVSEC work as well as the criteria for selection of projects will be discussed and defined by the ENVSEC partners. The NFPs will then be asked to comment and possibly further develop the criteria. Georgia also suggested having a process on defining the Georgian understanding of the concept. The NFPs are welcomed to develop their definitions of the concept and to share that with their colleagues in the region. However, it should be remembered that the ENVSEC approach is a process oriented one and continuous discussion of the scope shall be part of the process. In any case, the starting point of the selection of projects to be implemented is the regional work programme, which builds upon the findings and results of the national and regional ENVSEC assessment.

**Potential new activities** were discussed and the participants presented a number of project proposals. The ENVSEC partners will start a project on 'Capacity Building on Legal Instruments for the Protection and Sustainable Development of Mountainous Regions. A proposal on focusing on the ecological problems of the Nagorny Karabakh region was given by the NFP of Azerbaijan and the Armenian NFP expressed their support to idea on collaboration in the region. Georgia proposed three new areas of potential new activities: the Black Sea region between Turkey, Russia and Georgia; a Georgian and Russian collaboration project to monitor ecological situation and a strategy for environment and security priorities in the Southern Caucasus region.

The following project proposals were received from the OSCE Georgia Office:

1. Opening Aarhus Centres in Tbilisi and in the regions of Georgia.
2. Opening Environmental Information Centre in Tskhinvali, South Ossetia region.
3. Holding conference on Black Sea issues, involving interested parties to come up with ideas and priorities for future projects. The priority also is to involve Abkhazian side into the common project around the environmental problems of the Black Sea coastline;
4. Carrying out project on municipal solid waste management in Tbilisi according the ENVSEC priority of big cities identified in the ENVSEC assessment.
5. Discussing further the project proposal on the seismologic risks in the Southern Caucasus.

And from the OSCE Armenian Office:

1. Opening Aarhus Centers in three regions of Armenia
2. Seismology risk reduction: creation of a network throughout the Caucasus; public awareness; timely information; good governance and reduction of the number of victims of earthquakes consequently; trainings; exchange of information;
3. Waste management
  - Roundtable for stakeholders;
  - Support the Government on elaboration of a comprehensive conception;
  - Implementation
4. Assessment on mining contamination (heavy metals, etc. in Syunik region in Armenia).

In addition project proposals on Natural Disasters Preparedness (by UNDP Disaster Reduction Unit), education (by the University of Peace) and sustainable investment projects (by SNS Bank) were presented.

## **2. Central Asia**

### **Facilitator Ben Slay, UNDP**

In ENVSEC terminology, Central Asia is a 'mature' region; there exists a common understanding about the concept and this in turn lead to quite vivid and good discussions in the working group. While it is relatively easy to embark on fundamental discussions on the water resources in the region, there seems to be some sort of a consensus about the 'ENVSEC of the small steps', eventually contributing to improvements of the situation through some very concrete activities, rather than by 'dancing with the elephants'. With regards to the geographical level of interventions some participants would prefer a more top-down approach strongly rooted at the national level and building upwards (to the sub-region) from there, while others prefer a more bottom-up approach, starting with practical implementations where the problems are. This was concretely discussed in relation to information management and centers. With the Ferghana valley assessment report just launched, the Ferghana valley obviously got most attention, including the upper Syr Darya basin as the priority water issue. Presentations and discussions around the industrial hot spots (REHRA project), uranium waste (NATO and IAEA projects), natural disaster preparedness (UNDP) were very informative and non-controversial. It was however emphasized how relevant it will be for ENVSEC to actively establish connections and synergies with other relevant activities - in particular the ISDC (Interstate Sustainable Development Commission) - going on in the region. The public participation cluster (Aarhus / Public Environmental Information centers, Eco-journalism festival and media tour) provided some more insight of ENVSEC's public information and awareness activities. Concretely, all countries agreed on the need to link the existing information centers. As new activities assessments in the Eastern Caspian region of Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan and the assessment of the Amu-Darya region were introduced. Meeting attended by about 30 to 40 participants, besides the focal points and the UNDP and OSCE representatives from all the Central Asian republics international organizations, such as UNDP, IAEA, University of Peace were also present in the session.

## **3. South Eastern Europe**

### **Facilitator Harald Egerer, UNEP**

The meeting had a general exchange on the Belgrade 2007 Environment for Europe Conference and agreed that partners should prepare joint EnvSec action for South Eastern Europe for this occasion, including the presentation of tangible outputs. Such outputs could possibly include the creation of a SEE Network of Protected Areas, a transboundary Peace Park or other cooperative instruments (e.g. on mountain regions).

The meeting gave valuable guidance regarding the first EnvSec cluster (reduction of transboundary risks of hazardous activities) and recommended that issues of emergency

planning, preparedness and response be addressed and integrated into all projects currently being developed, as well as early warning systems – suggested by the representative from Republic of Serbia. Furthermore, the strengthening of cooperation with the private sector should be explored.

During discussions on the second cluster (management of transboundary natural resources), the meeting recommended to better link connected projects such as those concerning the Tisza River Basin (where initiatives by UNDP and FAO are ongoing). The meeting welcomed a report by FAO on environment and security related aspects of forest management. The meeting considered the proposal for a new activity (Capacity building on a legal instruments for the protection and sustainable development of mountain regions in South Eastern Europe) and recommended its inclusion into EnvSec. Some discussion took place on the importance of keeping a focus of the EnvSec initiative, and it was emphasized that issues of preventive diplomacy (environmental cooperation as a bridge-builder) are within the core interest of EnvSec.

In the third cluster (cross-cutting issues), the meeting welcomed the presentation of the idea for an environmental diplomacy course by OSCE Serbia and Montenegro, which could possibly be linked with and complement the regional project under development by UNEP.

The meeting took note of good progress made by Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in establishing the National Coordination Groups and recommended further strengthening of national implementation mechanisms including the possibility of NFPs to develop and propose in cooperation with EnvSec partners' small-scale projects for funding by national sources.

The meeting also welcomed the proposal for a roundtrip and recommended to explore possible political connotations such as high-level segments during the planned trip.

The meeting concluded with the confirmation of commitment to work together and produce tangible results until the Belgrade 2007 Conference.

#### **4. Eastern Europe** **Facilitator Bernard Snoy, OSCE**

Representatives from MoE and MFA from Belarus and Ukraine and from MoE of Moldova participated in the meeting as well as representatives from ENVSEC partner organizations (UNEP Geneva; UNDP Minsk, Kyiv, Chisinau, New York HQ; OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine; the OSCE Mission to Moldova, Vienna HQ; NATO Brussels HQ), FAO, REC CEE, donor agencies (Federal Foreign Office of Germany, Canadian International Development Agency). Bernard Snoy, OSCE, chaired the group

During an introductory round, countries listed a number of priority issues to be considered during the ENVSEC assessment.

Ukraine has emphasised

- Areas contaminated after the Chernobyl accident
- Pesticides storage and dumps
- Storage of melange and other military waste (including radioactive dumps presenting, potentially, a regional-scale threat – e.g. in the centre of the Crimea)
- Transboundary water management and pollution (the Dniester basin in particular)
- Industrial waste (e.g. accumulation/ processing in the Donetsk-Dnepropetrovsk area as well as illegal import of hazardous waste)

Moldova raised the issues of

- Identification (inventory) and utilisation of obsolete pesticides.
- Lack of data available from the Transdnestrrian region, where i.e. a large part of Moldova's heavy industry was located during the Soviet time

- Transboundary water management and pollution (the Dniester – main water source for Chisinau – as well as the Prut) as well as pollution of ground-water (e.g. with kerosene)
- Transboundary monitoring and transboundary cooperation altogether

Belarus listed a number of related concerns such as the rehabilitation of areas affected by the Chernobyl accident, cross-border flows of air pollution (e.g. sulphur), industrial waste and landfills, obsolete pesticides (ongoing work by WB – GEF), transboundary rivers (five flowing out of the country). Some related processes already in place include the preparation for opening an Aarhus centre in Minsk as well as educational work (GreenPack). The MFA deems the ENVSEC process important and would like it to focus on the issues and demands of the countries. Raised in particular (and also explained in a greater detail at the end of the group session, see below) was the Lithuanian plans to locate a storage facility for waste from decommissioned Ignalina nuclear power plant very close to the Belarusian border. Polesie wetlands and peat land fires was discussed as another regional-scale issue (UNDP facilitates restoration activities there).

The methodology of ENVSEC assessments were explained by a representative of UNEP; starting with a desk assessment (background paper) by international and local consultants followed by participatory consultations in the countries concerned and involving all relevant stakeholders. Emphasis was put on the role of the ENVSEC NFPs as representatives of the governments of the assessed countries in reviewing drafts of the report and assisting in identifying participants for the consultation meetings. The key to the success of the assessment and work program is the participatory process, meaning that the country stakeholders themselves select the priority issues based on their perception of their security relevance. Practical preparatory work for the assessment in Belarus-Moldova-Ukraine will start in October-November 2005, and national consultations will be held in all three countries in 2006.

A question was raised by the UNDP office in Kiev whether there would be any value added by the ENVSEC assessment and work program, or whether the initiative would simply become an extra layer of coordination and bureaucracy.

The representative from Moldova pointed to the Transdnestrrian conflict zone and said that if ENVSEC could help Moldova to achieve better cooperation with the Transdnestrrian authorities, especially concerning the exchange of environmental data that would be a clear value added. According to the OSCE Mission to Moldova, an opportunity may exist to add an environmental dimension to the ongoing confidence-building process facilitated by the OSCE, Russia and Ukraine, for instance, by including a protocol on the environment into the agreements facilitated by the OSCE between Chisinau and the Transdnestrrian authorities.

The Representative from Belarus MFA said that in his view a regional initiative like ENVSEC would be useful in ensuring a bigger picture of over all progress of several ongoing bilateral activities. Further he mentioned that by putting the issue of hazardous waste storage within an international initiative he hoped a better dialogue between Belarus and Lithuania could be promoted.

The representative of NATO suggested that a concise regional overview of priorities is what it expects from the exercise: if there was already a map with listed environment and priority priorities NATO would be happy to go directly into the implementation stage.

The representative of UNEP clarified that ENVSEC also aims at achieving impact and complement ongoing country-level activities by scaling-up national and international awareness of the specific environment-security linkages and 'hot-spots' identified by the countries in a coherent manner, bringing and developing additional expertise in the countries, and attracting additional resources for practical follow-up to these specific concerns. It does not aim at adding another layer of coordination, but rather a new dimension to environmental activities, namely that of their security relevance.

Following this discussions a number of ongoing and related projects were presented and discussed, including

- The OSCE/UNECE Project Transboundary Cooperaton and Sustainable Management of the Dniester River
- The OSCE/NATO melange program
- The OSCE/NATO pesticides project
- UNDPs ongoing work on dealing with the aftermaths of the Chernobyl disaster.

UNEP mentioned a Daugava/ Zapadnaya Dvina – Neman cooperative project with a focus on information exchange among water authorities in the basin. REC CEE referred to its experience of promoting cooperation in the Tisza river basin which includes some of the Eastern European countries and may also provide some good examples for river basin cooperation relevant for Eastern Europe

Belarus MFA provided additional details about the Ignalina NPP situation. Belarus decided to move the issue form bilateral to international for a after Lithuania did not respond to multiple inquires about options and consequences of radioactive waste disposal as well as liabilities associated with a potential accident. Referring to the option of burying waste near Belarussian border, the country's authorities request details about technology, precautions and financial guarantees to cover possible economic losses by Belarus. Since a contract for a feasibility study has been already awarded, Belarus would like to be part of the impact assessment rather than being informed post-factum. An accident in would damage a unique region with developing eco-tourism. Belarus requests assistance from international organisations in facilitating discussion with Lithuania.

OSCE commented that EBRD manages a decommissioning fund for the Ignalina NPP and may be in a position to review and help facilitate the situation. From the ENVSEC viewpoint the issue can also be addressed as a direct follow-up to the assessment.

It was agreed that the presented issues, activities and projects matched well with the countries priorities listed above, and that they could usefully be linked to ENVSEC implementation in Eastern Europe. Participants expressed their interested in staying involved in / informed about the related activities.

#### **Other international organisations' activities in the field of environment and security**

##### **Presentation by Ronald A Kingham, Institute for Environmental Security**

*See annex 7 for the presentation*

##### **Volker Sasse, FAO Sub-regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe**

##### **Steinar Sørenssen, UNEP/GRID-Arendal**

#### **Closure of the meeting**

The meeting was closed by Frits Schlingemann, who concluded that "the meeting provided a highly appreciated reality picture of a process in motion".

## Annex 1 Welcome remarks by Ben Slay, Director of UNDP Regional Centre

Your Excellencies, distinguished delegates, experts, ladies and gentlemen: It gives me great pleasure to welcome you all to this conference, which brings together the national focal points from Environment and Security Initiative partner countries, participants from donor countries as well as partner organisations.

During the course of these two days, the discussions will allow us to review the progress since last year's Advisory Board meeting in Geneva, chart the way forward for ENVSEC, and seek cooperation with new partners. This year we therefore have a slightly different mix of participants, bringing donor and partner countries together. In 2005, the programme document defining the strategy for ENVSEC comes to an end. We must define a new strategy for the future of the programme that will reflect the transition from the Initiative's assessment phase to programme implementation. This implementation phase will underscore the importance of the UNDP and OSCE country offices on which the Initiative depends.

Each of the Partner Organisations brings a different mandate into the ENVSEC Initiative, working towards a common goal of mitigating environmental risks and enhancing collective security. The cultivation and promotion of sustainable environmental policies and practices is duly noted in the United Nations Millennium Declaration, a document that gained strong renewed support from world leaders at the UN Summit two weeks ago. In the sound management of international waters, preventing land degradation, or forestalling natural disasters, environmental sustainability is inseparable from national and human security, and therefore human development.

Water plays a pivotal role for sustainable development, including poverty reduction. The use and abuse of and competition for increasingly precious water resources have intensified dramatically over the past decades, reaching a point where water shortages, water quality degradation and aquatic ecosystem destruction are seriously affecting prospects for economic and social development, political stability, as well as ecosystem integrity. Additionally, large parts of our region are heavily polluted by unsustainable industrial activities and lack adequate environmental safeguards, resulting in serious environmental degradation and affecting health negatively. It is only through the trans-boundary cooperation between states that such challenges can be addressed, as the environment does not recognise administrative borders.

**Comment [PS1]:** Not sure exactly how to formulate this though.

These issues are of the utmost importance for the progress of human development. Therefore we have devoted this afternoon to these two subjects in parallel sessions, where trans-boundary natural resource management and trans-boundary risks of hazardous activities and their impacts on human security will be discussed in detail. In addition, our different sub-regions to some extent face different challenges, which is why tomorrow morning we will discuss these challenges in the setting of each specific sub-region. It is my hope and expectation that by doing so, this conference will have substantial output in the shape of inter-state cooperation and a better understanding of the shared common challenges we face and bring tangible development results with it.

Environmental degradation can aggravate social, economic, or political tensions that too often underpin conflict-generating forces. By the same token, cooperation for better environmental governance in difficult circumstances can help build confidence and improve relations between communities that share common resources. The partnership of the ENVSEC Initiative is in and of itself a manifestation of that cooperative rationale, and by assembling here for these two days the intention is to work towards making this cooperation prevail over the conflict-generating forces.

Thank you very much.

## **Annex 2 Opening remarks by Frits Schlingemann**

Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board, Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe

The Baia Mare cyanide spill.

On 30 January 2000 a tailings dam at the Aurul mine in Baia Mare, Romania overflowed and released 100,000 cubic meters of cyanide containing effluent into the Tisza river basin. By the time the spill was detected, the alarm raised and emergency measures taken to staunch the flow, heavily contaminated wastewater had reached the Tisza river and was on its way to Hungary and beyond. Traces of cyanide, albeit at a very low level, were still detected in the Danube river water when it reached the Black sea two weeks later.

A storm of protest arose over the alleged large quantities of cyanide in the drinking water of numerous towns and settlements. Accusations, denials, assurances and recriminations flew in all directions. The fact that the ecology of the rivers began to recover just a few weeks after the incident remained relatively unnoticed. What counted was 70 tons of cyanide in the river; over 1,000 ton of dead fish, depriving local fishermen of their livelihood; and a shattered tourist industry.

The Baia Mare incident did put the relationship between Romania and Hungary under severe strain. Ex post analyses showed that the incident could easily repeat itself at another mine and that the region hosts many mining legacies and even newly planned mining activities which constitute a potential threat to the human environment, pose security risks, and are or can easily become a source of tension between neighboring states.

In a Subregional Conference, in Cluj Napoca, Romania, May 2005, EnvSec brought together experts and politicians around an analysis of the mining hot spots in South Eastern Europe and the Tisza River basin. They agreed on a checklist of measures to minimize the risks of mining practices and sites, and identified mining situations requiring urgent preventive or remedial action. The checklist, entitled "Mining for Closure" is for the first time available today. It will be distributed widely for stakeholders and public use. EnvSec is now seeking the collaboration and support of the EC and others for focused analysis and remedial action at the sites identified.

Nagorny Karabakh.

On 30 January 2001, Deputy Prime Minister Hasanov of Azerbaijan alleged that "Armenia is burying nuclear waste on territory it has annexed from Azerbaijan". "The occupied Azerbaijani territories are being exposed to the large scale dumping of industrial wastes of Armenia", was the message of 12 November 2003 by Azerbaijan to the United Nations when it discussed Armenian aggression against Azerbaijan. Half a year later, Azerbaijan's Environment Minister Bagirov warned that "if the world community shows indifference to the barbaric destruction of natural resources in the Nagorny Karabakh this will inevitably cause an environmental disaster". In turn, in September 2004, Armenian experts expressed fear that "Azerbaijan may again, like in the 1970s, poison the Karabakh rivers that can also influence Lake Sevan, the main water source for Armenia". From these quotes it is clear that already the absence of undisputed information about the environmental situation in a frozen conflict areas like Nagorny Karabakh, is a source of unrest, contributing to the tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

Interviewed by the Russian News Agency 'Interfax' on 7 February 2005, Environment Minister Bagirov of Azerbaijan said: "The Ministry of the Environment has more than once suggested to study the environmental situation in the occupied territories, involving international organizations". Similar calls are coming from Armenia. EnvSec therefore is exploring the possibility of assisting the Governments of Armenia and Azerbaijan in making an undisputed assessment of the state of nature and natural resources in the Nagorny Karabakh region, through a participatory desk assessment followed by a field mission. Such assessment would help to put the information right, take tension away, and protect the environment or remedy its decline.

The Ferghana valley.

The Ferghana valley is the most fertile, densely populated region in Central Asia, straddling three countries – Kyrgyzstan; Tadjikistan and Uzbekistan – and seven enclaves. Yet, it carries all the characteristics of potential conflicts and insecurity: soviet legacies such as uranium tailings with nuclear waste and complex national borders; conflicting water management policies and practices and trans-boundary industrial pollution; limited land availability under growing agricultural pressure and strong population growth, multicultural societies with cross border national minorities; and widespread poverty and unemployment.

It should therefore not be surprising that the Government representatives and other stakeholders of the Central Asian countries, meeting in Ashgabat in January 2003, to identify environmental problems posing security risks, requested for a special focus on the Ferghana valley. Consequently, EnvSec, through consultations with the stakeholders, developed a suite of interventions in the region addressing the problems and bottlenecks identified.

The interventions aim at improving transboundary management of land and water resources in the Upper Syr-Darya basin; analyzing the environmental and health risks at selected industrial sites; and helping authorities and local communities to improve management of risks related to natural disasters such as landslides, mudflows, floods and drought. All the interventions help building stronger environmental institutions and dialogue, both between and within the countries and their enclaves.

EnvSec's "raison d'etre"

What is the rationale behind these EnvSec interventions? Let me devote some words to that. Human behaviour has an impact on the environment. When the impact negatively affects the environment of others, there is an environmental problem and in many cases an argument. The argument can turn into a conflict but also lead to co-operation. Reliable information on environmental problems and on what caused them can help avoid conflicts and lay the basis for co-operation. Assisting parties to meet, discuss and apply sustainable solutions to disputed environmental problems eliminates the cause of future conflicts and helps creating lasting peace and stability.

Susan Boos, a Swiss journalist participating in an international media tour of the Ferghana valley organized by EnvSec in June 2005 went even further in saying: "Ecological issues know no boundaries: they affect those who actually created them, but also those who happen to live at the other side of the border and may well be subject to the same pollution. Both sides end up sharing a serious problem, even if they can't stand each other. If both sides can be brought together to work out the problem jointly, at least then they're talking. And once they're talking to each other, it's easier to work out some kind of peace. Even if UNEP people would not quite put it that way, hazardous waste – if handled correctly – can actually serve to build bridges and create peace"

That the state and management of nature and natural resources have an impact on political stability, has probably never been disputed. At the same time the interdependency may never have been so clearly articulated as recently. During the negotiations in preparation of the Environment for Europe Conference in Kyiv, May 2003, the proposal was made to name the Conference "Conference on Environment and Security". In December 2004, the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, established by the UN Secretary General, to devise a stronger role and performance of the UN in the field of collective security, stressed the need "to develop norms governing the management of natural resources for countries emerging from or at risk of conflict". It was in the same month, on 10 December 2004, in Oslo, that an environmental activist, Mrs, Wangari Mathai, was awarded the Nobel Peace Price.

The state and management of nature and natural resources also affect socio-economic conditions and in turn, environmental change is often a consequence of them. It was in Rio de Janeiro, in 1992, that the world community recognized that reducing, redressing and preventing

environmental decline requires addressing the social and economic driving forces behind that decline. And 10 years later, in Johannesburg, the world's leaders affirmed that "peace, security, stability and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms are essential for achieving sustainable development". Both Rio and Johannesburg underlined that sustainable livelihoods depend on sound environmental management.

Environmental change is related to socio-economic development and hence to peace and stability, that is the political reality of today. There is an almost natural connection between conflict prevention, environmental care, and social and economic development, all crucial for achieving sustainable livelihoods. That presupposes that there are advantages in using the environmental and socio-economic forces and arena's for conflict prevention work and vice versa. And that explains the partnership and alliance between OSCE with its mandate for co-operation and security; UNDP with its country level lobby for sustainable livelihoods, and UNEP, guardian and custodian of the world environment.

EnvSec's start, approach and achievements.

It was at the Environment for Europe Conference in Kyiv and the OSCE Economic Forum in Prague, in May 2003, that the Environment and Security Initiative was launched. At that time, the Initiative had already started to operate in Central Asia and South Eastern Europe. The first phase was relatively simple and the results were obvious. Civil society directly affected identified environmental problems with security risks, politicians expressed their concerns and the Initiative assisted in making the risks visible, embedded in the social and economic realities of today. The hot spots and their footprint were captured in maps and a publication, together with recommendations for future work.

That future work included further consultations, in depth assessments and focused programs to help address environmental threats perceived as urgent and conflict prone. In both Central Asia and South Eastern Europe, EnvSec is now fully active on the ground, and you will have ample opportunity during these two days to listen to detailed briefs and discuss and guide our future work.

The same goes for EnvSec's alliance with the Southern Caucasus region. An assessment report highlighting environment and security risks was launched during the Ministerial Conference on the environment strategy for the countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, in Tbilisi, Georgia, on 22 October 2004. A workprogramme has been put together and field action is underway or planned. You will learn more and have the possibility to discuss the program today and tomorrow.

Requests for assistance have reached the Initiative from Moldova, Belarus, Ukraine and stakeholders in the Arctic region. Once resources are secured, a full scale EnvSec approach will be applied to both regions: overall assessment of hot spots; selected in depth assessments of the environmental problems and their political and socio economic context; and a portfolio of activities to promote cooperation and apply sustainable solutions to the problems identified.

EnvSec and NATO.

The Initiative is happy with its association with NATO. NATO's work has an obvious focus on preventing and managing (military) conflicts. I already illustrated extensively that and how the management of nature and its resources affects security and can increase or decrease the risk of conflict. Therefore the association between EnvSec and NATO's Science program, with its expertise and longstanding experience in dealing with different aspects of this conflict-environment inter linkage, was a logical and almost natural step. You will hear more about that association from our NATO colleagues.

EnvSec: organization and funding

That brings me to the organization and funding of the Initiative. As an organization the Initiative is and will also in the future be kept flexible and lean, dwelling highly on the human resources of

the partners. It is run by a Board comprised of representatives of the partners and meeting twice a year. Its Secretariat consists of a small nerve center presently operating from UNEP Geneva and staff freed for secretariat work in OSCE, UNDP, UNEP, and NATO. Donors, recipients and other stakeholders gather in the form of an Advisory Board whenever the need arises.

The strength of the Initiative has been that it is a joint venture of three, in fact four organizations which complement each other, and which can benefit from the field presence of both OSCE and UNDP. That makes both the policy development and the operations comprehensive and cost effective, permitting for minimal overhead requirements. What is more, in terms of clients and donors the Initiative can count on a broad base of interest and support, of Ministries of Environment, Development and Foreign Affairs. Given the quite extensive network of alliances which each of the partners brings into the exercise, the program and activities link to, build upon and integrate almost all the related work on the areas of focus in the countries concerned. With that, the Initiative has become an important tool for catalysing development processes in the regions where it is active, which are sustainable and environmentally sound in the long run

Today, the EnvSec portfolio includes well over 30 projects in the three regions where EnvSec assessments have been completed, many of which are already under implementation. Thanks to funds provided by Austria, Belgium, Canada, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and the USA, USD 1,5 has been made available for activities in 2005. An additional USD 3 million has been mobilized by UNDP through the Global Environment Facility. Several international organizations, including the associated EnvSec partner, NATO's Science for Peace program, have aligned their activities with EnvSec identified priorities. Fundraising is ongoing for the next year's budget of approximately USD 2 million.

Having introduced you and many of you again in the Environment and Security Initiative, I want to conclude by challenging you to look with us into the future. Questions which come up, include: are our clients, both recipients and donors satisfied with what we do; how do we come from assessing problems to solving them; are our network and toolbox sufficiently equipped for that; how do we deal with requests for additional association and expansion; stakeholders in both eastern Europe and the Arctic region have requested our assistance; both ECE and the REC have enlisted their wish to join. And last but not least: how can we sustain and expand our support base, consolidating the broad donor interest we already enjoy and bringing on board new ones?

My colleagues and I look forward to discussing and receiving your guidance on these and other matters with over these two days.

### **Annex 3 Perspective of OSCE by Bernard Snoy**

Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities

Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to begin by thanking the UNDP Regional Centre for Europe and the CIS for hosting this meeting. As new coordinator of the OSCE for Economic and Environmental Activities, it is an honour and privilege to participate for the first time to an Advisory Board Meeting of ENVSEC and to spend two days reviewing together what ENVSEC has done and what more it could do.

As you know environmental concerns have been on the OSCE's agenda since the very beginning, and over the last decade we have been able to take an increasingly active role with regards to environmental threats to security. Being a security organization, the interest of OSCE in environmental matters is focused on how the environment links to security. While it is difficult to prove a decisive and immediate causal link between environmental issues and conflict, a number of factual observations can be made which suggest a sufficiently close relationship for environmental issues to be treated as genuine security issues in certain cases. We believe that increased attention needs to be given to the nexus between environment and security.

In 2003 the OSCE Ministerial Council in Maastricht adopted a new strategy for the OSCE Economic and Environmental Dimension. The strategy document recognizes that environmental degradation, unsustainable use of- and unequal access to natural resources have security implications. As a response, the OSCE participating States committed themselves to promote cooperation on environmental matters, to abide by principles of sustainable development and to assess and exchange information on the state of their environment. What is more, the strategy document contains an explicit commitment by OSCE participating States to support the further development of the ENVSEC initiative. These commitments give the OSCE a unique political mandate to monitor and assess environmental change and its broader security implications.

At the OSCE Ministerial Council in Sofia 2004, OSCE foreign Ministers decided to establish a panel of eminent persons to review the strategic orientation and effectiveness of the OSCE. The result of the panel's review was published on the 27 June this year in a report called "Common Purpose – Towards a More Effective OSCE". In this report the panel specifically single out the ENVSEC initiative as a good example of how the OSCE should be working in the environmental field. As you understand, for the OSCE, one of the founding partners of the initiative, the ENVSEC initiative is a key program which has our full commitment – through my office in Vienna, through the OSCE field offices in South East – and Eastern Europe, South Caucasus and Central Asia and through the delegations of OSCE's 55 participating States in Vienna.

It is the partnership that gives the ENVSEC initiative its strength. This is not only the partnership among international organizations (UNEP, UNDP and OSCE), but also the partnership with the countries where ENVSEC is implementing projects. The ENVSEC initiative aims at maintaining a constant dialogue with these countries through the ENVSEC National Focal Points and national representations to the OSCE in Vienna. The country ownership of and involvement in ENVSEC activities is invaluable to the initiative. The national expertise and political support is what ensures that the Initiative deals effectively with the risks and opportunities jointly identified through the ENVSEC assessments. I am therefore very pleased to see so many of the ENVSEC National Focal Points here today, and I hope we will have very fruitful discussions together over the next two days.

#### **Annex 4 Perspective of NATO by Suzanne Michaelis**

Programme Director, Science for Peace Programme, NATO

Since the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), one of NATO's major goals has been to improve the communication and understanding amongst its members in order to weld together the Alliance. As a tool contributing to this goal, the member states established in 1958 (47 years ago) the NATO Science Committee that launched the Science Programme. Back at that time this non-military co-operation programme supported scientific co-operation within the Alliance.

About seven years ago the focus of the Science Programme shifted towards east-west co-operation, aiming at confidence building between NATO and its Partner countries. The Programme experienced another major change in January 2004 when it was decided to focus the Programme on security issues. This change is reflected in its new name "Security Through Science" (STS).

Until recently it was a purely bottom-up programme with individual scientists submitting their proposals directly to NATO. NATO would award projects without further consultation with the countries involved or other organisations in the field. However, for applied environmental projects that accounted for about 30% of awarded NATO projects, a governmental authority had to be involved as an end-user. In recent years it became obvious that while the number of environmental projects funded through different organisations was increasing and the financial resources for such projects were limited, NATO's projects needed better co-ordination with other organisations and better integration into the national priorities.

NATO's association with the ENVSEC initiative in summer 2004 has helped our bottom-up projects in this respect. We appreciate very much the effort that the three organizations UNEP, UNDP and OSCE put into organizing ENVSEC meetings and assessment studies that allowed NATO to raise awareness of its environment and security relevant projects and to better co-ordinate with the local governments.

The ENVSEC organizations also screened NATO projects for their value to the initiative. You can find those NATO projects that have been identified as ENVSEC priorities in the ENVSEC Progress Report. Some of these projects will be presented to you during this meeting. Parties interested in the outcome of these projects may request from NATO the progress or final reports that our project directors are sending to us on a regular basis.

Today, NATO's STS Programme is aiming at concentrating its funds more-and-more on priority topics as identified by governments and local experts of our Partner countries. In other words the Programme is now open for financing top-down projects dealing with security issues. Obviously, the ENVSEC initiative can be of great help in initiating such top-down projects.

By using the ENVSEC reports, governments from South East Europe, South Caucasus, Central Asia as well as Eastern Europe will have the opportunity to request NATO's help for suitable top-down projects. One channel to request NATO's help is through your national representatives to the NATO Science Committee.

The next meeting of the Science Committee will take place on 19 October this year in Brussels and NATO is requesting for the first time concrete top-down ideas from the participants. The contact details of the Science Committee members are available from me.

I recommend that participants of today's meeting discussing with their respective ministries the possibility to use this channel and to put forward concrete ideas to NATO. Once an idea has been raised at the Science Committee meeting, a concrete proposal would have to be developed in co-ordination with ENVSEC and NATO staff.

## Annex 5 Presentation by Georgina Wigley, CIDA

„Thank you Mr. Chairman. Good morning ladies and gentlemen.

On behalf of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), I'm honoured to be among such esteemed colleagues today to share with you some thoughts on the importance of the ENVSEC Initiative. CIDA has been involved with ENVSEC since 2003 as one of its earliest and most enthusiastic supporters. We are very pleased to see the advances the initiative has made in the past two years.

*At the outset, ENVSEC had three focus areas of activity:*

- 1. vulnerability assessments and monitoring;*
- 2. capacity building and institutional development; and*
- 3. policy development and implementation.*

*ENVSEC has made solid progress in all three areas.* \* We have seen the results of the desk assessments and field work, especially in the Ferghana Valley and South-Eastern Europe. Participation here today by so many representatives from the target regions speaks clearly to achievements in capacity building and institutional development. And the publication of practical policy documents such as "Mining for Closure" is evidence of useful work in the policy area.

In preparation for this meeting, my colleague Karine Landry and I asked CIDA staff based in the regions in which ENVSEC is active to provide us with their feedback on the initiative to share with you. Among other input, we received a telling comment from our colleague Jan Sheltinga, who takes care of CIDA's Central Asia Program from Almaty, Kazakhstan. In commenting on the success of the field assessment of hot spots in the Ferghana Valley that recognized the importance of identifying and managing risks associated with industrial pollution and radioactive waste in an area with high population density, Jan noted that in the absence of ENVSEC it is doubtful that these issues would be addressed.

The same could probably be said of other topics that ENVSEC has identified as potential factors that can spark conflict or deepen existing conflict, or that conversely, could serve as a way for parties in areas of tension to work together for mutual benefit. The issue of management and disposal of melange stocks in Ukraine comes to mind. As well, we believe that ENVSEC can play a valuable role in the South Caucasus.

We congratulate the Initiative's partners and their dedicated staff for their important work towards building stability in areas that have long suffered pervasive insecurity. This is an area that requires concerted action, and we see the Initiative as an excellent platform for promoting coordination and harmonization amongst donors. We congratulate fellow donors for their continuing support to the Initiative, and urge those who have not yet joined to do so.

In his address to the United Nations General Assembly on the occasion of the recent World Summit in New York, Canada's Prime Minister highlighted security as one of Canada's three international priorities, the others being development and human rights. He stated that security represents the protection of life, and thus the basis for everything else we do. ENVSEC's work as a catalyst for furthering human security through sound environmental management fits well into the kind of vision Canada holds for a better world of peace and cooperation.

*Certainly, huge challenges remain. In his Foreword to the Worldwatch Institute's 2005 State of the World report, former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev also highlighted security as one of the top three interrelated challenges facing the world today. The other two, for him, are the challenge of poverty, and the challenge of environmental sustainability. He calls for a "Global Glasnost" – openness, transparency and public dialogue – on the part of nations, governments and citizens today to build consensus around these challenges.*

---

\* Sections in italics were not delivered at the meeting, due to restricted time.

*I would argue that ENVSEC is a positive force towards such a Glasnost. Although issues of regional and global security are almost certain to remain with us for some time, the experience and expertise being gained today by strong, cooperative initiatives like ENVSEC will serve all of us well in the future as we continue to strive for a better, more peaceful and secure world.*

My colleague Karine and I look forward to joining all of you in interesting discussions today and tomorrow to further strengthen the ENVSEC Initiative.

## **Annex 6 Presentation by Massimo Cozzone, Ministry of Environment of Italy**

"My intervention will be in the forms of questions and answers in order to clarify some key points.

### Q. 1: Why Italy is supporting the ENVSEC initiative?

A.: The answer lies well with the introductory speech made by Fritz Schlingemann: he started his speech recalling the event of cyanide spill in Baja Mare, Romania, in 2000. It was that same event that brought the Italian Ministry of Environment to support the development of a methodology to quickly assess risks from industrial hazardous activities, the REHRA methodology: this means that we are on the same track.

My previous job was to evaluate and review risk assessments for nuclear power plants, and I can tell you that these studies are very complex and costly, therefore we felt the need to develop a simpler and quick methodology that can be useful for decision-making.

### Q. 2: Where the REHRA methodology was already applied?

A.: We produced several documents and papers, the last one presented at the Transwater Conference in Dushambe last May. The methodology was actually applied in many of the regions of the interest of ENVSEC, that is Central Eastern Europe, South Eastern Europe and now in Central Asia.

### Q. 3: What is the current state of the project?

A.: In this respect let me invite you to follow the parallel session no. 2 on hazardous activities today and the parallel working group on Central Asia tomorrow, where our project team will provide more information on current activities. I can say, however, that we have found a very positive response from authorities and experts of the Countries involved, and there is a spirit of cooperation that constitutes a good basis for the success of the project.

### Q. 4: What do we foresee for the future of this project?

A.: The project looks very promising in terms of results, which will identify possible concrete measures for remediation and environmental improvements. In this respect I think that this meeting could be helpful to identify the necessary resources.

### Q. 5: What is the main added value of ENVSEC?

A.: I will never get tired to repeat that in my opinion the main added value of the ENVSEC initiative, when compared with other programmes and initiatives, is the synergy and cooperation among several international organizations. ENVSEC is indeed a very good example of this approach, and therefore we would welcome possible cooperations with other organizations, like UNECE and REC; in particular, for our project, this would be very welcome because some developments of the methodology were done in the framework of one of the UNECE Conventions, namely the Convention on Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to all of you in the plenary, we will be available with our project team to provide you during the meeting with all the information about the REHRA project."

## **Annex 7 Presentation by Ronald A Kingham, Institute for Environmental Security**

„Since the start of the Institute for Environmental Security in 2002-03, we have been pleased to collaborate with the ENVSEC Initiative in various ways. We have taken part in earlier ENVSEC meetings and NATO, OSCE, and UNEP were very much involved in The Hague Conference on Environment, Security and Sustainable Development which we organised at the Peace Palace in May 2004.

During the past year, with the support of The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, we and several partners have been carrying out our own environmental security assessments in 3 eco-regions in developing countries: the Kalimantan area in Indonesia; the Great Lakes region in Africa, and the Mantaven area in Colombia.

Like the ENVSEC assessments in Europe, our studies employ a multidisciplinary approach examining political, social, economic factors as well as environmental, security and developmental concerns. Reference to MEAs and relevant international environmental law is an especially important part of the analysis in each case. The work is done in collaboration with partners in the region – NGO and national governmental experts and officials and the Dutch embassies in these countries.

Our methodology is somewhat unique in that it makes use of satellite and radar remote sensing and aerial photography to help identify critical conditions, track changes during the last several years, analyze trends and make forecasts about various factors. In Indonesia for example, we are able to show how drought conditions and the danger of forest fires can be forecasted. The technique has also been used to detect illegal logging and in one case our partners were able to verify this using ultra light aircraft leading to arrests within just a couple of days after analysing satellite data.

Results of our three studies are expected to be ready by the end of October. These include background analysis, legal analysis, descriptive maps (prepared in co-operation with UNEP GRID-Arendal) and recommendations.

Unlike ENVSEC, which in some cases has gone beyond assessments and recommendations to operational plans and projects, we are not yet in the stage of comprehensive action plans. However, some things are already happening partly as a result of this work, for example as in the case in Indonesia.

Forest fires in Kalimantan, Indonesia pose direct threats to local communities and nature, and haze and smoke threaten health in neighbouring countries. Annually, greenhouse gas emissions from peat forest fires in the region are on par with total emissions of traffic and energy production in Western Europe.

So, in 2004, we were instrumental in bringing this situation to the attention of the Dutch Parliament, which led to a budget amendment allocating 5 million Euros in 2005 to prevent fires and illegal logging in the peat swamp forests of central Kalimantan and 10 million Euros per year in the future as part of a proposed multi-year multi-donor fund.

Our project also involves a GIS internet interface for viewing on line the satellite data for the three assessment areas. The system operates easily, even for users in developing countries who do not have high speed connections. Once public, in a few weeks you can yourself select different analytical indicators to display and for different periods of time. You can see changes over the past few years and the data will continue to be updated automatically on a regular basis.

Over the next five years we aim to continue to monitor these three regions and further develop action plans for them, in co-operation with others. In addition, we will launch several new assessments elsewhere in the developing world. The areas to be chosen will depend on the developing partnerships and other factors. Possible areas to be assessed include:

Guyana Shield (Northern Amazonia), Sudan, Congo River Basin, Horn of Africa and Mekong Delta.

Finally, another result of our project will be a report on how the studies were done. In completing our methodology, we would also like to take into account the risk assessment methodologies explained in the report called Investing in Prevention published in February 2005 by the Prime Ministers' Strategy Unit in the UK. I highly recommend this report. Its scope is broader than environmental security, but it is very useful to all of our work. When ready later this year, we hope our methodology document will help make it easier to replicate the kinds of studies we have done in other regions.

An idea for further co-operation between IES and ENVSEC would be for us to exchange information on our respective methodologies and perhaps produce together a "how-to" handbook on environmental security assessments.

Another activity to inform about is that, with the support of The Netherlands environment ministry and the UK environment and development departments, we are currently working on an Inventory of Environmental Security Policies, Programmes and Projects, which will describe the work to-date of selected OECD donor countries related to environment and security. We will also include key intergovernmental organisations and programmes and the ENVSEC initiative will be prominently featured, of course.

The Inventory will take the form of a publication briefly describing the approach of selected OECD countries and IGOs plus a database containing details of all the specific initiatives we know about. We will also try to update this information on a regular basis. Linked to this action will also be a chart of international negotiations, which are relevant for environment and security.

For more information about our Institute and these initiatives please visit our website at [www.envirosecurity.org](http://www.envirosecurity.org). Thank you for this opportunity to inform you about our work."

## Annex 8 Agenda of the meeting

### Day 1 Thursday, 29 September 2005

8.30-9.00 Registration in front of the Conference Room at the Hotel Danube

#### Opening session

Chairman: Frits Schlingemann, Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board,  
Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe

Welcome remarks by Ben Slay, Director of UNDP Regional Centre

Opening remarks by Frits Schlingemann, Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board,  
Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe

Perspective of OSCE by Bernard Snoy, Co-ordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental  
Activities

Perspective of NATO by Suzanne Michaelis, Programme Director, Science for Peace  
Programme, NATO

09.40 – 10.40 **ENVSEC National Implementation** - a moderated session with brief (2-5 min)  
highlights by the National Focal Points

10.40 – 11.00 **Presentations by Advisory Board Members**

11.00 – 11.20 Discussion

11.20 – 11.45 Coffee/tea break

#### 11.45 – 13.00 Parallel Theme Sessions

##### Room Diamond 3

###### **THEME I: Management of Trans-boundary Natural Resources and Impacts on Human Security**

Chairman: Ben Slay, UNDP  
Moderator: Marc Baltés, OSCE

10 min presentation + 5 min intervention by a recipient or donor country for each of the cases

- Reducing Transboundary Degradation in the Kura-Aras River Basin (by Jürg Staudenmann, UNDP)
- Improved Land and Water Resource Management in the upper Syr Darya Basin (by Inkar Kadyrzhanova, UNDP)
- Enhancing Transboundary Biodiversity Management in South Eastern Europe (by

##### Room Diamond 1+2

###### **THEME II: Trans-boundary Risks of Hazardous Activities and Impacts on Human Security**

Chairman: Frits Schlingemann, UNEP  
Moderator: Otto Simonett, UNEP

10 min presentation + 5 min intervention by a recipient or donor country for each of the cases

- “Mining for Closure” and Anticipated Activities at Pilot Sites in South-eastern Europe (by Philip Peck, consultant, UNEP/GRID-Arendal)
- Rocket Fuel Component (melange) Disposal (by Raul Daussa, OSCE)
- Rapid Environment and Health Risk Assessment (by Bruno Frattini, Managing

Jasmina Bogdanovic, UNEP)	Director, ICARO; Massimo Cozzone, Ministry of Environment, Italy)
Discussion 30min "Lessons learnt and opportunities to share experience"	Discussion 30min "Lessons learnt and opportunities to share experience"

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch Break

14.30 – 15.30 Plenary (Presentations of results of the theme sessions and discussion)

15.30 – 16.00 Coffee/tea break

16.00 – 18.00 **ENVSEC Future Developments**

Introduction by Frits Schlingemann, UNEP

- Institutional arrangements (national and international)
- Regional scope of the Initiative
- Financial situation and needs
- Future orientation and focus of the initiative

Potential cooperation in supporting investment projects

Dariusz Prasek, Head, Operational Support, Environment Department, EBRD

Kajetan Hetzer, Sustainability expert, SNS Bank

Discussion

18.30-onwards

Dinner Reception: Hotel Danube, Restaurant Viennois

## Day Two Friday, 30 September 2005

Chairman: Frits Schlingemann, Chairman of the ENVSEC Management Board,  
Director of UNEP Regional Office for Europe

09.00 – 11.30 **Parallel Regional Working Groups** - Latest developments, key projects and issues in the region.

Room Diamond 1	Room Diamond 2	Room Diamond 3	Room Mayor Suit
Caucasus <i>Facilitator</i> Frits Schlingemann, UNEP	Central Asia <i>Facilitator</i> Ben Slay, UNDP	South-eastern Europe <i>Facilitator</i> Harald Egerer, UNEP	Eastern Europe <i>Facilitator</i> Bernard Snoy, OSCE

11.30 – 12.00 Coffee/tea break

12.00 – 12.30 Highlights from the sub-regional discussions

12.30 – 13.00 **Possibility for presentations by other international organisations** on activities related to Environment and Security<sup>2\*</sup>  
Ronald A Kingham, Institute for Environmental Security  
Volker Sasse, FAO Sub-regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe

Other organisations are welcome to make presentations

13.00 – 13.30 **Closure of the meeting**

13.30 – 14.30 Lunch

14.30 – 18.00 Opportunities for bilateral discussions between the ENVSEC Partners & Donors

19.00 Optional: Boat trip (2 hours) with drinks/dinner

**Day Two, Friday 30 September**

09.00 – 11.30 Room Diamond 1

**PARALLEL REGIONAL WORKING GROUPS**  
Latest developments, key projects and issues in the region

**SOUTHERN CAUCASUS**

**OBJECTIVES:**

- to provide update on developments since the latest regional meetings in Tbilisi on 30<sup>th</sup> of June, and an overview for new participants on ENVSEC programme in the sub-region;
- to discuss the programme implementation or potential new areas and niches for the future;
- to identify interest from the side of other international and donor organizations to cooperate with the ENVSEC in the future.

*Facilitators:* Frits Schlingemann, UNEP  
Marc Baltés, OSCE  
Marika Palosaari, UNEP

1. Quick interventions by National Focal points from the countries of Southern Caucasus (overview & update)
2. Questions and Answers concerning activities under the ENVSEC work programme for the Southern Caucasus (ref. Work programme and the Tbilisi regional meeting record)
3. Facilitated discussion on possible new thematic areas for ENVSEC Programme:
  - Mountain ecosystem initiatives
  - Natural Disasters Preparedness
4. Cooperation with the project on Reducing transboundary degradation in the Kura Aras river basin – Tim Turner, Chief Technical Adviser of UNDP/GEF project
5. Interventions from the floor from the international organizations and Government representatives:
  - prospects for cooperation with the ENVSEC - synergies, complementary activities and/or areas of overlap/conflict with current project
5. Other points added by participants of the group

**CENTRAL ASIA**

**OBJECTIVES:**

- to provide update on developments since the last regional meetings in the sub-regions, and an overview for new participants on ENVSEC programme in the sub-region;
- to discuss the programme implementation or potential new areas and niches for the future;
- to identify interest from the side of other international and donor organizations to cooperate with the ENVSEC in the future.

*Facilitators:* Ben Slay, UNDP  
Inkar Kadyrzhanova, UNDP  
Otto Simonett, UNEP  
Raul Daussa, OSCE

1. Quick interventions by National Focal points from the countries of the Ferghana Valley - overview & update
2. Update on ENVSEC programme in Ferghana Valley
  - Progress in implementation of the REHRA project – Bruno Brattini, ICARO
  - Improved land and water resource management in the upper Syr Darya basin (UNDP/GEFproject)
  - Uranium waste management – Peter Stegnar, NATO expert; Peter Waggit, IAEA
  - Natural disasters preparedness – Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov, UNDP
  - Cluster on public participation – Aarhus Information centers – Raul Daussa, OSCE  
Eco-journalism festival and Ferghana web-portal – Inkar Kadyrzhanova
3. Possible new thematic areas for ENVSEC Programme
  - ENVSEC Assessment in Eastern Caspian region of Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan
  - ENVSEC Assessment in the Amu-Darya river basin – Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan
4. Interventions from the floor from the international organizations and Government representatives:
  - prospects for cooperation with the ENVSEC - synergies, complementary activities and/or areas of overlap/conflict with current project
5. Other points added by participants of the group

### **SOUTH EASTERN EUROPE**

#### OBJECTIVES:

- To update on developments since last meetings in the sub-regions, and an overview for new participants on ENVSEC programme in the sub-region.
- To discuss on programme implementation or potential new areas and niches for the future.
- To strengthen cooperation with National Focal Points in development and implementation of small scale projects in the framework of the ENVSEC Initiative.
- To identify interests from the side of other international and donor organizations.

*Facilitators:* Harald Egerer, Jasmina Bogdanovic, UNEP  
Peter Svedberg, UNDP  
Philip Reuchlin, OSCE

1. Short overview of the ongoing activities in the region by ENVSEC team:
  - a. Managing and reducing ENVSEC risks of hazardous activities (mining pilot projects).
  - b. Management of trans-boundary natural resources (Tisza, Sava, Prespa, biodiversity).
  - c. Cross-cutting issues (awareness, information, education) (diplomatic course, training courses).
2. Up-coming activities (Round Trip in SEE, ENVSEC conferences, workshops, etc.)
3. More active involvement of the National Focal Points (identification of the small scale projects, framework for funds). Discussion.

4. Establishment of National Coordination Groups - discussion with National Focal Points
5. Feed back from National Focal Points, donors, and other international organizations.
6. Other points added by National Focal Points, donors, other participants.
7. Training courses, target groups, topics

Documents for distribution:

- Work programme for South Eastern Europe for 2004-2006 (up-dated)
- Round Trip SEE - general description
- List of up-coming activities conferences, workshops, etc.
- Terms of References for National Focal Points
- Terms of References for National Coordination Groups

## EASTERN EUROPE

**OBJECTIVES:**

- To update on developments since last meetings in the sub-regions, and an overview for new participants on ENVSEC programme in the sub-region;
- To discuss programme implementation or potential new areas and niches for the future;
- To identify interests from the side of other international and donor organizations.

Issues from the side of ENVSEC partner organisations (preliminary timing in brackets, the final timing will depend on other issues brought up by participants at the beginning of the group session)

*Facilitators:* Bernard Snoy, Annica Carlsson, OSCE  
 Nikolai Denisov, UNEP  
 Susanne Michaelis, NATO

1. Information from national focal points on current / latest developments and issues relevant to ENVSEC (3 x 5-10 min. = 15-30 min.)
2. Preparation of the 1<sup>st</sup> phase regional assessment for Belarus-Ukraine-Moldova: time-line for 2005-2006, events, support needs, expected outputs (Nikolai Denisov UNEP, 15 min.+ discussion)
3. Synergies with other ENVSEC-related projects (a round of short briefings about on-going and planned work; 5 min per item + discussion):
  - Dniester cooperation and monitoring (Leonid Kalashnik OSCE, Susanne Michaelis NATO)
  - progress of melange assessment in Ukraine (Leonid Kalashnik OSCE)
  - pesticide clean-up in Moldova (Susanne Michaelis NATO )
  - Chernobyl programme – Oksana Leschenko, UNDP
  - other projects? (to be added by participants of the group: focal points, UNDP and OSCE officers, donors, international organisations)
4. Brainstorm on (other) national and regional issues and areas where ENVSEC involvement may be relevant and useful: environment contributing to conflict, environment helping cooperation (20-30 min.)
5. other points added by participants of the group

## Annex 9 List of participants

### National Focal Points

country / organisation	institution	contact
Albania	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Lorenc Xhaferraj</b> Blv. Gjergj Fishta Nr.6 Tirana Albania Tel: +355 4 3640 90 ext 142 Fax: +355 4 362084/5 <a href="mailto:lxhaferraj@mfa.gov.al">lxhaferraj@mfa.gov.al</a>
Armenia	Ministry of Nature Protection	<b>Ms. Ruzanna Davtyan</b> Head of International Cooperation Dept. 3rd Government Building, Republic Square Yerevan, Armenia Tel: +37410 58 53 49 Fax: +37410 58 54 69 <a href="mailto:interdpt@rambler.ru">interdpt@rambler.ru</a>
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Ms. Noune Zastoukhova</b> First Secretary, UN Desk International Organizations Department 2, Government Building, Republic Square Yerevan, Armenia Tel: +37410 54 40 41, ext. 232 Fax: +37410 54 39 25 <a href="mailto:n.zastoukhova@mfa.am">n.zastoukhova@mfa.am</a>
Azerbaijan	Ministry of Ecology and Nature Protection	<b>Mr. Imran Abulov</b> Deputy Head of Ecology and Nature Protection Policy Baku, 100 A B.Agaeva str., AZ 1073 Tel: +99412 4983907 Fax: +99412 4925907 <a href="mailto:imranabdulov@baku.az">imranabdulov@baku.az</a>
Belarus	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Denis Sidorenko</b> Head of OSCE / Council of Europe Unit Lenina str., 19 Minsk 220030, Belarus Tel: +375 17 227 5556 Fax: +375 17 227 4521 <a href="mailto:Osce.coe.unit@mfa.org.by">Osce.coe.unit@mfa.org.by</a>
	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection	<b>Ms. Natalya Golovko</b> Consultant, International Cooperation Department Kollektornaya ul. 10, Minsk 220048, Belarus Fax: 375 17 200 7454 <a href="mailto:ngolovko@minpriroda.by">ngolovko@minpriroda.by</a>
Bulgaria	Ministry of Environment and Water	<b>Ms. Detelina Peicheva</b> Expert, International Cooperation Dept. 22 Maria Luiza Blv. Sofia 1000, Bulgaria Tel: +359 2 940 6138 Fax: +359 2 980 8406 <a href="mailto:dpeycheva@moew.government.bg">dpeycheva@moew.government.bg</a>

Georgia	Ministry of Environment Protection and Natural Resources	<p><b>Mr. George Kolbin</b> Head of Department of International Relations and Conventions Tel: +99599 556510 Fax: +99532 984443 <a href="mailto:gkolbin@hotmail.com">gkolbin@hotmail.com</a></p>
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<p><b>Mr. Ioseb Abashidze</b> First Secretary International Economic Relations Dept. 4 Chitadze Str. Tbilisi 0118, Georgia Tel: +99532 28 46 78 Fax: +99532 28 46 78 <a href="mailto:Joseph_abashidze@yahoo.com">Joseph_abashidze@yahoo.com</a></p>
Kazakhstan	Ministry of Environmental Protection	<p><b>Mr. Dastan Tleubekov</b> Leading Specialist Astana, Av. Pobeda, 31, Kazakhstan Tel: +73172 591951 Fax: +73172 591981 <a href="mailto:D_tleubekov@nature.kz">D_tleubekov@nature.kz</a></p>
Kyrgyzstan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<p><b>Ms. Zamira Tohtohodjaeva</b> Counsellor 57, Erkindik blv., Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan Tel: 996-312-626773 Fax: 996-312-660501 <a href="mailto:zamirat@mail.ru">zamirat@mail.ru</a></p>
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Ministry of Environment and Physical planning	<p><b>Mr. Kosta Trajkovski</b> Head of Division for Project Preparation Str. Drezdenska No.52 1000 Skopje, Republic of Macedonia Tel: +389 2 3066 930, ext. 120 Fax: +389 2 3066 931 <a href="mailto:k.trajkovski@moepp.gov.mk">k.trajkovski@moepp.gov.mk</a></p>
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<p><b>Mr. Jani Bogoevski</b> Head of Department Dame Gruev 6 Skopje-1000, Republic of Macedonia Tel: +3892 3123 044 Fax: +3892 3115 790 <a href="mailto:Jani.bogoevski@mfa.gov.mk">Jani.bogoevski@mfa.gov.mk</a></p>
Romania	Ministry of Environment and Water Management	<p><b>Mr. Heredea Nicolae</b> Personal Councillor to the Secretary of State Libertatti Blvd. No. 12, Sector 5 Bucharest, Romania Tel: +4021 316 0243 Fax: +4021 316 0243 <a href="mailto:nheredea@mappm.ro">nheredea@mappm.ro</a></p>
Russia	Mission of the Russian Federation to the OSCE	<p><b>Mr. Andrey Kiselev</b> Counsellor Elzherzog Karl Strasse 182 1220 Wien, Austria Tel: +34 1 280 27 62 Fax: +43 1 280 31 90</p> <p><b>Mr. Vladimir Zemliakov</b> Minister Counsellor</p>

Serbia and Montenegro		Elzherzog Karl Strasse 182 1220 Wien, Austria Tel: +34 1 280 27 62 Fax: +43 1 280 31 90
	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Physical Planning of Montenegro	<b>Mr. Dragutin Grgur</b> Senior Advisor PC Vektra, Rimski trg bb Podgorica Montenegro Tel: +381 81 482 166 Fax: +381 81 234 131 draguting@mn.y
	Ministry of Science and Environmental Protection	<b>Mr. Micun Stanic</b> Consultant for transboundary pollution transport assessment and early hazard warning Directorate for Environmental Protection Omladinskih Brigada 1 11000 Beograd, Serbia and Montenegro Tel: +381 11 31 32 571 Fax: +381 11 31 32 574 Micun.stanic@ekoserb.sr.gov.yu
Tajikistan	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Luqmon Isomatov</b> Head of Department on UN Rudakiav, 42, Dushaube, Tajikistan Tel: +992327 21 07 34 Fax: +992327 21 07 59 <a href="mailto:luqmon@umomfa.tajik.net">luqmon@umomfa.tajik.net</a>
	Ministry of Industry	<b>Mr. Makhmadsharif Khakdodov</b> Deputy Minister Tel: +92 372 21 55 94 Fax: +92 372 21 55 94 <a href="mailto:nrsa@tjinter.com">nrsa@tjinter.com</a>
Turkmenistan	Ministry of Nature Protection	<b>Mr. Serdar Eyeberenov</b> Chief Specialist, International department Kemine 102 str Ministry of Nature Protection Tel: (+99312) 35-38-95(direct) (+99312) 39-85-90 (ext 117) Fax: (+99312) 39-31-84 <a href="mailto:serdar.05@mail.ru">serdar.05@mail.ru</a>
Ukraine	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Volodymyr Tolkach</b> Head of the OSCE Division Department for UN and Other International Organizations 1, Mykhailivska Sq., Kyiv 01018, Ukraine Tel: +380 44 238 1640 Fax: +380 44 272 2040 <a href="mailto:v.tolkach@mfa.gov.ua">v.tolkach@mfa.gov.ua</a>
	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Natural Resources	<b>Ms. Innesa Medvedenko</b> Director for Strategic Planning, Uritskogo vul. 35, Kyiv 03035, Ukraine Tel./ Fax: +380 44 245 1008 <a href="mailto:im@menr.gov.ua">im@menr.gov.ua</a>
Uzbekistan	State Committee on Environment	<b>Mr. Timur Tillyaev</b> Head of Environmental Law Dept. Tashkent, 99 A. Temur Str. Uzbekistan

Tel: 135 7864  
 Fax: 135 0761  
 135 7920

Donors, Potential Donors, Implementing Partners

country / organisation	institution	contact
Austria	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Mangement	<b>Ms. Elfriede More</b> Director Stubenbaste 5 A-1010 Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 1 51522 1621 Fax: +43 1 51522 7626 Elfriede-anna.more@bmlfuw.gv.at
	Austrian Development Agency	<b>Ms. Sandra Wibmer</b> Programme Officer Environment and Natural Resources Zelinkagasse 2, 1010 Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 1 90399 533 Fax: +43 1 90399 1533 Sandra.wibmer@ada.gv.at
Belgium	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Cedric Janssens de Bisthoven</b> Directorate for Environment 15 rue des Petits carmes BE-1000 Brussels, Belgium Tel: +32 2 501 4229 Fax: +32 2 501 3703 Cedric.JanssensdeBisthoven@diplobel.fed.be
	Permanent Mission of Belgium to the OSCE	<b>Ms. Brigitte Waignein</b> Second Secretary Wohllebengasse 6 1040 Wien, Austria Tel: +43 1 505 63 64 Fax: +43 1 505 03 88 viennaosce@diplobel.be
Canada	Canadian International Development Agency	<b>Ms. Georgina Wigley</b> Senior Environment Advisor 200, Promenade du Portage, Gatineau Que. K1A 0G4 Canada Tel: +819 994 0187 Fax: +819 944 7161 Georgina_wigley@acdi-cida.gc.ca  <b>Ms. Karine Landry</b> Program Officer 200, Promenade du Portage, Gatineau Que. K1A 0G4 Canada Tel: +819 994 4932 Fax: +819 944 0928 Karine_landry@acdi-cida.gc.ca
Egypt	Embassy of Arab Republic of Egypt	<b>Mr. Abdel Rahman Negmeldin</b> Diplomatic Attache Feriencikova 14 814 99 Bratislava, Slovakia Tel: +421 2 5296 4462

EBRD		Fax: +421 2 5296 1474 Egypt.embas@netax.sk
	European Bank of Reconstruction and Development	<b>Mr. Dariusz Prasek</b> Head, Operational Support, Environment Dept. One Exchange Square London EC2A 2JN, UK Tel: +44 207 338 6873 Fax: +44 207 338 7486 prasekd@cbrd.com
Finland	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Jukka Siukosaari</b> Director Unit for International Environment Policy P.O.Box 176, Katajanokanlaituri 3 FI-00161 Helsinki, Finland Tel: +358 9 160 55590 Fax: +358 9 160 56567 Jukka.siukosaari@formin.fi
Germany	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation	<b>Ms. Bettina Hedden-Dunkhorst</b> Head of Division for International Nature Conservation Konstantinstr. 110 53179 Bonn, Germany Tel: +49 228 8491 239 Fax: +49 228 8491 245 Bettina.hedden-dunkhorst@bfn.de
	Federal Foreign Office	<b>Ms. Cristina Zametzer</b> Desk Officer Wederscher Markt 1 10117 Berlin, Germany Tel: +49 1888 174460 Fax: +49 1888 1754460 As-u-3@diplo.de
Hungary	Ministry of Environment and Water	<b>Mr. Peter Kovacs</b> Head of Department Water and Soil Protection 1011 Budapest, Fo u.44-50, Hungary Tel: +36 1 457 3580 Fax: +36 1 201 2607 kovacsp@mail.kvvm.hu
Italy	Ministry for the Environment and Territory	<b>Mr. Massimo Cozzone</b> Senior Official Via C. Colombo 44 00147 Roma, Italy Tel: +38 06 5722 8141 Fax: +38 06 5722 8180 cozzone.massimo@minambiente.it
	ICARO	<b>Mr. Bruno Frattini</b> Managing director Cortona (AR) 52044 Vicolo Boni, 7 Italy Tel: +39 0575 638314 Fax: +39 0575 638379 b.frattini@icarocortona.it
	ICARO	<b>Ms. Anna Borroni</b> Environmental Analyst Involve ENVSEC/RHERA Project

The Netherlands		Cortona (AR) 52044 Vicolo Boni, 7, Italy Tel: +39 0575 638344 Fax: +39 0575 638379 a.borroni@icarocortona.it
	Ministry of Environment	<b>Mr. Jaco Tavenier</b> Policy Advisor Post Box 30945 2500 GX Den Haag, The Netherlands Tel: +31 70 339 4035 Fax: +31 70 339 1306 Jaco.Tavenier@minvrom.nl
	SNS Bank	<b>Mr. Kajetan Hetzer</b> Sustainability Analyst Pettelaarpark 120 5201 DZ's-Hertogenbosch, The Netherlands Tel: +31 73 6833 002 +31 6250 28896 (mobile) Fax: +31 73 6833 950 Kajetan.hetzer@sns.nl
Norway	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Embret Aasen</b> Adviser 7, juni plassen 1 Oslo, Norway Tel: +4722 24 36 00 Fax: +4722 24 95 80 eaas@mfa.no
Luxembourg	Permanent Representation of Luxembourg to the OSCE	<b>Ms. Béatrice Kirsch</b> Counsellor, Deputy Head of Mission Wallnerstr. 2/1/2 1010 Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 1 478 21 68 Fax: +43 1 478 21 43 Vienne.osce1@mae.etat.lu
Poland	Mission of Poland to the OSCE	<b>Mr. Marek Wejtko</b> Minister Counsellor C/O Embassy of Republic of Poland Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 699 180 70370 Fax: +43 699 180 15331
Portugal	Embassy of Portugal to the Slovak Republic	<b>Ms. Ana Montero</b> Secretary of Embassy Tel: +421 2 5241 5354 Fax: +421 2 5249 5355 Emb.portbrat@stonline.sk
Slovenia	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	<b>Mr. Robert Kokalj</b> Minister Counsellor Presernova 25 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia Tel: +386 1 478 2046 Fax: +386 1 478 Robert.kokalj@gov.sl
Switzerland	Swiss Embassy to the Slovak Republic	<b>H.E. Josef Aregger</b> Ambassador Tolskeho ul. 9 811 06 Bratislava, Slovakia Tel: +421 2 5930 1111 Fax: +421 2 5930 1100

	Swiss Delegation to the OSCE	<b>Mr. Rolf Stuecheli</b> Deputy Head of Delegation, Minister Rooseveltplatz 4-5/8 1090 Wien, Austria Tel: +43 1 505 89 25 Fax: +43 1 505 89 255 osze@vim.rep.admin.ch
Turkey	Prime Ministry, Turkish International Cooperation Administration	<b>Ms. Yesim Baktir</b> Technical Assistance Expert Akay Cad. No: 6, Kucukesat 06640 Ankara, Turkey Tel: +90312 417 27 90, ext. 327 Fax: +90312 417 27 99 y.baktir@tika.gov.tr
United Kingdom	Department for International Development	<b>Ms. Magdalena Banasiak</b> Infrastructure and Environment Advisor, ECAD Magda_banasiak@yahoo.co.uk m-banasiak@dfid.gov.uk
United States of America	U.S. Mission to the OSCE	<b>Mr. Robert Carlson</b> Political / Economic Officer Obersteingasse II 1190 Wien, Austria Tel: +43 1 31 339 3212 Fax: +43 1 31 339 3255 CarlsonRW@state.gov

#### International Organisations

Adelphi Research		<b>Mr. Carius Alexander</b> Managing Director Caspar-Theyss-Str. 14a 14193 Berlin, Germany Tel: +49 30 8900068-0 Fax: +49 30 8900068-10 carius@adelphi-research.de
FAO	FAO Sub-regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe	<b>Mr. Volker Sasse</b> Forestry Officer Benczur ut. 34 H-1068 Budapest, Hungary Tel: +36 1 461 2028 Volker.sasse@fao.org
REC HUNGARY	Regional Environmental Center for Central and Eastern Europe	<b>Mr. Stephen Stec</b> Head of Environmental Law Programme Senior Legal Specialist Ady Endre ut 9-11 2000 Szentendre, Hungary Tel: +36 26 504 000 Fax: +36 26 311 294 sstec@rec.org
University of Peace		<b>Ms. Vera Narodnitzkaia</b> Programme Director 5, Chemin du Rivage 1292 Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 737 3081 Fax: +41 22 737 3090 vnarodnitzkaia@upeace.org
UNECE		<b>Mr. Bo Libert</b> Regional Advisor

Institute for Environmental Security		Tel: +41 22 9172396 Fax: +41 22 9170621 bo.libert@unece.org
		<b>Mr. Ronald Kingham</b> Programme Director Anna Paulownastraat 103 2518 BC The Hague, The Netherlands Tel: +31 70 365 1074, +32 2 688 0243 Fax: +31 70 365 1306, +32 2 688 2685 rkingham@envirosecurity.org
International Atomic Energy Agency		<b>Mr. Peter Waggit</b> Waste Safety Specialist Decommissioning and residues unit Division of Radiation, Transport and Waste Safety Wagramer Strasse 5, A-1400 Vienna, Austria Tel: +431 2600-0 Fax: +431 2600-7 p.waggit@iaea.org

EnvSec Partner Organisations

UNEP	UNEP Regional Office for Europe	<b>Mr. Frits Schlingemann</b> Director and Regional Representative International Environment House, 15 Chemin des Anémones, CH-1219 Châtelaine Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 8024 Fax: +41 22 917 8089 Frits.schlingemann@unep.ch
		<b>Ms. Marika Palosaari</b> Associate Programme Officer 11-13 chemin des Anémones CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 8779 Fax: +41 22 797 3420 marika.palosaari@unep.ch
		<b>Mr. Ron Witt</b> DEWA Regional Coordinator 11 chemin des Anémones CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland Tel: + 41 22 917 8295 Fax: + 41 22 917 8229 Ron.witt@grid.unep.ch
	UNEP/DEWA/GRID - Europe	<b>Mr. Harald Egerer</b> Programme Officer, Natural Resources P.O. Box 500 1400 Vienna, Austria Tel: +43 1 26060 4545 Fax: +43 1 26060 74545 Harald.egerer@unvienna.org
	UNEP Office in Vienna	<b>Ms. Jasmina Bogdanovic</b> Consultant, Environment and Security Vienna International Center

NATO		<p>P.O. Box 500  1400 Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 26060 5018  Fax: +43 1 26060 6730  Jasmina.bogdanovic@unvienna.org</p>
	UNEP/GRID-Arendal	<p><b>Mr. Nikolai Denisov</b>  Head of ENVSEC Programme Management Unit  11-13 Ch. des Anémones  Geneva, Switzerland  Tel: +41 22 917 8281  Fax: +41 22 797 3420  Nickolai.denisov@unep.ch</p> <p><b>Mr. Otto Simonett</b>  Director of Operations  11 chemin des Anémones  CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland  Tel: +41 22 917 8342  <a href="mailto:Otto.simonett@unep.ch">Otto.simonett@unep.ch</a></p> <p><b>Mr. Steinar Sorensen</b>  Managing Director  Longum Park, Service Box 706  N-4808 Arendal, Norway  Tel: +47 370 35 730 / 5734  Fax: +47 370 350 50  Steinar.sorensen@grida.no</p>
	Lund University / GRID Arendal	<p><b>Mr. Philip Peck</b>  Consultant UNEP/GRID  Tegnersplatsen 4  22100 Lund, Sweden  Tel: +46 709 220739  Fax: +46 46 222 0200  <a href="mailto:Philip.peck@grida.no">Philip.peck@grida.no</a>, <a href="mailto:philip.peck@iiee.lu.se">philip.peck@iiee.lu.se</a></p>
		<p><b>Ms. Susanne Michaelis</b>  Associate Programme Director  Bd. Leopold III  1110 Brussels, Belgium  Tel: +32 2 707 4520  Fax: +32 2 707 4232  <a href="mailto:s.michaelis@hq.nato.int">s.michaelis@hq.nato.int</a></p> <p><b>Mr. Peter Stegnar</b>  Prof. Dr., Project Manager  IRC Slovenija  Jozef Stefan Institute, coordinator  Jamova 39  Ljubljana, Slovenia  Tel: +386 1 477 3831  Fax: +386 1 477 251 9385  <a href="mailto:peter.stegnar@ijs.si">peter.stegnar@ijs.si</a></p>

OSCE	OSCE Secretariat	<p><b>Mr. Bernard Snoy</b>  Coordinator of OSCE Economic and Environmental Activities  OSCE Secretariat, Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 51 436 525  Bernard.snoy@osce.org</p> <p><b>Mr. Marc Baltés</b>  Senior Economic Adviser  OSCE Secretariat, Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 51 436 742  Marc.baltes@osce.org</p> <p><b>Ms. Annica Carlsson</b>  Environmental Adviser  OSCE Secretariat, Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 51 436 913  Annica.carlsson@osce.org</p> <p><b>Mr. Raul Daussa</b>  Associate Programme Officer  OSCE Secretariat, Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 51 436 237  Raul.daussa@osce.org</p> <p><b>Mr. Philip Reuchlin</b>  Economic and Environmental Assistant  OSCE Secretariat, Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 51 436 223  Philip.reuchlin@osce.org</p> <p><b>Mr. Stefan Gold</b>  Intern  OSCE Secretariat, Vienna, Austria  Tel: +43 1 51 436 756  Philip.reuchlin@osce.org</p>
	OSCE Armenia	<p><b>Ms. Gohar Ghazinyan</b>  Senior Environmental Assistant  89Teryan, Yerevan  Republic of Armenia  Tel: +37410 54 10 63 / 116  Fax: +37410 54 10 61  gghazinyan@osce.org</p>
	OSCE Belarus	<p><b>Mr. Vahram Abadjian</b>  Deputy Head  11, Prospect Gazety Pravda  220116 Minsk, Belarus  Tel: +375 17 272 34 96  Fax: +375 17 272 34 98  Vahram.abadjian@osce.org</p>
	OSCE Croatia	<p><b>Mr. Stefano Gnocchi</b>  Head of Civil Society, Project Management Unit  OSCE Florijana Andraseca 14  HR-10000, Zagreb, Croatia  Tel: 01-3096620  Fax: 01-3096621  Stefano.gnocchi@osce.org</p>

UNDP	OSCE Georgia	<b>Ms. Nino Antadze</b> Economic and Environment Assistant 4, GMT Plaza Freedom Square, 0105, Tbilisi, Georgia Tel: +995 32 24 42 01, ext. 212 (office) +995 99 92 64 58 (mobile) Fax: +995 32 24 42 02 Nino.antadze@osce.org
	OSCE Moldova	<b>Mr. Kenneth Pickles</b> Political Military Mission Member Mitropolit Dosoftei 108 MD – 2012, Chisinau, Moldova Tel: +373 22 223495, ext. 209 Fax: +373 22 223465 Kenneth.pickles@osce.org
	OSCE Turkmenistan	<b>Mr. Markku Visapaa</b> Economic and Environmental Officer OSCE Centre in Ashgabat, 15 Turkmenbashi Shayoli 744005 Ashgabat, Turkmenistan Tel: +993 12 353 092 Fax: +993 12 353 041 Markku.Visapaa@osce.org
	OSCE Ukraine	<b>Mr. Leonid Kalashnyk</b> Environmental Activities Officer 16 Striletska St. Kyiv 01034, Ukraine Tel: +380 44 492 0382 Fax: +380 44 492 0383 Leonid.kalashnyk@osce.org
	OSCE Uzbekistan	<b>Mr. Ulugbek Ruziev</b> Program Assistant 12b, Afrosiyob street 700015, Uzbekistan Tel: +998 71 140 04 70, ext.120 Fax: +998 71 140 04 67 Ulugbek.Ruziev@osce.org
	UNDP Armenia	<b>Mr. Armen Martirosyan</b> Environmental Governance Portfolio Coordinator 14 Adamyany St., Yerevan 375010, Armenia Tel: +37410 566073, ext. 104 Fax: +37410 543811 Armen.martirosyan@undp.org
	UNDP Azerbaijan	<b>Ms. Jamila Ibrahimova</b> Senior Programme Advisor 3 UN 50th Anniversary Street Baku AZ 1001, Azerbaijan Tel: +99412 498 9888 ext. 112 Fax: +99412 492 2491 Jamila.ibrahimova@undp.org
	UNDP Belarus	<b>Mr. Dmitry Goloubovsky</b> Program Officer 17 Kirov str., Minsk, Belarus Tel: +375 17 227 45 27 Fax: +375 17 226 03 40 Dmitry.goloubovsky@undp.org
	UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina	<b>Mr. Goran Vukmir</b> Environment Portfolio Manager

	Gundulicava 24 Banja Luca, Bosnia and Herzegovina Tel: +387 51 303 318 Fax: +387 51 303 318 gvukmir@undp.ba
UNDP Bulgaria	<b>Mr. Maxim Vergeichik</b> Program Analyst 25 Khan Krum Str. Sofia, Bulgaria Tel: +359 2 9696 112 Fax: +359 2 9813 184 Maxim.vergeichik@undp.org
UNDP Georgia	<b>Ms. Mariam Shotadze</b> Program Analyst UN House in Georgia 9 Eristavi St., 0179, Tbilisi, Georgia Tel: +99532 25 11 26 / 28 / 29 / 30 Mariam.shotadze@undp.org
UNDP Kyrgyzstan	<b>Mr. Zharas Takenov</b> International Senior Programme Officer Environment Unit Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek, Chui av. 160 Tel: +996 312 61 12 13 Fax: +996 312 61 12 17 zt@undp.kg
UNDP Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	<b>Ms. Anita Kodzoman</b> Programme Analyst Head of Energy and Environment „Dimitrije Cupovski“ – 8, P.O.Box 305 1.000 Skopje, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia Tel: +389 2 3116 335, ext. 118 Fax: +389 2 3118 261 Anita.kodzoman@undp.org
UNDP Moldova	<b>Ms. Margareta Petrusevschi</b> Programme Analyst UN House 131, 31 August 1989 str. Chisinau, MD 2012, Moldova Tel: +373 22 220045 Fax: +373 22 22041 Margarita.petrusevschi@undp.org
UNDP Russia	<b>Ms. Irina Bredneva</b> Programme Assistant Ostozhenka st. 28 119034, Moscow, Russia Tel: +095 787 21 42 Fax: +095 787 21 42 Irina.bredneva@undp.org
UNDP Serbia and Montenegro	<b>Ms. Christina Hansson</b> Environmental Programme Officer 69 Internacionalnih Brigada 11000 Belgrade, Serbia and Montenegro Tel: +381 11 2040 411 Fax: +381 11 3444 300 Christina.hansson@undp.org
UNDP Tajikistan	<b>Mr. Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov</b> Programme Analyst 39 Aini St.

	Dushabe, Tajikistan Tel: +992 372 210670 / 80 Fax: +992 372 510021 Sukhrob.khoshmukhamedov@undp.org
UNDP Turkey	<b>Ms. Katalin Zaim</b> Program Manager Birlik Mahallesi 2. Cadde.No: 11 06610 Cankaya Ankara, Turkey Tel: +90312 454 1125 Fax: +90312 496 1463 Katalin.zaim@undp.org
UNDP Turkmenistan	<b>Mr. Rovshen Nurmukhamedov</b> Regional Environment Cooperation Assistant 40 Galkynysh Street Ashgabat 744000, Turkmenistan Tel: +993 12 425250 Fax: +993 12 425317 Rovshen.nurmuhamedov@undp.org
UNDP Ukraine	<b>Mr. Sergei Volkov</b> Senior Programme Manager 1, Klovsy Uzviz Kiev, 01021, Ukraine Tel: +38 044 253 9363 Fax: +38 044 253 2607 Sergei.volkov@undp.org
UNDP Uzbekistan	<b>Mr. Alexey Volkov</b> National GEF Advisor 4, T. Shevchenko str Tashkent, 700029, Uzbekistan Tel: +998 71 120 34 50 Fax: +998 71 120 34 85 Alexey.volkov@undp.org
UNDP Regional Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery	<b>Ms. Maria Olga Gonzalez</b> Disaster Management Specialist 11-13 chemin des Anemones, 1219 Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +4122 917 8239 Fax: +4122 917 8060 mogonzalez@undp.org
UNDP Regional Bureau for Europe and the CIS (RBEC)	<b>Ms. Oksana Leshchenko</b> Programme Specialist, Chernobyl Coordinator, Environmental Focal Point One UN Plaza, DC 1-1672 New York, NY 10017, USA Tel: + 1 212 906 6734 Fax: + 1 212 906 6595 Oksana.leshchenko@undp.org
UNDP Regional Office for Europe and the CIS	<b>Mr. Ben Slay</b> Director 35 Grosslingova Bratislava, Slovakia Tel: +421 2 5933 7444 Fax: +421 2 5933 7450 ben.slay@undp.org  <b>Mr. Vladimir Litvak</b> PSPD: Energy and Environment

Regional Coordinator for Climate Change  
35 Grosslingova  
Bratislava, Slovakia  
Tel: +421 2 5933 7  
Fax: +421 2 5933 7450  
vladimir.litvak@undp.org

**Ms. Inkar Kadyrzhanova**  
Programme Specialist  
35 Grosslingova  
Bratislava, Slovakia  
Tel: +421 2 5933 7168  
Fax: +421 2 5933 7450  
inkar.kadyrzhanova@undp.org

**Mr. Jürg Staudenmann**  
Water Governance Advisor  
35 Grosslingova  
Bratislava, Slovakia  
Tel: +421 2 5933 7250  
Fax: +421 2 5933 7450  
juerg.stadenmann@undp.org

**Mr. Vladimir Mamaev**  
Regional Technical Advisor  
35 Grosslingova  
Bratislava, Slovakia  
Tel: +421 2 5933 7267  
Fax: +421 2 5933 7450  
vladimir.mamaev@undp.org

**Mr. Tim Turner**  
Chief Technical Advisor  
1 Sarah Siddons Walk  
The Park, Cheltenham Glos  
GL50 2LW United Kingdom  
+44 (0) 1242 576461  
trturner@btinternet.com

**Mr. Peter Svedberg**  
Energy and Environment Practice Assistant  
35 Grosslingova  
Bratislava, Slovakia  
Tel: +421 2 5933 7168  
Fax: +421 2 5933 7450  
peter.svedberg@undp.org

Total number of participants: 108 (73 male and 35 female).