



## Second Meeting HORIZON 2020 Review, Monitoring and Research Sub-Group

Copenhagen, 30-31 March 2011

### DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD

*Agenda, list of participants, presentations and all documents are available at the following link:*  
<http://coordination.h2020.net/rmr/meetings/2011-03-30-31-copenhagen-2nd-rmr-sub-group-meeting>

#### 1. Welcome and Opening

EEA (David STANNERS, H2020 RMR sub-group Chairman) opened the meeting and set the scene for the second meeting of the Horizon 2020 Review, Monitoring and Research sub-group. The purpose of the meeting was to have an open discussion and share views and ideas, thus it was organised around a few break-out sessions. The Chairman highlighted that this meeting was now extended to include more countries, it was embedded in the framework of the ENPI-SEIS project and it benefited from greater variety of existing information to monitor progress that was available for the last meeting.

#### Tour de table/Round table

During the “tour de table” the participants were asked to introduce themselves and express their areas and themes of interest, as well as their expectations from the meeting. [*See document “Expectations” in annex*]. These issues were clustered in the following three groups: a) cooperation, b) concrete outcomes, c) ways of working.

## SESSION 1: Taking stock

#### 1. Update on the Horizon 2020 Initiative

Introducing this agenda item, DG ENV (Andrew MURPHY) emphasised the added value of the cooperation within the Mediterranean region under the umbrella of H2020 initiative, and briefly touched upon the outcome of the recent Steering Group meeting held in Amman, Jordan. Reflecting on the complexity of the cooperation, he called for a better coordination among the international organisations active in the region.

DG EuropeAid (Alessandra SENSI) underlined the importance of the country missions in the process. The visits would link to the priorities and seek operational commitment from the countries.

Touching upon the activities of the Capacity Building/MEP project, Prof. Michael SCULLOS briefed the participants about the collaboration developed with the UNEP RACs (Regional Activity Centres) and synergies with other regional initiatives aimed at aligning the progress with the *aquis*. He reminded that CB/MEP activities were extended also to West Balkan countries and Turkey.

As part of the progress on the Pollution Reduction component, Vasilios NIKITAS presented the status of the projects developed under the Mediterranean Hot Spots Investment Programme – Project Preparation and Implementation Facility (MeHSIP-PPIF). He emphasised that in developing these projects was followed an integrated approach with inputs from National Activity Plans, rather than concentrating on quick wins. He clarified that MeHSIP would not fund these projects, but would prepare them for applying for loans from international funding sources.

In concluding the discussion, EEA (David STANNERS) underlined the importance of ensuring necessary synergies and interactions between the activities of the three sub-groups.

## **2. Review of the outcomes of the first RMR sub-group meeting in light of recent development**

EEA (David STANNERS) briefly summarised the outcome of the 1<sup>st</sup> RMR meeting that took place in October 2008 in Athens (presentations, materials and follow-up available at the following [link](#)). He touched upon the intensive discussions that took place following the meeting with all EC partners to design the ENPI-SEIS project currently in place. The country visits within the project, which were about to start, were also aimed to build upon the RMR discussions.

With respect to the review and monitoring component, it was mentioned that many reports and assessments were being done in the countries and that they could be used as an element to support indicator-based assessments. For the research component there was still potential to be explored with other actors in the region, and the next point in the agenda would provide some path for reflection.

UNEP/MAP (Saverio CIVILI) reminded about the UNEP/MAP indicator proposal (encompassing H2020 + wider indicators) that was put forward at the first RMR meeting, and which was still on the table to be taken into consideration in the further process, also along the lines of the EEA-UNEP/MAP cooperation.

## **3. Research projects/activities in the Mediterranean**

The main question addressed during this session was how the research component could contribute to the further work of the sub-group. To that end, a presentation on the Mediterranean Innovation and Research Coordination Action (MIRA) under FP7 was done by the MIRA Coordinator (Rafael RODRIGUEZ), who outlined the planned activities of the MIRA project to support the objectives of H2020. This information was complemented by DG RTD (Aur lie PANCERA) on other research projects supported in the Mediterranean on water management (notably the ERA-Wide projects). The need of a wider public engagement in the process was also addressed, possibly through creation of a working group or other platform for coordination of such engagement. The representative of EMWIS (Eric MINO) supported this idea highlighting water as a key point that needed further elaboration.

On behalf of JRC, Giovanni BIDOGLIO presented FATE<sup>1</sup> activities embedded into the H2020 process and specifically mentioned the spatial data sets for North Africa and Middle East.

As a next step, the EEA would follow-up on the current discussion and coordinate with DG RTD to discuss potential links to MIRA as well as to identify similar research initiatives in the Mediterranean region to move towards concrete realisation on the assessment side.

## **4. Reporting on the ENPI-SEIS project, objectives, activities and consultation meeting held on 11-12 November 2010**

EEA (Gordon McINNES) presented the ENPI-SEIS project objectives, recent activities and next steps in the project implementation, covering among other issues the following:

- NFPs both from environmental and statistical side were appointed in the partner-countries;
- Consultation meeting held in November 2010 identifying the main priorities for the region;
- Country visits were planned to start in the beginning of April as an important milestone in the cooperation with the countries.

In response to a question from Jordan on the difference in methods for data collection and how to ensure the representativeness of data, Gordon McINNES clarified that this would be reviewed and streamlined in a step-by-step process jointly with the countries, looking for a harmonized approach using international or EU standards.

---

<sup>1</sup> FATE is the ensemble name for the pool of activities related to the assessment of fate and impacts of pollutants in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems carried out at the Institute for Environment and Sustainability (IES) of the Joint Research Centre (JRC).

## SESSION 2: How to report on environmental progress?

At the start of the session, H.E Fatmir MEDIUH Albania Environment Forests and Water Administration Minister who was visiting the EEA on that day, took the opportunity to share the experience of Albania in cooperating with EEA, in particular illustrating the importance of environmental assessments and inter-institutional cooperation when moving towards the EU legislation. In complementing that, the EEA Executive Director (Jacqueline McGLADE) welcomed the participants at the RMR meeting, revisited the background and expectations of the meeting. Furthermore, she touched upon the latest EEA developments on near-real time information, and citizen's involvement in environment discussion ([link to EoE platform](#)) as an example of citizens science and progress that can be achieved together. She highlighted biodiversity as a good example where non-governmental actors are of great importance and do data collection for official reports. She also mentioned that in every thematic area, EEA was aiming at going beyond formal networks and requirements, at the same time keeping quality assurance as key criteria.

Following the discussion on the modality of work with civil society, CEDARE reminded the meeting of the existence of the Arab Network for Environment and Development (RAED): network of Arab non-governmental organizations very active in the region.

### 5. General introduction – Developing a regular reporting process on the environmental progress “Depolluting the Mediterranean”

The Chairman informed the participants that the design of a coherent indicator-based process and framework for regular indicator-based analyses was a key outcome of the RMR sub-group and would be the basis for reviewing environmental progress with the H2020. Such review was foreseen to include country assessments, profiles and information to better understand the existing actions being taken in countries and their associated problems and solutions. To feed the discussion, this session started with short presentations on relevant key experiences.

EEA (Thomas HENRICH) presented the model followed in the production of the State of the Environment Report (SOER) 2010. This was followed by a presentation of the Euro-Mediterranean Information System on know-how in the Water sector (EMWIS, Eric MINO) and focused in particular on the experience in supporting Mediterranean countries in the implementation of national information system on water, promoting a unique source of information as WISE in Europe. Important capacity building activities are being implemented by EMWIS to better harmonise data and information. According to E. Mino, SEIS is an opportunity to further support the willingness of the countries in the development of national information systems, putting emphasis on the critical need for more convergence at a national and regional level.

On behalf of Eurostat (who sent their apologies for absence from the meeting), EEA (Cecile RODDIER-QUEFELEC) presented the Eurostat activities on Environment statistics and the preeminent role of the statistical community in the process towards a regular reporting of environmental progress.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- EEA mentioned the DPSIR assessment model, as a very useful tool which specifies the different types of information needed for an integrated assessment, and the MDIAK reporting chain which clarifies the different levels of information required and available;
- EEA clarified that the country assessment part of the SOER 2010 did not include marine pollution as this was tackled through the regional seas assessment, and countries did not choose it as part of their national assessments.
- The Chairman complemented the SOER presentation with some particular elements for the country assessment part, such as: **Commonality** – analysing the environment prospects in countries based on a manageable number of common issues, **Diversity** – highlighting the diversity of countries realities by providing the context within the reader can understand that having environmental achievements is not straightforward, and **Flexibility** – looking at different types of challenges and identify specific issues The Chairman indicated that the end-result of the country assessment part of the SOER 2010 reflected better the country situation compared to the top-down analysis.

- UNEP/MAP (Saverio CIVILI) indicated the creation of a new instrument - a compliance committee towards the Barcelona Regulation, which would mean that non-reporting would be considered as non-compliance to the Convention. The UNEP/MAP was also engaged in the implementation of an ecosystem approach (first report to be issued by the end of this year), and within this framework, first quality status report to be issued next year. On the information side, the larger Information System - so called InfoMAP, was under finalisation, and the MED POL information system would become operational by the end of the year.

## 6. Break-out session

During this session, the participants discussed and shared their information, experiences and ideas to help frame and build the review mechanism in three separate breakout groups. To ease and guide the discussion, the following questions were proposed:

- What does the review mechanism look like? Is it a mechanism, a book, a map, presentation, indicators, combination of outputs? What would be useful for you to make appropriate responses? Create a set of instruments to have different effects.
- What should it include/focus on?
- How do we expect it to work? Commitment on the steps, how we will build it (people, consultant, EEA/UNEP-MAP, etc). How to communicate?

One rapporteur per group was appointed to report the main points discussed back to the plenary, including the key ideas that would be developed further and that would be constituted options for the coming next thematic discussions. Below is a summary of the main points from the groups presented in plenary.

### BREAK-OUT SESSION 1 – Developing a regular reporting process on the environmental progress

#### **Type of review mechanism:**

Mixed and flexible approach needed to address short-term H2020 monitoring needs while addressing sustainability in the longer-term based on SEIS. A periodic reporting (every 2 years), with some guidelines linked to indicators seems the most appropriate process to develop, together with a strong regional integration.

Goals and policy questions should be elaborated more specifically taking into account regional and national contexts. The need to develop indicators in line with their policy use, with the appropriate balance between cost/data availability versus accessibility was pointed out. The potential development of composite indicators, as raised during the first RMR meeting, still appears as a valid path.

The group pointed out that in terms of support of the mechanism, the underpinning “technical aspect” (eb portal, reports or a mixture of that) is not important; the message is the most important. The ENPI-SEIS country visits should help in defining more concrete steps.

**Content/Audience:** To use both - regional and the national level reporting for policy makers, with a wider dissemination towards the civil society.

#### **How to develop it?**

The following lines of actions were identified:

- Working on improving data quality based on existing work;
- Sharing/connecting existing information with the support of national teams to unify methods and data sharing mechanisms based on existing guidelines;
- Identifying targets and developing pilots (one pilot for each priority area), with an added value on top of this - production of scenarios, specific indices/indicators.
- Multi-purpose outputs: web portal, newsletters, maps, reports.

Following the presentation of the three rapporteurs, the following points were raised:

- Prof. Michael SCOULLOS underlined the need to discuss the type or group of indicators to be developed and proposed to set up some methodological aspects that should be address during the thematic discussions.
- George AKL underlined the multidisciplinary nature of the foreseen mechanism (many players with different and multiple backgrounds), and called for an overall coordination.

All agreed that coordination is a key aspect in the further work.

In summarising the discussions, the Chairman clarified that the foreseen reporting mechanism was something regular and multiple (different tools in parallel to address different audience), and highlighted the fact that the target audience had not yet been sufficiently clarified. In response to the need to discuss further the indicators and to identify a core set, the UNEP/MAP proposal, made at the 1<sup>st</sup> RMR meeting, was distributed as a reference point to support the upcoming thematic discussions.

## **SESSION 3: Thematic discussions**

This session focused on the three H2020 priority areas (in line with the ENPI-SEIS South project consultations in November 2010):

1. Water covering fresh and marine water (quality and quantity) and urban waste water,
2. Waste (covering municipal waste), and
3. Industrial emissions.

For each thematic discussion, the sessions were organised in two steps: 1). General overview of the thematic area, supported by key contributions, to set-up a common understanding; 2). Discussions in break-out session, aimed at exploring into further detail the key questions.

A rapporteur was identified to synthesise the breakout session discussions to the plenary, focusing on developing story-lines from the countries' perspectives.

The overall guiding questions for discussion under this session were the following:

- What are the priority questions/policy questions?
- What are we trying to collect?
- What do we already have, including indicators, analysis, SoE (availability, coverage, level of harmonization)?
- How to assess progress?
- What are good country practices?

### **7. Water**

In introduction to the thematic discussion on water, the session started with short presentations on key relevant experiences (MED POL, EMWIS, EEA). Presentations made are available at the link on page 1 of this report.

#### **BREAK-OUT SESSION 2 – Main outputs of breakout groups**

##### **Main policy questions:**

- What are the key questions for the water issue?
- What is already there?
- What are we learning?
- What are common elements?

##### **- Answers:**

Focus should be given to:

- Urban waste water emissions and infrastructure, as a percentage of completion of reduction actions and measures (for managers implementing action plans), or toward reduction target, expressed as pollutant loads (total t/year) (for environmental assessments), normalised (kg/y/cap) (to enable

indicators for comparisons), focused on the main sources of pollution (Hot spots) and their impact on Mediterranean water quality, with a specific interest to source control and product control;

- Mediterranean Water Quality, in particular to the ecological status (water, biota), and oxygen depletion, eutrophication, chemicals (toxicity and bioaccumulation);

- Human health, in connection to the issue of water demand, water stress and water reuse, the seafood contamination and bathing water quality.

#### **Policy-Assessment/Indicator – Data Chain**

The importance of developing appropriate policy assessment based on indicators and relevant data chain was pointed out, in particular to be built on existing information: Barcelona Convention, MSFD, WFD, and also national policy questions.

The existing tools, such as water accounting, inventories of sources should be used to support the process.

**As regard indicators**, in addition to the existing national indicators, the following Mediterranean indicators could be proposed to start with:

- WW01/coastal population

- WW03/m3

- Treatment level for generated pollution

The groups raised also the importance of developing data streamlining and to limit as much as possible duplicate reporting. Data accessibility and confidentiality should also be specifically addressed.

Following the introductory presentations and feedback from the breakout sessions, the following points were raised:

- Despite the complexity of the issue (tackling marine waters together with water quality and quantity), the policy questions are known and it seems useful to repeat them in the broader context of H2020, but without having to reinvent the wheel and to use the existing wealth of information and data.
- In terms of monitoring aspects, UNEP/MAP (Saverio CIVILI) explained the process developed for identified hotspots in each Mediterranean country; these hotspots (reference point set by the countries), are being formally endorsed by the Contracting Parties and are used by international organisations and donors (Industrial projects). For microbial/bathing water quality, MED POL identified numerous and big differences between country assessments and MEDPOL assessments, and called for the development of Mediterranean standards, supported by a report on compliance. Saverio CIVILI reminded that MED POL carried out 8 years ago an inventory of sewage plants (2003 and 2008 surveys on coastal cities) and that the 2008 exercise was currently being completed with all the countries (geo-referenced data). UNEP/MAP was not using an indicator based approach, but developing an ecosystem approach and started to introduce the issue of indicators.
- As mentioned earlier, the UNEP/MAP indicator proposal could be a basis for further discussion (the document gives some indication as regard data sources and availability) and to be completed during the country visits. The countries asked to get more detailed indicators sheets and guidelines to support this activity. EEA has already done some prioritisation on an EU scale through the WFD and MSFD, and it was proposed to use this work as guidelines.
- A clear definition of coastal areas/coastal cities should be agreed among the sub-group before starting working on the indicators.
- A mapping of current information systems would be helpful (metadata, data accessibility and confidentiality in the UNEP/MAP database and in the countries), together with a state of the art of the reporting commitments.

## 8. Industrial Emissions

In setting the scene, EEA (Eva GOOSSENS) presented the overall purpose and history of Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTR) in general, as well as international legal framework on the EU and the international level. The European PRTR covering 32 European countries and hosted by EEA was presented as an example of a fully developed PRTR. Following this, in three separate breakout groups the participants discussed relevant policy questions, possibly applicable indicators and ideas about immediate pilots in the countries. A core group was appointed to help prepare feedback to the plenary.

### BREAK-OUT SESSION 3 – Main outputs of breakout groups

#### **Main policy questions:**

- What is feasible to be achieved (focus on hot spots, industrial pollution register)?
- What is feasible, what is covered (sectors, activities, pollutants)?
- How to use the information?

#### **Answers**

- A focused State of the Environment (SoE) for the Mediterranean (using general indicators on pollution from industry to water and air in a DPSIR context with input from all H2020 countries) as a first step to identify the key industrial sectors and pollutants of relevance in the region.
- Creating a register/data base to include facility based information (the SoE to be used as screening tool for defining the coverage of such a database which could focus on a small number of sectors with high environmental and health impact).

#### **Facility based data and registers**

The outcomes of the discussions showed that there is a need to have reliable data on facility level at least for the polluters with big impact on the environment (relatively small number of polluters). This information can form the basis for policy development and evaluation and will allow identification and prioritization of investments as well as improvement of pollution indicators (at regional, national and local level).

#### **How to reach these goals**

The breakout groups suggested a stepwise approach where at a first stage in a pilot the key polluters (few facilities with huge impact) in the coastal areas would be involved in data gathering covering the most important pollutants. Through the pilot a capacity building would take place through assistance in getting emissions data and in developing reporting formats and systems.

#### **Differentiation within H2020 region**

As recognition of the different position of the H2020 countries it was suggested that countries should be divided into 2 groups. The first group would include the countries without a (plan for a) fully developed PRTR. For these countries, the above mentioned stepwise approach for the development of a register or database through pilots would apply. The second group would include the countries with a PRTR (reflecting the UN-ECE PRTR Protocol). For these countries, no reporting would be initiated but the countries would make the PRTR data available for further indicator-based assessments.

Following the break-out group presentations, the plenary discussed the depollution trends of the Mediterranean. Saverio CIVILI commented that the emissions to air and releases to water had been reduced in the Mediterranean. He also clarified that the confidentiality of entities had still not been resolved and the data policy strategy of MED POL had yet to be finalised.

## 9. Waste

The session was opened by a presentation of Eurostat activities on waste statistics by EEA on behalf of Eurostat followed by a presentation on the Croatian experience in doing a country assessment for waste given by Jasna KUFIRIN (Head of Waste Department of the Croatian Environment Agency/EEA NRC for Waste).

In three separate break-out groups, the participants discussed and shared their information, experiences and ideas on waste management. To ease and guide the debate, the following questions were proposed:

- From your point of view and experience, what are the main environmental (and health) challenges resulting from municipal waste in your country?
- What is the status of waste management in your country, e.g. managed/engineered /unmanaged landfills/uncontrolled dumps?
- When working on monitoring and generation of data related to municipal waste, what would be your priorities: amounts generated; how is it managed; population coverage with waste collection services; location and status/quality of waste management sites; other?
- What is the situation of the data collection?

### BREAK-OUT SESSION 4 – Main outputs of breakout groups

#### **Identify challenges:**

The groups identified a number of challenges regarding mainly the cost and methods of waste management, keeping WEEE, hazardous waste and medical waste separate, problems of different data collection methods, question of finding good practices on waste management as well as awareness-raising.

#### **Proposed indicators:**

During the discussions the following points came up as proposals for indicator development:

- Municipal waste generation per capita
- Landfills + dumps: number, capacity, location (mapping)
- Collection, separate collection, coverage of population with waste services
- Management of collected waste including informal sector

#### **Outputs**

After the discussion the groups came up with concrete proposals for possible outputs which included the need to develop national and regional strategies for solid waste management, need for assessment of progress, need to involve the private sector and find investors, to explore the use of economic instruments, and to link waste to climate policies.

Following this break-out session, the floor was open to participants' comments on the issues discussed during the two-day meeting. The following points were raised in the discussion:

- DG ENV (Andrew Murphy) commented that it was necessary to justify why data collection was needed - showing the economic effect or the effect on population and the regional element can make it seem less critical;
- Lebanon expressed concerns over the need to clarify some definitions (like defining coastal zones) before going into indicator development. The need of study tours to other countries was also expressed and information about on-going projects and data provided to MEDSTAT;
- Palestinian Authority raised concerns of awareness-raising regarding data sharing and asked for clarification on benefits of sharing data and having open systems;
- Jordan raised concerns for the need of special expertise in indicator development;
- Israel formulated an opinion that existing and available data should be the basis for choosing indicators.



## **10. Overall conclusions and next steps**

In wrapping up, EEA (David Stanners) thanked everybody for their active contributions and concluded the two-day sessions by proposing the following actions as next steps in the process:

1. EEA to propose possible pilots (on the three priority areas of H2020) from which the countries could choose where they want to participate. The list of possible pilots will be sent to the RMR sub-group for comments.
2. In parallel to the first action point, EEA to invite participants for comments from the RMR sub-group meeting regarding possible next steps they might want to have.
3. During 2011 (starting already early April), EEA country visits to ENP region to take place focusing on specified country priorities and trying to engage countries e.g. in country-level assessments or indicator development.

The participants were informed that the information, presentations and communication materials from the meeting would be distributed through the H2020 RMR portal. The portal would be further developed to make it even more informative (e.g. web-map services, wiki like structure). Feedback from the countries on that would be very welcome.

## **ANNEX: Expectations of the RMR meeting from the participants shared at initial tour de table**

As done at the 1<sup>st</sup> RMR meeting, the following is a list of main expectations expressed about the meeting itself and the RMR sub-group in general by the participants. These issues are clustered in the following three groups: a) cooperation, b) concrete outcomes, c) ways of working

### a) Cooperation

- Sharing of tools
- Country level cooperation
- Coordinate/cooperate with countries
- Cooperation
- Combine efforts
- Cooperation
- Get to know relevant people
- Improve institutional framework
- Work with countries
- Build links and bridges

### b) Concrete outcomes

- Improve regularity of statistics (especially on waste)
- Common language
- Common benefits
- Data collection methods, designing indicators
- Identify synergies (industrial pollution)
- Enhance shared environmental information
- Get indicators in place
- Speed up the process of H2020
- Serve H2020 goals
- Gather country needs
- Progress in indicator development
- Progress in setting up IT systems
- Progress beyond ideas
- Concrete actions
- Filling gaps for scenario analysis
- See the status of activities and contribute to them
- Data policy enhancement
- Improve quality and quantity of data
- Provide technical guides
- Enlarge the network
- Build capacities
- Data collection methods
- Improvements on the three themes
- Information and methods to improve statistics on waste
- Provide scientific support
- Mobilize scientific knowledge
- Integrate research element
- FATE

### c) Ways of working

- Listen to countries
- Provide contribution needed
- Facilitate data sharing and policy making
- Value added to statistics

- Data sharing
- Learn about countries reaching H2020 goals
- Promote research projects
- Share experience
- Benefit from experiences
- Change expertise / ideas
- Clarify what is possible
- How to better coordinate the three areas
- Share experiences
- Information on H2020
- Building synergies
- Learn about other projects
- Learn about H2020 progress and the ENPI-SEIS project
- Share views and experiences
- Knowledge sharing
- Wider channels of communication
- Use of experiences
- Better understanding of countries' capacities
- Share experiences
- Collect information
- Have concrete steps
- Gather information on H2020 data availability