

SESSION A9

Session A9 – Transboundary SEA

Workshop A9.1

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Nick Bonvoisin & John Horberry | Introduction to the session / workshop | Slides |
| Eike Albrecht (absent due to illness) | SEA in Binding Land Use Plan Procedures in Brandenburg (Germany), with Special Focus on Transboundary Consultation | Slides |
| Rita Albergaria and Teresa Fidelis | Transboundary EIA: Iberian Experiences | Slides |
| Maja Kostic-Mandic | Transboundary SEA (or lack of it) in decision-making on the BUK-BIJELA power plant (case study) | Slides + paper |
| Merrell-Ann Phare | SEA as a transboundary watershed management tool | (slides – but awaiting permission) |

ANNEX II: Reporting format for Topic Sessions

Topic leaders are asked to use this reporting format to summarize the highlights of their session. Not all of the information called for below may be relevant to your session. In that case, the checklist should be customized to purpose.

| | |
|---|---|
| ID number and title of conference session (e.g. A1 Legal and Policy frameworks for SEA in Africa) | |
| <i>Session Leader(s)</i> | Nick Bonvoisin (Nicholas.Bonvoisin@unece.org); John Horberry (john.horberry@ntlworld.com) |
| <i>Focus and approach</i> | <p>List the papers and presentations made in the session</p> <p>Transboundary EIA: Iberian Experiences, by Rita Albergaria and Teresa Fidelis, Departamento de Ambiente e Ordenamento do Território, Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal</p> <p>Transboundary SEA (or lack of it) in decision-making on the BUK-BIJELA power plant (case study), by Maja Kostic-Mandic, Assistant Professor on Private International Law and Environmental Law, University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Serbia and Montenegro</p> <p>SEA as a transboundary watershed management tool, by Merrell-Ann Phare, Centre for Indigenous Environmental Resources, Canada</p> <p>The presentations were followed by a brief general discussion with the</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | presenters responding as a panel. |
| <i>Main trends and issues</i> | <p><i>Itemize the main trends, issues and developments discussed at the session</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absence of SEA was identified as the problem • Potential solutions depend on clear agreements or relationships at appropriate political level • Effective application also requires established cooperation mechanisms at regional level • Public involvement is crucial for identifying and addressing key issues – often the driver for raising issues to decision making level • TB environmental issues at project level generally stem from upstream policy decisions <p>Indicate aspects that are of particular importance or present pressing challenges for SEA (e.g. for legislation, practice, linkages, cross-cutting issues or improving standards and building capacity)</p> |
| <i>Profile of the status, quality and effectiveness of SEA</i> | <p><i>Rate the current status of the aspect, area or component of SEA being addressed (e.g. relatively well developed, some deficiencies, numerous limitations, etc)</i></p> <p>No actual cases were discussed as the dominant message was the absence of SEA in cases where it would have been of benefit.</p> <p>Key issues that would have influenced effectiveness or impact included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear agreement on level of government at which decision making and communication responsibilities are located • Recognition of existing international agreements • Open recognition of conflicts of interest at government level • Avoidance of “hidden” policy decisions that shape future TB projects • Joint data collection • Enabling NGO’s to access assessment data |
| <i>Key findings and lessons</i> | <i>Specify the main conclusions from your session and their implications for SEA development in general or for the particular aspect, area or component discussed</i> |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| | <p>Significant challenges in achieving TB SEA at policy level but significant consequences downstream that are hard to remedy through TB EIA. Major barrier seems to lie at political level – unwillingness to enter into TB agreements, and difficulty of coordinating central and regional government level responsibilities.</p> |
| <i>Future directions</i> | <p><i>Indicate key research and development needs to improve SEA quality and effectiveness for aspect, area or component discussed</i></p> <p><i>Identify any priorities for future development of SEA for the aspect, area or component discussed or in general (moving the field ahead and beyond its current scope of application)</i></p> <p>Priority lies in developing effective agreements or relationships (bilateral or multilateral) to ensure that SEA can be considered in relation to upstream policy decisions.</p> |