

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE CURRENT FUNCTIONING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AARHUS CONVENTION

Please send your response before 30 December 2012 to: aarhus.survey@unece.org

This Questionnaire is distributed to Parties and Signatories to the Aarhus Convention and to key stakeholders pursuant to Decision IV/6 on the work programme for 2012-2014, Activity IX, (ECE/MP.PP/2011/2/Add.1)¹, adopted by the Aarhus Convention's Meeting of the Parties at its fourth session (29 June - 1 July 2011, Chisinau).

This questionnaire aims to:

- a) Collect information on countries' and stakeholders' views of the current Convention's activities, including the work of the Task Forces;
- b) Identify barriers that may potentially compromise the smooth functioning and effective implementation of the Convention;
- c) Determine improvements that can be made in order to ensure the smooth functioning and effective implementation of the Convention.

The purpose of the Questionnaire is to contribute to the preparation of an in-depth evaluation² of the current functioning and implementation of the Convention. The Questionnaire covers three areas: the impact of past and current activities under the Convention on national implementation through evaluation of the open-ended Convention's bodies, barriers to the achievement of the objectives identified under these processes, and possible solutions to the obstacles identified. The results and recommendations of the evaluation will be considered in the process of preparation of draft decisions, including the Strategic Plan 2015-2020 to be submitted to the Meeting of the Parties at its fifth session (June 2014).

You are requested to complete and return this questionnaire to the following email address: **aarhus.survey@unece.org** with subject line "Convention survey from [Party/Signatory/Other country/Organization]" for processing **before 30 December 2012**.

Please note that your answers to this questionnaire are crucially important for the quality and objectivity of the evaluation of the current functioning and implementation of the Convention.

Selected respondents will be contacted for follow-up interviews.

We are looking forward to your cooperation on this important activity. Thank you!

¹ Available from:

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/mop4/Documents/ece_mp.pp_2011_2_add.1_eng.pdf

² The approved proposal on the in-depth evaluation can be accessed here: http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/wgp/WGP-15/ece.mp.pp.wg.1.2012.7-CRP.2_clean.pdf

CONTACT INFORMATION

Please provide name and contact data of the person who filled in the questionnaire:

First Name:

Last Name:

Position:

Name of the Organization:

Type of organization: Government Intergovernmental organization Non-governmental organization Other (please specify)

Address:

Telephone:

Fax:

E-mail:

Website:

After each question, please check the answer box or boxes that you find the most appropriate. You can check a box by double clicking on the square and selecting 'checked'. Please add additional pages for explanation if necessary.

Part I. How would you evaluate the work of the Convention's bodies and their meetings?

Section A: the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention³

1. How regularly does a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the sessions of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention? (please select one)
 - Regularly (all or almost all)
 - Irregularly (sometimes)
 - Never or almost never
-

³ <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/mop.html>

2. What barriers do preclude or may in the future preclude your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the sessions of this body?
3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Meeting of the Parties? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)
- Efficiently getting through agenda of its sessions and adopting all proposed Meeting of the Parties decisions ____
 - Providing close oversight of the work of the Convention's subsidiary bodies ____
 - Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention ____
 - Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing previous decisions of the Meeting of the Parties ____
 - Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
 - Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
 - Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____
 - Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the implementation of the Convention ____
 - Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected above, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Meeting of the Parties? (please select one)

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The working of the Meeting of the Parties has been clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items are moved through; how to get access to documents is clear and transparent; procedures of how the Meeting of the Parties worked are clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Meeting of the Parties has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

7. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the sessions of the Meeting of the Parties has been:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

8. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the sessions:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

9. The decisions of the Meeting of the Parties are clearly communicated:

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. Please provide concrete examples of how decisions of the Meeting of the Parties have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please give the reference to the specific decision to which you refer as well as briefly explain how you consider it has helped national implementation. Please include as many examples as possible (this information is very helpful for us).

*Section B: the Working Group of the Parties to the Convention*⁴

1. How regularly does a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the meetings of the Working Group of the Parties to the Convention? (please select one)
 - Regularly (all or almost all)
 - Irregularly (sometimes)
 - Never or almost never

⁴ <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/wgp.html>

2. What barriers preclude (or may in the future preclude) your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of this body?

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Working Group of the Parties? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)

- Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda and adopting a list of agreed decisions and outcomes ____
- Providing close oversight of the work of the Convention's Task Forces and other intersessional activities ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the relevant decisions of the Meeting of the Parties ____
- Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____
- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected above, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Working Group of the Parties? (please select one)

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The working of the Working Group of the Parties has been clear, open and transparent. (e.g. how the agenda items are moved through; how to get access to documents is clear and transparent; procedures of how the Working Group of the Parties worked are clear)

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Working Group of the Parties has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

7. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of the Working Group of the Parties has been:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

8. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

9. The decisions of the Working Group of the Parties are clearly communicated:

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. Please provide examples of how decisions and outcomes of the Working Group of the Parties have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please give the reference of the specific decision or outcome of the Working Group of the Parties to which you refer as well as to briefly explain how you consider it has helped national implementation. Please include as many examples as possible (this information is very helpful for us).

Section C: the Task Force on Public Participation in Decision-making⁵

1. How regularly did a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the meetings of the Task Force? (please select one)
- Regularly (all or almost all)
- Irregularly (sometimes)
- Never or almost never
2. What barriers preclude or may in the future preclude your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of this body?

⁵ <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/ppdm.html>

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Task force? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)

- Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention's provisions relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the decisions of the Meeting of the Parties relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
- Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____
- Providing a forum for discussing the future direction of work on this topic under the Convention ____
- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected above, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Task Force? (please select one)

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The Task Force is progressing well in fulfilling its mandate and meeting its objectives.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. Would you say the thematic scope of the Task Force is too broad, about right, or too narrow?
(please select one)

Too broad

About right

Too narrow

How would you suggest the thematic scope should be changed to meet your concerns?

7. The working of the Task Force has been clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items are moved through; how to get access to documents is clear and transparent; procedures of how the Task Force worked are clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

8. My Party/Signatory/other country/stakeholder group has the possibility to put forward issues for inclusion in the agenda of the Task Force.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

9. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Task Force has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of the Task Force has been:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

11. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

12. The outcomes of the Task Force meeting are clearly communicated:

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

13. The activities under the Task Force have been useful to my Party/Signatory/other country/stakeholder group in meeting the relevant objectives of the Convention.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

14. Please provide concrete examples of how activities under the Task Force have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please feel free to include as many examples as you think relevant (this information is very helpful for us).

15. A Task Force is/is not the appropriate type of body for furthering the goals of the Convention in this area. Please explain your answer.

*Section D: the Task Force on Access to Justice*⁶

1. How regularly did a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the meetings of the Task Force? (please select one)
 - Regularly (all or almost all)
 - Irregularly (sometimes)
 - Never or almost never

2. What barriers precluded your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of this body?

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Task force? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)
 - Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda ____
 - Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention's provisions relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
 - Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the decisions of the Meeting of the Parties relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
 - Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
 - Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
 - Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____
 - Providing a forum for discussing the future direction of work on this topic under the Convention ____

⁶ <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/public-participation/aarhus-convention/envpptfwg/envppatoj/meetings.html>

- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the future implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Task Force? (please select one)

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The Task Force is progressing well in fulfilling its mandate and meeting its objectives.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. Would you say the thematic scope of the Task Force is too broad, about right, or too narrow? (please select one)

- Too broad
- About right
- Too narrow

How would you suggest the thematic scope should be changed to meet your concerns?

7. The working of the Task Force has been clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items are moved through; how to get access to documents is clear and transparent; procedures of how the Task Force worked are clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

8. My Party/Signatory/other country/stakeholder group has the possibility to put forward issues for inclusion in the agenda of the Task Force and define its activities.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

9. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Task Force has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of the Task Force has been:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

11. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

12. The outcomes of the Task Force meeting are clearly communicated:

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

13. The activities under the Task Force have been useful to my Party/Signatory/ other country/stakeholder group in meeting the relevant objectives of the Convention.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

14. Please provide examples of how activities under the Task Force have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please feel free to include as many examples as you think relevant (this information is very helpful for us).

15. A Task Force is/is not the appropriate type of body for furthering the goals of the Convention in this area. Please explain your answer.

*Section E: the Task Force on Electronic Information Tools*⁷

1. How regularly did a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the meetings of the Task Force? (please select one)
 - Regularly (all or almost all)
 - Irregularly (sometimes)
 - Never or almost never

2. What barriers precluded your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of this body?

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Task force? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)
 - Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda ____
 - Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention's provisions relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
 - Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the decisions of the Meeting of the Parties relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
 - Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
 - Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
 - Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____
 - Providing a forum for discussing the future direction of work on this topic under the Convention ____

⁷ <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/electronictools.html>

- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the future implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Task Force? (please select one)

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The Task Force has fulfilled its previous mandate and met its objectives.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. Would you say the thematic scope of the TF was too broad, about right, or too narrow? (please select one)

Too broad

About right

Too narrow

How would you suggest the thematic scope should be changed to meet your concerns?

7. The working of the Task Force was clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items were moved through; how to get access to documents was clear and transparent; procedures of how the Task Force worked was clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

8. My Party/Signatory/other country/stakeholder group had the possibility to put forward issues for inclusion in the agenda of the Task Force.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

9. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Task Force has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of the Task Force was:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

11. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

12. The outcomes of the Task Force meeting were clearly communicated:

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

13. The activities under the Task Force were useful to my country/stakeholder group in meeting the relevant objectives of the Convention.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

14. Please provide concrete examples of how activities under the Task Force have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please feel free to include as many examples as you think relevant (this information is very helpful for us).

15. A Task Force was/was not the appropriate type of body for furthering the goals of the Convention in this area. Please explain your answer.

*Section F: the Task Force on Public Participation in International Forums*⁸

1. How regularly did a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/ organization take part in the meetings of the Task Force? (please select one)

Regularly (all or almost all)

Irregularly (sometimes)

Never or almost never

2. What barriers precluded your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of this body?

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Task force? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)

- Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention's provisions relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the decisions of the Meeting of the Parties relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
- Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____

⁸ <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/public-participation/aarhus-convention/envpptfwg/envppwgcrp/task-force-on-public-participation-in-international-forums/task-force-on-public-participation-in-international-forums.html>

- Providing a forum for discussing the future direction of work on this topic under the Convention ____
- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the future implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected above, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Task Force? (please select one)

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The Task Force has fulfilled its mandate and met its objectives.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. Would you say the thematic scope of the Task Force was too broad, about right, or too narrow? (please select one)

- Too broad

About right

Too narrow

How would you suggest the thematic scope should be changed to meet your concerns?

7. The working of the Task Force was clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items were moved through; how to get access to documents was clear and transparent; procedures of how the Task Force worked was clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

8. My Party/Signatory/other country/stakeholder group had the possibility to put forward issues for inclusion in the agenda of the Task Force and defining its activities.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

9. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Task Force has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of the Task Force was:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

11. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

12. The outcomes of the Task Force meeting were clearly communicated:

- Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

13. The activities under the Task Force were useful to my Party/Signatory/other country/stakeholder group in meeting the relevant objectives of the Convention.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

14. Please provide concrete examples of how outcomes under the Task Force have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please feel free to include as many examples as you think relevant (this information is very helpful for us).

15. A Task Force was/was not the appropriate type of body for furthering the goals of the Convention in this area. Please explain your answer.

*Section G: Working Group on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs)*⁹

1. How regularly did a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the meetings of the Working Group on GMOs? (please select one)

Regularly (all or almost all)

Irregularly (sometimes)

Never or almost never

2. What barriers precluded your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of the Working Group on GMOs?

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Working Group on GMOs? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)

- Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention's provisions relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the relevant decisions of the Meeting of the Parties ____
- Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____

⁹ <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/public-participation/aarhus-convention/envpptfwg/envppwgcrp/envppgmowg.html>

- Providing a forum for discussing the future direction of work on this topic under the Convention ____
- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the future implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected above, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Working Group on GMOs? (please select one)

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The Working Group on GMOs has fulfilled its mandate and met its objectives.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. Would you say the thematic scope of the Working Group on GMOs was too broad, about right, or too narrow? (please select one)

- Too broad

About right

Too narrow

How would you suggest the thematic scope should be changed to meet your concerns?

7. The working of the Working Group on GMOs was clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items were moved through; how to get access to documents was clear and transparent; procedures of how the Working Group on GMOs worked was clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

8. My country/stakeholder group had the possibility to contribute to setting the agenda of the Working Group on GMOs and defining its activities.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

9. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Working Group on GMOs has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of the Working Group on GMOs was:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

11. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

12. The outcomes of the Working Group meetings were clearly communicated:

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

13. The activities under the Working Group on GMOs were useful to my country/stakeholder group in meeting the relevant objectives of the Convention.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

14. Please provide examples of how activities under the Working Group on GMOs have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please feel free to include as many examples as you think relevant (this information is very helpful for us).

15. The Working Group on GMOs was/was not the appropriate type of body for furthering the goals of the Convention in this area. Please explain your answer.

*Section H: Working Group on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs)*¹⁰

1. How regularly did a delegate/delegation from your Party/Signatory/other country/organization take part in the meetings of the Working Group on PRTRs? (please select one)

Regularly (all or almost all)

Irregularly (sometimes)

Never or almost never

2. What barriers precluded your Party/Signatory/other country/organization from regular participation in the meetings of the Working Group on PRTRs?

3. What criteria would you use to measure the effectiveness of the Working Group on PRTRs? Please rank each criteria from 0-5 (0 = not relevant, to 5 = extremely important)

- Efficiently getting through the meeting agenda ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the Convention's provisions relevant to the mandate of the Task Force ____
- Providing close oversight of progress (or lack thereof) by individual Parties in implementing the relevant decisions of the Meeting of the Parties ____
- Raising the profile of and political priority given to the Aarhus Convention issues at national level ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchanges of views between Parties ____
- Providing an opportunity for exchange of views between Parties and stakeholders ____

¹⁰ <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/prtr.wg.html>

- Providing a forum for discussing the future direction of work on this topic under the Convention ____
- Providing opportunities for discussing specific issues or constraints relevant to the future implementation of the Convention ____
- Other (please specify): _____

4. Bearing in mind the criteria you have selected above, how do you rate the overall effectiveness of the Working Group on PRTRs? (please select one)

- Excellent
- Good
- Satisfactory
- Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

5. The Working Group on PRTRs has fulfilled its mandate and met its objectives.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please explain:

6. Would you say the thematic scope of the Working Group on PRTRs was too broad, about right, or too narrow? (please select one)

- Too broad

About right

Too narrow

How would you suggest the thematic scope should be changed to meet your concerns?

7. The working of the Working Group on PRTRs was clear, open and transparent (e.g. how the agenda items were moved through; how to get access to documents was clear and transparent; procedures of how the Working Group on PRTRs worked was clear).

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

8. My country/stakeholder group had the possibility to contribute to setting the agenda of the Working Group on PRTRs and defining its activities.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

9. The participation of the public (e.g. NGOs) in the work of the Working Group on PRTRs has been adequately facilitated (e.g. had opportunity to participate in the discussions and comment on the documents) and proved useful for quality of the outcomes?

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

10. The organization and servicing by the Secretariat of the meetings of these bodies was:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

11. How would you rate the logistic arrangements of the meetings:

Excellent

Good

Satisfactory

Unsatisfactory

Please explain:

12. The outcomes of the meetings were clearly communicated:

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

13. The activities under the Working Group on PRTRs were useful to my country/stakeholder group in meeting the relevant objectives of the Convention.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

Please explain:

14. Please provide examples of how activities under the Working Group on PRTRs have influenced national implementation of the Convention. Please feel free to include as many examples as you think relevant (this information is very helpful for us).

15. The Working Group on PRTRs was/was not the appropriate type of body for furthering the goals of the Convention in this area. Please explain your answer.

Part II. Tools, mechanisms and processes

1. How effective do you consider each of the following tools and mechanisms in facilitating the Convention's implementation in the Country? (rate each item from 0-5 (0=not helpful, 5= very helpful))

Decisions of the Meeting of the Parties¹¹ _____

Findings and recommendations of the Compliance Committee¹² _____

National reporting¹³ _____

Recommendations and guidelines, including:

(a) The Aarhus Convention: An Implementation Guide¹⁴ _____

(b) Guidelines on access to information, public participation and access to justice with respect to genetically modified organisms, adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its first session (Lucca, Italy, 21-23 October 2002)¹⁵ _____

(c) Almaty Guidelines on Promoting the Application of the Principles of the Aarhus Convention in International Forums, adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its second session (Almaty, Kazakhstan, 25-27 May 2012)¹⁶ _____

(d) List of the international forums as adopted by the Working Group of the Parties at its sixth meeting (Geneva, 5-7 April 2006)¹⁷ _____

¹¹ <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/mop.html>

¹² <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/pubcom.html>

¹³ <http://apps.unece.org/ehlm/pp/NIR/index.asp>

¹⁴ <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/acig.pdf> (The Guidance document is currently being revised)

¹⁵ <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/documents/gmoguidelinesenglish.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2005/pp/ece/ece.mp.pp.2005.2.add.5.e.pdf>

¹⁷ <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2005/pp/ece/ece.mp.pp.2005.2.add.3.e.pdf> (prepared by the Task Force on Public Participation in International Forums)

(e) Recommendations on the more effective use of electronic information tools to provide public access to environmental information, adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its second session (Almaty, Kazakhstan, 25-27 May 2012)¹⁸ _____

(f) Draft Guidance for National Nodes of the Clearinghouse Mechanism¹⁹ _____

(g) Draft Recommendations on Public Participation in Decision-making in Environmental Matters²⁰ _____

(h) Guidance on reporting requirements prepared by the Compliance Committee (ECE/MP.PP/WG.1/2007/L.4)²¹ _____

(i) Guidance document on the Aarhus Convention Compliance Mechanism²² _____

Capacity-building activities at the UNECE regional level _____

Capacity-building activities at the subregional level (please specify): _____

Capacity-building at the national level _____

Analytical studies (please specify)²³: _____

Resources of the Aarhus Clearinghouse²⁴ _____

Jurisprudence database²⁵ _____

Collection of thematic case studies²⁶ _____

Other (please specify): _____

¹⁸ <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2005/pp/ece/ece.mp.pp.2005.2.add.4.e.pdf>

¹⁹ <http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2006/pp/ECE.MP.PP.WG.1.2006.5.add.1.e.pdf> (prepared by the Task Force on Electronic Information Tools)

²⁰ http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/ppdm/recommendations/Draft_Recommendations_on_PPDM_21_10.2012_clean.doc (prepared and being considered by the Task Force on Public Participation in Decision-making)

²¹ http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/documents/2007/pp/ece_mp_pp_wg_1_2007_L_4_e.pdf

²² http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/pp/compliance/CC_GuidanceDocument.pdf

²³ Examples are available from: <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/public-participation/aarhus-convention/envpptfwg/envppatoj/analytical-studies.html>.

²⁴ <http://aarhusclearinghouse.unece.org/>

²⁵ <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/public-participation/aarhus-convention/envpptfwg/envppatoj/jurisprudenceplatform.html>

²⁶ Examples are available from: <http://www.unece.org/env/pp/ppif.compendium.html>

2. What other tools that are not used at the moment would you recommend (please specify):

3. How often do you contribute resources to the Aarhus Clearinghouse

- No contribution
- 1-2 times per year
- 3-4 times per year
- More than 4 times

4. Please indicate what are the barriers to contribute to the Aarhus Clearinghouse

5. How often do you use the resources from the Aarhus Clearinghouse?

- Do not use
- less than 2 times per week
- Less than 4 times per month
- Less than 12 times per year

6. Please specify organizations with which your Party/Signatory/other country/organisation had cooperation with in regard to the implementation of the Aarhus Convention in each of the following categories:

a. UN institutions (e.g. UNDP, UNEP, UNITAR, UNESCO)

b. Secretariats of ECE MEAs

c. Secretariats of other MEAs

d. Other international organizations (e.g, OSCE)

e. Regional environmental centers

f. Aarhus Centres

g. Other

If you have examples of cooperation with the above organizations that you would like to bring attention to, please explain:

Part III. Future implementation of the Convention

1. Please identify the three most significant barriers to the effective implementation and functioning of the Convention in your country/of your organization geographical focus and provide suggestions as to how these might be overcome, with particular attention to actors and responsibilities.

Access to information

Obstacle 1 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 2 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 3 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Public Participation

Obstacle 1 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 2 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 3 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Access to Justice

Obstacle 1 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 2 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 3 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Access to Information, Public Participation in Decisionmaking and Access to Justice with regard to genetically modified organisms

Obstacle 1 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 2 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 3 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Public Participation in International Forums

Obstacle 1 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 2 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

Obstacle 3 (title: _____).

Solution: _____

2. What multilateral processes and tools do you suggest for the future Convention's Work Program 2015-2017? For example, additional subsidiary bodies on particular subjects (please specify), guidelines on particular subjects (please specify), advisory assistance mechanisms etc. Please explain why you consider these would be particularly effective to facilitate implementation of the Convention.
