



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Implementing the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context in Armenia

**National training workshop for policy makers, administrative officials,
and NGO representatives**

Yerevan, Armenia, 26-29 November 2013

Workshop report

Unedited version

January 2014

Prepared by M. Khotuleva and O. Borysova



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Contents:

<i>Implementing the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context in Armenia.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>National training workshop for policy makers, administrative officials, and NGO representatives</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Yerevan, Armenia, 26-29 November 2013.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1. Background</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>3. Methodology</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>4. Summary of Training Outcomes.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>4.1. Linkage between Planning and SEA Processes.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>4.2. Screening (Determining whether SEA Is Needed for the Proposed Plan) and Scoping ..</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>4.3. Analysis of Baseline Trends</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>4.4. Analysis of Proposed Development Priorities and Alternatives.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>4.5. Preparing the SEA Report</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Assessment of Cumulative Impacts</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>4.6. Ensuring Effective Public Participation in SEA</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>4.7. Ensuring that SEA Outcomes Are Taken into Consideration in Decision Making and Monitoring</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>5. Trainer's Observations.....</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
<i>6. Workshop Evaluation.....</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>7. Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Acknowledgements.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Annex 1: Workshop Agenda</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Annex 2. List of Participants.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Annex 3: Summary of Workshop Evaluation Results</i>	<i>18</i>



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

1. Background

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a primary tool for ensuring that environmental, including health, considerations are thoroughly taken into account in the development of plans and programmes. SEA promotes sustainable development by mainstreaming the environment into economic and social development and integrating green economy and sustainable consumption and production targets into strategic decision-making process.

Armenia, the only country in the Eastern European and Caucasian region to join the SEA Protocol to the UNECE Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment (January 24, 2011), is gradually introducing the SEA elements into the planning and permitting systems. In 2013, a new draft Law on the Environmental Impact Assessment and Review Process was developed in Armenia to define the notion of SEA and set a number of requirements to the SEA process. From 2003 to now, various SEA capacity building activities have been undertaken, including:

- UNDP, with the support of the CEA REC and OECD, implemented the SEA capacity building programme funded under the Environment and Security Initiative (2004-2005). This programme was undertaken in cooperation with the Espoo Convention Secretariat and aimed to strengthen the SEA capacity and support the implementation of the SEA Protocol in these countries. The outcomes of the programme included the review of the SEA capacity building needs at the national and sub-regional level; organization of workshops; review of relevant national legislations; and implementation of the pilot SEA of the Yerevan Master Plan;
- The SEA capacity building workshop (EcoGlobe, 2005).

This training workshop "Implementing the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in Armenia" was organised by the UNECE Secretariat in close cooperation with the Ministry of Ecology of the Republic of Armenia and the EcoGlobe NGO for decision makers, administrative officers, and representatives of non-governmental organisations to provide a step-by-step guidance on application of the SEA as a tool in the strategic decision-making and strengthen the implementation of the UNECE Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context. The workshop was held on 26–29 November 2013 in Yerevan, Armenia.

The workshop was first of a number of technical advice and capacity building activities envisioned for 2013 – 2016 under the Work Plans of the Espoo Convention and its Protocol on SEA. Other activities include carrying out reviews of the existing national regulatory and legislative frameworks, implementing pilot projects, developing guidelines and conducting other activities to strengthen local SEA/EIA capacity and administrative capacities of authorities in charge of the environmental assessments. These activities are funded by the EU Programme 'EaP GREEN: Greening economies in the European Union's Eastern Partnership countries'¹ and among other things aim to promote use of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as

¹ The "Greening economies in the European Union's Eastern Partnership countries (EaP-GREEN)" is a four year EU funded Programme. It is implemented jointly by OECD, UNECE, UNEP and UNIDO for the benefit of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and the Ukraine from 2013-2016. Espoo Convention Secretariat is responsible for implementation of the SEA/EIA related component. More information on the Programme is available following the link: <http://www.oecd.org/env/outreach/eapgreen.htm>



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

essential planning tools for sustainable development in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine.

2. Workshop objectives

This workshop aimed to achieve the following objectives:

- Provide support to the Republic of Armenia in applying the Espoo Convention Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment;
- Provide the training participants with detailed recommendations on using SEA as an efficient tool to support strategic decision making and public engagement;
- Employ a stepwise approach to introduce the participants to the SEA procedures as defined by the SEA Protocol;
- Provide the participants with relevant knowledge and skills required to enable them to use SEA independently and develop the national SEA practices;
- Train the specialists to act as experts and trainers in the pilot SEA and other training activities planned for 2014-2016 and aiming to support the establishment of the SEA system and practice in Armenia.

The workshop agenda included two main components:

1. An introductory part, where the Espoo Convention and its Protocol on SEA were presented, as well as the progress with adapting and developing relevant legislation on environmental assessment in Armenia; and
2. A three-day practice-oriented training on SEA.

The training agenda is presented in Annex 1 to this report).

Twenty seven participants have completed the training course and received the training certificate, including experts from ministries, research institutions, NGOs and other organizations. Other 15 participants attended selected training sessions. The list of participants is presented in Annex 2.

By a mutual decision of UNECE and host party, the workshop was delivered in Russian without translation into Armenian. Training materials were also prepared in Russian.

3. Methodology

The workshop programme was largely based on SEA training manual developed by the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ/InWEnt). The training course used the casework methodology of the Harvard Business School that focuses training on the practical approaches to SEA, adjusted to take account of local specifics, and knowledge and skills of the participants. It extensively employed interactive methods; and conclusions were formulated through joint debate rather than providing 'ready-made' teaching messages.

The training course was divided into half-day training sessions (please see the Workshop Agenda in Annex 1). Each training unit begins with an introduction provided by the trainer, followed by a thematic exercise. To facilitate practical training sessions, a case study featuring the use of SEA tool for the National Energy Policy of the fictitious Lusentia Republic was further elaborated. The fictitious case study provided context information required to solve the tasks set for the participants, followed by trainer's practical tips and instructions. Participants worked in small teams, which were established at the beginning of the training. Only two small exercises were completed in one large



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

group comprising all the participants. Furthermore, the public participation exercise was modified as a business role-playing game in the course of the workshop.

The fictitious case was developed in a manner that provides similarity in some respects between the Lusentia Republic and Armenia. This approach helped to provide a broader perspective that extends beyond the country-specific context. Participants were able to complement the background information provided in the case study with any required data pertaining to the Armenian reality or drawn from elsewhere, thus enabling participants to employ their real life experience – not necessarily specifically related to SEA.

The training manual and slides were modified to encourage participants to find possible practical solution for the tasks on designing an SEA process for this fictitious case through the following exercises:

- a. Discussing the planning process and providing linkages with the SEA process
- b. Determining whether SEA is needed and scoping
- c. Reviewing baseline trends
- d. Reviewing proposed development priorities and alternative options
- e. Assessing cumulative impacts
- f. Using effective means of participation
- g. Finding linkages between programme preparation and SEA²
- h. Ensuring reflection of SEA results in decision-making as well as an adequate management and monitoring system for implementation
- i. Managing SEA effectively within budgetary and time constraints

In order to strengthen the learning effect and provide specific real-life examples of how can certain typical SEA tasks be performed in practice, each section was concluded by discussion entailing short presentations from real SEA cases conducted in the region delivered by the trainers. In addition, two real-life SEAs were presented in more detail throughout the whole training, in order to consistently demonstrate practical issues, problems, and potential solutions. Because the available SEA practice is currently limited in Armenia³ and in order to provide a broader perspective, SEA examples from other countries (Ukraine, Russia, and Czech Republic) were widely used.

4. Summary of Training Outcomes

This section summarises the outcomes of discussions held after each training session.

4.1. Linkage between Planning and SEA Processes

Trainers outlines general approach to providing linkage between the strategic planning and SEA processes. Participants were invited to describe the strategic planning process in Armenia. The discussion was organized in large group and focused on the Armenian realities only, without

² This topic was introduced at the second day of training and addressed again at the concluding session at the last day in order to allow the participants to use the information and knowledge gained during the previous training's sessions.

³ A search for real-life SEA case studies available in Armenia was conducted prior to the workshop to reveal that the only attempt in conducting a SEA in line with the methodology recommended in the Protocol was the pilot SEA of the Yerevan Master Plan (2004-2005). Several experts involved in that project attended this training workshop. According to them, only to a limited extent can this pilot SEA be used for demonstrating a range of capabilities the SEA Protocol offers.

http://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/env/eia/documents/SEA_CBNA/Armenia_SEA_Yerevan_en.pdf.



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

referring to the fictitious case. This discussion demonstrated that the strategic planning process is evolving actively in Armenia. Traditional planning forms (plans and programs) are being gradually complemented with strategies and policies. The strategic development planning hierarchy, both economic and social, is yet to be established but is developing at a rapid pace.

Current developments in the environmental assessment legislation are also aligned with the modern trends. The review of the draft Law on the Environmental Impact Assessment and Review Process that lists all currently existing forms of strategic planning is ongoing. In a way, the draft Law regulates the SEA process. At this stage, no direct linkage between the planning process and SEA is established. The Armenian legislation does not require issuing a formal SEA decision and/or appointing an authority in charge of undertaking the SEA.

The experts stressed the need for ensuring close linkage between the SEA process and national development planning system. It was indicated that SEA provisions of the new draft Law appear to be sufficient to facilitate further development of the system. The participants however noted that a detailed comparison between the provisions of the draft Law and those of the Protocol would be needed to facilitate the implementation of the Protocol.

4.2. Screening (Determining whether SEA Is Needed for the Proposed Plan) and Scoping

Trainers presented the Protocol requirements regarding screening (preliminary assessment) and scoping (determining the scope of the SEA), and modern approach toward the organization of these procedures. The workshop participants presented the results of their group work. The discussion also touched upon the key issues associated with the preliminary assessment process in Armenia.

The new draft law specifies the list of strategic planning documents that require SEA⁴. A number of documents were discussed in the context of the law enforcement practice. For example, there was a question whether SEA is needed for programs involving the development of mineral deposits. The participants to the discussion recognized that a formal SEA might be required according to the Protocol if a program forms a basis for further planning permit (Article 4). A specific and detailed answer to this question should be provided at the national level through the detailed review of these programs in the context of criteria set out in the Protocol.

Scoping should be conducted by experts responsible for SEA in close collaboration with a planning team and is seen as a source of useful information about possible risks that should be considered during the elaboration of a plan or a program.

The participants noted the difference in the way the term "preliminary assessment" is used in the Protocol and the Armenian legislation. While the former uses the expression to interpret the term "screening", "preliminary assessment" in the Armenian legislation (including both current and draft laws) refers to both screening and scoping (or defining the scope of SEA as the Russian version of the Protocol reads). This difference is not essential but should be clearly understood during the development of legislative documents.

The experts emphasized the need for further strengthening the national screening mechanisms and providing further guidance and more detailed legislative provisions.

A need for extensive consultations with environmental authorities and other stakeholders at this stage was recognized by the participants, while at the same time, concerns were expressed regarding the willingness of all stakeholder parties (governmental authorities, general public, and

⁴ No detailed analysis of the proposed list against the provisions of the SEA Protocol was undertaken.



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

local NGOs) to provide their inputs to the process. It was also noted that the current country practice is that involvement of the public is usually limited to commenting on final draft of a plan/programme/policy (PPP) and that this commenting often sounds like sharp criticism and ultimately is of little or no help in terms of improving strategic decisions that are being made. The workshop participants recognized that the public participation at the very early stages in the strategic decision making process could contribute significantly to promoting the SEA process in Armenia but emphasized that the implementation of this provision may be problematic at this stage.

4.3. Analysis of Baseline Trends

The workshop participants were introduced to the requirements of the Protocol and methodological approach to the collection of required information. The ensuing discussion focused on the possibility and feasibility of using some strategic planning methods in the SEA process (including the information gathering stage).

The national expert capacity in Armenia is relatively high; relevant governmental authorities collect baseline environmental information. It was however noted that the National State of Environment Report has not been prepared for several years and this can make the baseline analysis more difficult and time-consuming. Socio-economic data and data about future projects that would be needed for future baseline projections may be limited or not readily available to the SEA team. Close cooperation with the strategic planning team responsible for formulating a plan/programme that is subject to SEA may help streamline the collection of required data.

The participants to the discussion kept reverting to the insufficient data problem. The trainers emphasized that this is a typical limitation of SEA and the ability to pick up relevant data and information and handle uncertainties is the mere essence of the SEA process.

In addition, the participants of one small group claimed that they lacked clarity regarding the questions formulated in the case study exercises. The trainers therefore decided to modify the group work format by drifting away considerably from the way the small group tasks are set in the Training Manual and employing a range of other teaching methods.

4.4. Analysis of Proposed Development Priorities and Alternatives

The introductory presentation provided an overview of the Protocol requirements regarding the analysis of alternatives and approaches employed to review alternatives in the strategic planning and SEA processes.

Group exercises were reduced and simplified significantly. The participants in their small group presentations actively used approaches presented to them – a clear evidence that they had grasped the material successfully.

During the plenary discussion, the participants noted that alternative options are rarely considered in practice in Armenia. They also discussed the need for promoting the review of fundamental alternatives from the individual project level to the strategic planning level.

Trainers and participants agreed that the SEA team should include the representatives of the strategic planning team because this could greatly benefit the overall process. Integrating SEA in the planning process is the best practicable option because it helps save resources and enhance the planning process, etc. However, one of weaknesses of excessive integration is potential conflict of interests. Participants and trainers discussed options to avoid such conflict.



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

4.5. Preparing the SEA Report

Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

The interactive plenary session was held to discuss the contents and composition of the SEA Report. The participants discussed and agreed that the following issues are of key importance for selecting approach and methods to be used to assess cumulative impacts:

- Strategic document quality,
- Justification of proposed alternative options,
- Quality, reliability and level of detail of input data.

Special attention was focused on methods employed in the SEA. Participants were introduced to the methods of the objective-based analysis and specific examples of this analysis⁵. Other methods discussed during the workshop included those strategic planning methods that are widely used within the SEA (cost/benefit analysis, multi-criterial analysis, SWOT-analysis etc⁶).

Participants agreed that expert judgments by leading professionals in the field could provide sufficient basis for discussing potential cumulative impacts of a strategic initiative with the planners. Expert opinion adds new information (e.g. about possible risk) to the issues and risks already identified during the scoping stage.

The participants agreed that obtaining expert opinions at the early stages of the planning process would help improve the proposed program. A. Drnoyan noted that the new draft law includes a provision for undertaking SEA at the early stages of program planning.

The assessment of cumulative impacts should mainly focus on presentation of the scale of possible risks and problems and guide comparison of alternatives. Uncertainties and information gaps must be consistently acknowledged in order to prevent misunderstanding and misleading guidance to the decision-making. The participants discussed how various assessment tools could be applied in the SEA process (including, inter alia, mathematical modelling, strengths/weaknesses analysis, cost/benefit analysis, objective-based analysis). The discussion focused on the requirements to the SEA tools (level of detail, sensitivity to limited data and reliability of information); it was noted that whilst different SEA tools can be used to assess different strategic initiatives they should ensure that the SEA process meets the requirements of the SEA Protocol.

4.6. Ensuring Effective Public Participation in SEA

Prof. Aida Iskoyan prepared and delivered presentation describing the public participation requirements of the SEA Protocol and the real state of affairs with applying these requirements in Armenia. Participants were then introduced to relevant experience available in other countries and difficulties with getting the public involved in the SEA process encountered by experts in the post-Soviet countries in other countries by the trainers.

The group work was modified as a business role-playing game. In their group presentations, the representatives of the Ministry of Energy, Ministry of Ecology and the public presented their vision and position in the SEA and public consultation process for the Lusentia case study.

⁵ These methods are not used in the strategic planning and environmental assessment practice in the post-Soviet countries; they are new in the region and can be considered as a serious resource to support the development of SEA process.

⁶ These methods were used by the participants in their group work to demonstrate that they learned and understood the material well



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

4.7. Ensuring that SEA Outcomes Are Taken into Consideration in Decision Making and Monitoring

The 4 Corners business game was held where the participants were offered to choose what they consider as an appropriate outcome of a successful SEA:

- State of environment forecast
- Full participation of the public in the assessment process
- SEA Report
- Plan/program adjusted to take account the SEA results and approved by relevant authorities.

Initially, the majority of participants were inclined to think that the main outcome of a successful SEA is a detailed environmental forecast (which is considered to be a typical view prevailing among the representatives of the medium to top governance level). After discussing and revisiting the SEA objectives as defined in the SEA Protocol, participants agreed that the most appropriate outcome of the SEA is ensuring that the environmental considerations and concerns expressed by the public are taken into account in the relevant provisions of the proposed strategic initiative. The workshop participants reached a common conclusion that the systemic application of SEA procedures in the Armenian context can only be effective once SEA has become a formalized instrument embedded in the decision making system.

The participants also discussed the issue of costs and resources entailed in SEA. As many elements of SEA are to certain extent presented in standard Armenian procedures of environmental permitting, it is necessary to clarify relations between the existing procedures and SEA to avoid overlaps and inefficient use of resources.

5. Workshop Evaluation

Workshop participants were asked to fill the evaluation form. The results are presented in Annex 2 and can be summarized below. Generally, the participants reported that:

- The topic was very important (average score 2,4 of 3);
- The delivery of information was clear (average score 2,4 of 3);
- The participants consider that case studies and exchange of experience were the most useful components of the workshop (please see Annex 3 for more details);
- The following topics were recommended for further trainings:
 - EIA 7 participants;
 - SEA and strategic planning 13 participants
 - Link between economics and environment 12 participants
 - Engagement of the public in the strategic planning process (including SEA) 5 participants

More details are presented in Annex 3 (Item 4).

- The following forms of support for implementing SEA were considered important by the participants: pilot projects, trainings, consultancy and technical support on various issues including development of regulatory and methodological framework, study tour to a country with established SEA experience, etc.;
- The following information delivery improvements were recommended for future workshops:
 - Use simpler language to set tasks for practical exercises;



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

- Reduce workshop duration;
- Discuss local examples and techniques used in Armenia.

More detailed information is presented in Annex 3.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions were made by the trainers and participants:

1. Existing legislative and regulatory framework in Armenia may be considered sufficient for undertaking first SEAs. Whilst technical capacity for conducting SEA exists, the level of coordination among environmental, sectoral and strategic planning authorities and systems is low which is considered to be typical of the post-Soviet countries. Along with the inefficient planning system, this factor is a key obstacle impeding the large-scale application of SEA in the future.
2. While the ratification of the SEA Protocol offers broad opportunities for implementing SEA in the country, the progress in this area is currently slow. Significant and focused effort is required to demonstrate how the overall system could benefit from SEA to decision makers.
3. The draft Law on the Environmental Impact Assessment and Review Process contains the definition of SEA and provisions outlining key stages of SEA process. Whilst the review of this draft law was beyond the scope of this workshop, a picture emerging from discussions suggests that undertaking this review would be required to implement the provisions of the SEA Protocol in the country.
4. The country has significant scientific and technical expertise but the level of awareness about SEA is generally relatively low. SEA capacity needs to be developed and enhanced among all stakeholder groups. Special effort is recommended to be taken to strengthen the capacity of planning authorities.
5. A suite of capacity building measures is recommended including organization of pilot projects and trainings at various levels, exchange of SEA experience among the Central European and Caucasian countries, and publication of thematic materials based on local examples.
6. It is extremely important to ensure that relevant ministries and agencies in charge of strategic planning are interested in using SEA as a planning instrument of their own. Special focus should be placed upon raising the awareness of decision makers.
7. A study tour to one of the countries with established SEA practice and experience for leading specialists and decision makers may provide impetus for the development of SEA practice.
8. Training materials should be translated into Armenian and interpretation between Russian and Armenian should be provided during the training workshops .

Acknowledgements

The workshop was jointly prepared by UNECE Secretariat and Ministry of Ecology of Armenia in cooperation with the EcoGlobe non-governmental organisation.

The original training methodology was developed by a consultant team consisting of Jiri Dusik, Alfred Eberhardt and Felipe Perez supported by Harald Lossack, Axel Olearius (GTZ) and Jan-Peter Schemmel (GTZ). The set of PowerPoint slides for this particular training was modified by Michal Musil (Integra Consulting Ltd.). The case study on fictitious National Energy Policy of the Lusentia Republic was prepared by Michal Musil (Integra Consulting Ltd.) and further adapted by Marina



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Khotuleva and Maia Gachechiladze-Bozhesku (Ecoline Environmental Assessment Centre), and Olena Borysova (European Bank for Reconstruction and Development – EBRD).

The training was facilitated by M.V. Khotuleva (Ecoline Environmental Assessment Centre) and O.B. Borysova (EBRD).

Presentations about the legislative framework for SEA, green economy, and public participation in SEA were delivered by A. Drnoyan, A. Babayan, and A. Iskoyan, respectively.



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda

Day 1

09.00 – 09.30 09.30 – 9.50	<p>Registration</p> <p>Opening the workshop <i>Simon Papyan, first Deputy Minister of Environmental Protection, Armenia</i> <i>Ян-Кристоф Гаяранд, Делегация Европейской Комиссии в Республике Армения</i> <i>Elena Santer, Secretariat Espoo Convention, UNECE</i></p>
09.50 – 11.00	<p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of participants and their expectations <i>Marina Khotueva, Olena Borysova,</i> • Practical information <i>Nune Darbinyan, ECOGLOBE</i> • Introduction to the workshop objectives <i>Elyanora Grigoryan, Espoo Convention National Focal Point Ministry of Environmental Protection, Armenia</i>
11.00 – 11.20	Coffee break
11.20 – 12.00	<p>Introduction to the UNECE Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment the Espoo Convention <i>Elena Santer, Secretariat Espoo Convention</i></p>
12.00 – 13.00	<p>Environmental Assessment system development in Armenia, current status, including SEA provisions and implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal and institutional provisions • SEA key practical issues <i>Azganush Drnoyan, "Environmental Expertiza", Ministry of Environmental Protection</i> <p>Evolution and current status of environmental assessment system, including strategic assessment in Armenia</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal framework and institutional set-up • Main issues of SEA practice <i>Elyanora Grigoryan, Espoo Convention National Focal Point, Ministry of Nature Protection</i> <p><i>Ms. Aneta BABAYAN, National Focal Point, EaP GREEN Programme, Head of Economic Policy and Programs Division of Economic Development Policy Department</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Discussion, questions, comments</p>
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch
14.00 – 15.00	<p>Introduction to a case study for the application of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) procedure <i>Olena Borysova</i> Reading time for participants</p>
15.00 – 15.20	Coffee break
15.20 – 17.30	<p>Link Programme (P/P/P) and SEA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Case work <i>Olena Borysova</i>



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Wrap-up & Discussion on how the case work relates to the participants context

SEA training session (Days 2 – 4)

Day 2

09.30 – 11.00	Screening and scoping • Introduction • Group work • Presentations, Wrap-up & Discussion	<i>Olena Borysova</i>
11.00 - 11.20	Coffee break	
11.20 - 13.00	Screening and scoping (continued)	<i>Olena Borysova</i>
13.00- 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 15.30	Baseline analysis • Introduction • Group work • Presentations, Wrap-up & Discussion	<i>Marina Khotuleva</i>
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee break	
16.00 – 17.15	Baseline analysis (continued)	<i>Marina Khotuleva</i>
17.15 – 17.30	Closure of the day	

Day 3

09.30 – 11.00	Analyzing proposed development priorities and their alternatives • Introduction • Group work • Presentations, Wrap-up & Discussion	<i>Marina Khotuleva</i>
11.00 - 11.20	Перерыв	
11.20 – 13.00	Analyzing proposed development priorities and their alternatives (continued)	<i>Marina Khotuleva</i>
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 - 15.30	Reporting. Cumulative effects assessment • Introduction • Group work • Presentations, Wrap-up & Discussion	<i>Olena Borysova</i>
15.30 -15.50	Coffee break	
15.50 – 17.15	Reporting. Cumulative effects assessment (continued)	<i>Olena Borysova</i>



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

17.15 – 17.30	Closure of the day
---------------	---------------------------

Day 4

09.30 – 11.00	Ensuring efficient public participation in SEA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Group work • Presentations, Wrap-up & Discussion 	<i>Marina Khotuleva</i>
11.00 – 11.20	Coffee break	
11.20 – 13.00	Ensuring efficient public participation in SEA (continued)	<i>Marina Khotuleva</i>
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 15.30	Taking due account of the SEA outcomes in decision-making and monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction • Group work • Presentations, Wrap-up & Discussion 	<i>Olena Borysova</i>
15.30 – 16.00	Coffee break	
16.00 – 17.00	Closing session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wrap-up of the training • Training evaluation • Participants' view • Distribution of certificates 	



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Annex 2. List of Participants

N	Name/ surname	Organization / position	Tel. / e-mail
1	Simon Papyan	First Deputy Minister of MoNP RA	
2	Eleonora Grigoryan	Adviser to Minister, MoNP RA	
3	Aneta Babayan	Ministry of Economy. Green Economy	010 597121 anetababayan@mineconomy.am
4	Araik Mkrtchyan	Ararat Marzpetaran, division on environment and agriculture, Senior Specialist	093129329 055129329
5	Sanasar Baghdasaryan	Armavir Marzpetaran, division on environment and agriculture	091718989 023726898
6	Kamo Tumoyan	Kotayk Marzpetaran, division on environment and agriculture, Deputy Head of department	093215577 022323240 022321373
7	Vachik Harutyunyan	Aragatsotn Marzpetaran, division on environment and agriculture, Specialist	096242439 023233025 11.04.1960@mail.ru
8	Gevorg Torosyan	Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources, Mining, mineral resources and geology department, Senior Specialist	099205932 gevorgtorosyan@gmail.com
9	Ashot Giloyan	Ministry of Territorial Administration of RA, Head of Department of Local Self governance	n/a
10	Ripsime Babayan	Ministry of Territorial Administration of RA, Department of Self Governance, Senior Specialist	099552007 511345 work h.babayan@mta.gov.am
11	Gevorg Amatuni	Ministry of Transport and Communication of RA, Transport Policy Department, Senior Specialist	055941840 amatuni52@mail.ru
12	Lilit Gevorgyan	Ministry of Urban Development of RA, Department of Urban Development and territorial planning policy, Leading Specialist	099363663 lilit.gevorgyan.82
13	Sergey Karapetyan	Ministry of Health of RA, Disease Control and Prevention National center, Specialist	091463613 sergeydagraz@yahoo.com
14	Hovsep Hovhannisyan	Ministry of Health of RA, Disease Control and Prevention National center, Specialist	091204782 hovsep.hovhannisyan@mail.ru
15	Vahe Matsakyan	Ministry of Agriculture of RA, "Armforest" state non commercial organization, Head of Division of Forest Inventory and Cadaster	055600694 macakyanvahe@rambler.ru
16	Christine Khachatryan	Ministry of Nature Protection of RA, Environmental Strategic Programs and Monitoring Department, International Projects Management and Monitoring Division, Senior Specialist	585349 mnpkriskhach@mail.ru interproject@yahoo.com
17	Azganush	«Environmental expertise» SNSO of the	221568



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

	Drnoyan	Ministry of Nature Protection of RA Ministry of Nature Protection of RA, Expert	
18	Karine Movsisyan	«Environmental expertise» SNSO of the Ministry of Nature Protection of RA, Expert	221568 karajan61@mail.ru
19	Taguhi Shahinyan	Hazardous Substances and Waste Policy Division of the Ministry of Nature Protection of RA, Specialist	077524005 tguhishahinyan@yahoo.com
20	Arpik Hakobyan	Law Department of the Ministry of Nature Protection of RA, Senior Specialist	098860219
21	Aramais Avagyan	Underground Resources protection policy division of the Underground Resources and land Protection Policy Department, Ministry of Nature Protection, Senior Specialist	094378090 099378090 aramais56@yandex.ru
22	Ashot Sukiasyan	Land protection policy division of the Underground Resources and land Protection Policy Department, Ministry of Nature Protection, Senior Specialist	055353106 ashot_sugiasyan@yandex.ru or ashot-sugiasyan@yandex.ru
23	Vahe Martirosyan	Agency of Wastes and Air Pollution, Ministry of Nature Protection of RA, Head of Division of State Waste Cadaster and Register	099-144-155 vahe533@mail.ru
24	Aida Iskoyan	Environmental public advocacy Center NGO	091420021
25	Karine Danielyan	“Association for Sustainable Development” NGO, President	
26	Nelly Grigoryan	“Association for Sustainable Development” NGO, Member	091299208 nelli_grigoryan@inbox.ru
27	Nune Darbinyan	Eco-Globe NGO, President	091418311 221295, 575527 nuneemil@yahoo.com
28	Eliza Petrosyan	Eco-Globe NGO, Specialist, Assistant	221295 ep@ecoglobe.am
29	Elena Santer	UNECE, Espoo Convention Secretariat	
30	Marina Khotuleva	Ecoline EA centre, Trainer	
31	Olena Borysova	EBRD, Trainer	
32	Ruzanna Harutyunyan	Ministry of Economy, Industrial Policy Department, Senior Specialist	091323601 rharutyunyan@mineconomy.am
33	Olga Belyayeva	National Academy of Science of RA, Center of Econospheric studies, Scientist	093521395 olgabelso@gmail.com
34	Larisa Kharatova	Ministry of Nature Protection, International relations division	093696513 lararh@rambler.ru
35	Arevik Avetisyan	Armenian State Pedagogical University	093052599 arevik.avetisyan.91@mail.ru
36	Teresa	Armenian State Pedagogical University	099992101



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

	Arakelyan		teresa16@mail.ru
37	David Gulqanyan	Armenian State Pedagogical University	055283802 davgul.89@mail.ru
38	Vahe Martirosyan	Armenian State Pedagogical University	099354457 martirosyan.vahe@yahoo.com
39	Gohar Galstyan	Armenian State Pedagogical University	093903805
40	Bayramyan Nelli	Armenian State Pedagogical University	055577562
41	Filip Ashikyan	Eco-Globe NGO, member, Specialist	055575527 filemil@me.com

Of these, the following 27 participants completed the full training course and received certificates:

1. Eleonora Grigoryan
2. Azganush Dronyan
3. Nune Darbinyan
4. Aida Iskoyan
5. Filip Ashikyan
6. Eliza Petrosyan
7. Karine Movsisyan
8. Sanasar Baghdasaryan
9. Vahe Matsakyan
10. Christine Khachatryan
11. Taguhi Shahinyan
12. Arpik Hakobyan
13. Aramais Avagyan
14. Asshot Sukiasyan
15. Vahe Martirosyan
16. Ruzanna Harutyunyan
17. Olga Belyaeva
18. Nelly Grigoryan
19. Hovsep Hovhannisyan
20. Gevorg Torosyan
21. Ripsime Babayan
22. Gevorg Amatuni
23. Lilit Gevorgyan
24. Vachik Harutyunyan
25. Kamo Tumoyan
26. Araik Mkrtchyan
27. Sergey Karapetyan



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Annex 3: Summary of Workshop Evaluation Results

1. Please, indicate how important and relevant was the workshop topic for you?

1 (not important) - 0 2 (somewhat important) - 12 3 (very important) - 10

2. Please, indicate how clear and understandable was the delivery of information for you

1 – (absolutely unclear) 0; 2 (clear) 12 3 (absolutely clear) 10

3. What, in your view, was the most useful at the training workshop?

Group exercises	7
Definition of SEA, information about the Protocol	3
Analysis of baseline trends	1
Managing SEA effectively within the financial constraints	1
Exchange of opinions, experiences, and views among specialists representing various sectors	6
New knowledge	1
Friendly spirit throughout the workshop	1
Workshop materials	2
Establishing new professional contacts, links and skills	2
Structured information about the SEA process	
Training methods	
Introduction to new SEA methods and instruments	

4. Which topics you believe it is essential to conduct additional training for you and your colleagues on?

SEA	EIA	Link between economics and environment	Engagement of the public in the strategic planning process and SEA
13	7	12	5
Your answer		Analysis of case studies from various countries	

5. What forms of support are required for implementation of EIA and SEA

Financial support	2
Consultancy support, international experts	2
Exchange of experience among various countries	2
Case studies	1



EaP GREEN PROGRAMME

Study tours to countries with established SEA practice for national experts	2
Pilot project	4
Training of specialists, training courses and workshops at the local level and in the Ministry of Economy	4
Preparation of required literature including standards, instructions and guidance documents	2
Technical support to enhance existing legal framework	2
Identifying the most typical mistakes and problems, and frequently asked questions	1

6. What are your proposals to improve delivery of similar workshops?

Country-specific case studies, techniques and tasks should be discussed	3
Provide recommendations or alternatives, instruments for completing specified tasks	1
Provide translation during the workshop. Discussion is more efficient in native language	2
Reduce workshop duration (maximum 3 days)	3
For trainers: Present case studies from the very beginning of a thematic training unit, and then move to practical exercises	1
Present material in more simple form and language	6
Repeated training workshops	1
Professional level of the audience should be taken into account	1
Hold workshops and pilot programmes specifically for regional executive authorities and local self-governance bodies	1
Expanding a range of experts and non-governmental organisations, capacity building	2
More clearly formulated questions	2
More workshops of this kind is required	2
Getting familiarized with the international experience	1
More clear recommendations based on specific examples	1