

Romania-Ukraine Joint Operational Programme 2014÷2020

Strategic Environmental Assessment

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. INTEGRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE PROGRAMME	4
3. HOW THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT AND THE OPINION EXPRESSED BY THE PUBLIC AND CONSULTED AUTHORITIES HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION.....	5
3.1 To what extent have the consultation responses been considered in the sea process?.....	5
3.1.1 <i>Assessment Procedure Initiation</i>	5
3.1.2 <i>Setting up the working group</i>	6
3.1.3 <i>Working Group Meetings</i>	6
3.1.4 <i>The development of the Environmental Report</i>	7
3.1.5 <i>Public Consultation</i>	8
3.2 To what extent have the environmental report and the results of consultations been considered in the programme's completion?	8
3.2.1 <i>Recommendations regarding the programme activities</i>	8
3.2.2 <i>Recommendations regarding the programme indicators and monitoring of the effects on the environment</i>	10
4. REASONS FOR CHOOSING THE PROGRAMME, IN THE LIGHT OF ALTERNATIVES...	10
5. CONCLUSION	11

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1 - Comments and observations of consulted authorities and public

ANNEX 2 - SEA recommendation for the thematic objectives priorities of the Programme

ANNEX 3 - Monitoring indicators recommended

1. INTRODUCTION

The environmental statement is prepared and jointly presented by the Managing Authority and the National Authority for the “Romania-Ukraine Programme”, according to the provisions of Art. 9 (1-b) of SEA Directive 2001/42/EC.

In compliance with SEA Directive’s requirements, the statement is summarizing:

- how environmental considerations have been integrated into the programme;
- how the environmental report, the opinions expressed by the public and consulted authorities and any other consultations’ results have been taken into account, and
- the reasons for choosing the programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with.

The ENI Implementing Regulation requires that *“information on fulfilment of regulatory requirements laid down in Directive 2011/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council”* shall be included in the Programme as part of the programme implementation description.

In order to comply with the requirements of the ENI Implementing Regulation, the Romania - Ukraine Programme has gone through the necessary steps in compliance with Directive 2011/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council.

As the SEA Directive does not specifically address the issue of cross-border cooperation with countries that are not members of the EU, a *"Guidance Note on Strategic Environment Assessment in the context of ENI CBC"* has been developed by INTERACT ENPI and validated by the relevant directorates of the EC. The note provides MAs with an interpretation of the SEA Directive in the context of ENI CBC, including the necessary legal steps to conduct the SEA process and the actors to be involved. It states that the Member State hosting the MA is responsible for determining whether a SEA is required or not, according to its legislation, and also to involve and consult the partner countries concerned at the appropriate level.

In Romania the regulations in force for the development of SEA for the cross-border cooperation Programmes are Directive 2001/42/EC (SEA Directive) and SEA Protocol.

In Ukraine there is no specific legislation for SEA in force yet, the *Law regarding the strategic environmental assessment* is currently in public debate. There are regulations for assessment of the environmental impact of activities.

The participating countries have decided to have a joint Environmental Report that was subject to separate consultation in each country of the environmental and other relevant authorities and public in accordance with the requirements of the SEA Directive and relevant national legislation.

2. INTEGRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE PROGRAMME

The integration of environmental considerations into the Programme is reflected by the summary of the assessment of the Programme's likely significant effects, as well as by the priorities of the specific thematic objectives and the large infrastructure projects:

➤ TO3 - PROMOTION OF THE LOCAL CULTURE AND PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL HERITAGE

Objective 2: Preservation of the cultural and historical heritage in the eligible area, support the developing of local culture, specific cultural identities and the cultural dialog contributing to an enhanced attractiveness of the eligible area.

- *Priority 2.1 Preservation and promotion of the cultural and historical heritage*

➤ TO7 - IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESSIBILITY TO THE REGIONS, DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORT AND COMMON NETWORKS AND SYSTEMS

Objective 3: Improve public transport services, infrastructure and ITC cooperation and networking

- *Priority 3.1 – Development of cross border transport infrastructure and ICT tools*

➤ TO8 - COMMON CHALLENGES IN THE FIELD OF SAFETY AND SECURITY

Objective 4: Addressing common challenges concerning access to health, management of natural and anthropic risks and emergency situations, cross border cooperation through joint projects

- *Priority 4.1 Support to the development of health services and access to health;*
- *Priority 4.2 Support to joint activities for the prevention of natural and man-made disasters as well as joint actions during emergency situations...*

➤ LARGE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

- «Clean river» Danube;
- Improvement of the population safety and security level in the cross-border area by enhancing the joint training and cooperation actions in emergency management.

The Environmental Report presents the assessment of the likely significant effects of the Programme at the level of each indicative activity that might have an environmental effect and each large infrastructure project.

A Qualitative Assessment was undertaken for each environmental factor considered relevant to the indicative activities of the Programme: air, surface and underground waters, soil and subsoil and landscape, climate changes, population and human health, biodiversity, flora and fauna, waste management, cultural heritage and efficient use of resources, including renewable sources.

Impacts are assessed with regards to the following aspects, as appropriate: significantly positive, positive, neutral, negative, significantly negative and uncertainty. Identified likely significant effects are both positive and negative. Positive effects are mainly related to indicative activities aimed at development of environmental, social and health benefits, such as those under TO8, preservation of the cultural and historical heritage, under TO3 and activities funded under TO7.

No significant negative cumulative impact is expected at the level of the indicative activities and the large infrastructure projects of the Programme. The positive cumulative effect for long term is expected on air, water, soil, climate change, waste management, biodiversity, cultural heritage, population and human health.

Possible negative consequences of the development of regional infrastructure may have a negative impact on the biodiversity. These are related to and depend on future projects to be developed under the Programme and how their implementation will be done taking into consideration the national environmental legislation in force. The likely cumulative effect on the population and human health is entirely positive.

The level of detail of the Programme is not sufficient as to allow for a Quantitative Assessment. Thus, it has not been possible to say anything other than it may have significant environmental impacts. These impacts may be neutral or indirect as well as positive and may be expected for most of the environmental factors. Possible negative impacts are likely to be mainly consequences of construction operations of transport infrastructure. The positive impacts will mainly occur as a consequence of operations aiming at environmental protection.

3. HOW THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT AND THE OPINION EXPRESSED BY THE PUBLIC AND CONSULTED AUTHORITIES HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION

3.1 To what extent have the consultation responses been considered in the SEA process?

An ***Inception Report*** was made in order to identify the environmental relevant legislation and the Environmental Authorities from partner countries and to describe the methodology proposed by the Commission. The report included also an indicative calendar on how to develop the SEA procedure. The relevant environmental authorities were identified: for Romania, the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests (MEWF) and for Ukraine, the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MERN). This Inception Report was sent to inform the relevant authorities from both countries that the Programme needs to be evaluated during a SEA procedure.

The SEA procedure for the Romania-Ukraine Programme was guided by the **Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests** from Romania (MEWF) based on the SEA Directive and the Romanian Government Decision No 1076/8.07.2004 on the environmental assessment of Plans and Programmes.

3.1.1 Assessment Procedure Initiation

The Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration (MRDPA) from Romania, the Managing Authority for the Programme, notified the **Ministry of Environment, Water and**

Forest (MEWF) on February 11th, 2015 about the first draft of the Programme Ro-Ua and requested the starting of the environmental assessment according to the Directive 2001/42/EC. The current practice in Romania for the environmental assessment of such Programmes is to publish twice an announcement in mass-media. This was made in a newspaper of national circulation, ***Evenimentul zilei***, first time on February 11th, 2015 and the second time after 3 days on February 14th, 2015.

The MEWF Romania communicated its decision regarding the SEA procedure for the Programme to the MA on March 5th: a full SEA procedure has to be developed because the Programme defines the framework for the implementation of projects that are mentioned in Annex I and II of the Directive 2001/42/EC (EIA) and there is no need to do a **Screening Report**. Following this decision, according to the SEA Directive the procedure should have two phases:

- The completion of the Programme draft and the drafting of the Environmental Report;
- The analysis of the quality of the Environmental Report.

3.1.2 Setting up the working group

The MEWF decided, based on Article 6 (3) of the Directive, that a Working Group should be established in Romania in order to analyse and finalize the Environmental Report. The MEWF Romania communicated to the MA the composition of the Working Group set in accordance to the specific activities of the Programme as follows: *Ministry of Health, Ministry of Internal Affairs, General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations, Ministry of European Funds, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Ministry of Transport, Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Education and Scientific Research, Ministry for Information Society, Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest (through General Directorate of Impact Assessment and Pollution Control – Service of Air Protection and Pollution Control), General Directorate of Climate Change, Directorate of Biodiversity, General Directorate of Waste, Contamination Sites and Hazardous Substances, General Directorate of Water and General Directorate Forests, National Administration of Romanian Waters, County Councils from Programme area.*

3.1.3 Working Group Meetings

The **Working Group** was organised in Romania in order to discuss the impact of each indicative activity of the thematic objectives proposed by the Programme on the relevant environmental aspects and how this impact should be monitored during the implementation period. There were three meetings of the WG: on 30th March of 2015, 21st April of 2015 and 11th May of 2015.

In the first Working Group a presentation was made of the Programme draft, description of the SEA methodology, the key aspects of assessment and a proposal for the timetable for progress. The environmental aspects that have to be considered for the impact assessment of the Programme were agreed during this first meeting. The following meetings included presentation of environmental report drafts and the integration of the working group comments into the report drafts, and the programme, respectively, which were then released for public consultation.

3.1.4 The development of the Environmental Report

In order to develop the SEA procedure, the Preliminary Environmental Report was drafted and sent for consultation to the Working Group in Romania and to the National Authority and MERN in Ukraine. In Romania, according to the working procedures of the MEWF setting the scope of the SEA is part of the procedure of drafting the Environmental Report. As a request of the National Authority and with the scope of facilitating the SEA procedure in Ukraine, a Scoping Report was also drafted and sent, together with the Preliminary Environmental Report to the relevant authorities from Ukraine.

The framework content of the Environmental Report is as provided in Annex 2 of SEA Directive and includes:

- A description of the Programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes;
- The relevant aspects of the current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the Programme;
- The environmental characteristics of areas likely to be significantly affected and any existing environmental problems, in particular, those relating to areas designated pursuant to Directives 79/409/EEC and 92/43/EEC;
- The environmental protection objectives, established at international, Community or Member State level, which are relevant to the Programme and the way in which they were taken into consideration;
- The likely significant effects on the environment;
- The measures envisaged to prevent, mitigate and compensate the significant environmental effects;
- The measures envisaged concerning monitoring in accordance with Article 10.

The Environmental Report identifies, describes and assesses the potentially significant environmental effects of implementing the Programme, considering its objectives and geographical scope, as well as the alternative of not implementing it.

In preparing the Environmental Report information and recommendations obtained in the Working Group were taken into consideration as presented in **Annex 1– Comments and observations of the consulted authorities and public.**

On April 30th, 2015 MERN submitted its comments on the documents received. According to the official letter sent by the Ukrainian counterpart, Ukraine didn't ratify the SEA Protocol of 2003 and doesn't have national legislation for the environmental assessment of Programmes and plans as this legislation was still under public consultation at the time of the SEA procedure. The existing relevant legislation only refers to projects and is not applicable to plans and programmes. MERN Ukraine nominated a representative to participate in the consultation for SEA procedure.

The **Final Environmental Report** prepared in accordance with Annex I of the SEA Directive and including all the views of the relevant authorities was submitted to the MEWF from Romania and

to National Authority from Ukraine on May 18th, 2015 and made available for the public on the websites of the Managing Authority, JTS, Ro-Ua-Md Programme and MEWF.

3.1.5 Public Consultation

Romania

Following the notification of the MA, the MEWF Romania published the draft of the Programme on its website: <http://www.mmediu.ro/categorie/evaluare-de-mediu-pentru-strategii-planuri-programmee/60>). The Managing Authority also announced on their website www.mdrap.ro and on the Programme website www.ro-ua-md.net that the SEA procedure started.

Also, **the Working Group decided in its third meeting** to make available the **Environmental Report** for the public consultation for 30 days, starting on March 18th, 2015. The **Environmental Report** and the **Programme** were published on the websites of the Managing Authority, JTS, Ro-Ua-Md Programme and MEWF.

Ukraine

The **Final Environmental Report** was sent to the National Authority of Ukraine at the same time it was made available for the public in Romania in order to allow the Ukrainian side to carry on its own procedures. In order to facilitate the consultations in Ukraine the Report was also translated and made available in Ukrainian language.

Moreover, on May 27th, 2015 a public consultation was organized in Chernivtsi, Ukraine where a presentation of the **Final Environment Report** was made in front of relevant local authorities from Ukraine.

There were no comments from public regarding the Final Environmental Report.

3.2 To what extent have the environmental report and the results of consultations been considered in the programme's completion?

During the SEA procedure a series of recommendations were made for the improvement of the programme:

- Recommendations regarding the activities of the programme;
- Recommendations regarding the programme indicators and monitoring of the effects on the environment.

3.2.1 Recommendations regarding the programme activities

A series of recommendations were made regarding the activities of the programme and were presented to the JPC in the framework of the comments received for the programme. During the SEA procedure the SEA experts recommended to the experts responsible for the drafting of the programme to accept the recommendation made by the Ministry of Culture from Romania to add

to the activities under Thematic Objective 3, archaeological sites. The recommendation was accepted by the programming team and the programme text was revised as to include archaeological sites.

Given that the effects on the environment of future projects funded by the indicative actions of the four thematic objectives and the five large infrastructure projects should be reduced as far as possible, the following actions were recommended:

- Reduce the electricity and / or heat consumption;
- Reduce fuel, raw materials and hazardous substances consumption;
- Use of high energy performance equipment's;
- Choose adequate technologies for restoration/ preservation and respect them accurately so that the solutions chosen do not affect species of flora, fauna and aquatic ecosystems in the area;
- Valorification of cultural/ historical heritage should take into account the fact that it should not affect flora and fauna and aquatic ecosystems in the area;
- Preservation and conservation of protected species and habitats
- Minimize waste production;
- Minimize production of waste both during construction and functioning.
- Ensure collection/ sorting/ recycling/recovery of the waste resulted;
- Choice of technologies for construction/ rehabilitation/ widening roads with reduced emissions of particulate matter;
- Solutions for infrastructure construction so as to avoid contamination of soil and water by liquid fuel or other materials during construction period;
- Choice of routes for new roads or access parts so as to not affect flora and fauna species and aquatic ecosystems;
- Choice of low emission transportation solutions.

For the implementation of the thematic objectives of the Romania-Ukraine Programme the relevant Directives, Decisions and EU Regulations regarding air quality, surface and phreatic waters, soil and subsoil, climatic change, waste management, population health, biodiversity, cultural heritage preservation, efficient use of resources and/or of the national legislation (of Romania/Ukraine) will be taken into account if those are more restrictive.

Investment projects that will be financed within the indicative activities of the programme should consider the following measures recommended for the reduction of the impact on the environment:

- Obtaining the agreements/permits/statements/authorisations necessary for the construction and functioning, according to the national legislation in force, from the relevant authorities;
- In the case of projects relating to water resources, obtaining the relevant agreements according to national legislation in force (for Romania- agreement from the National Administration of Romanian Waters, or of the relevant Basin Administration from the area of the projects) and in the case of cross border waters also from the authorities in Romania/Ukraine (in accordance with the Agreement between the Government of

Romania and the Government of Ukraine on cooperation of cross border water management, Galati 1997);

- Obligation of conducting the biodiversity assessment of the potential effects on the natural protected areas of community interest for the projects that take place in natural protected areas, in accordance with national legal provisions in force which implement art 6.3 from the Habitat Directive;
- The requirements of the Framework Convention of the United Nations regarding climatic change and of the Kyoto Protocol and of the European/national policies and strategies regarding adaptation and reduction of the effects of climate change;
- The principles and directions regarding waste management from National Waste Management Strategy, National Waste Management Plan, and Regional Waste Management Plan.

For those indicative actions with impact on the environment have been proposed measures to prevent and reduce any likely impact.

3.2.2 Recommendations regarding the programme indicators and monitoring of the effects on the environment

According to Article 10 of SEA Directive the significant effects on the environment of the implementation of the Programme have to be monitored.

In the process of establishing the monitoring indicators for the programmes the SEA experts assessed the indicators already proposed by the programme with the following conclusions:

- Some of these indicators are the same as those monitoring the implementation of the Programme, and as such they can also monitor the impact on the environment;
- For certain indicative activities under some priorities and LIPs, specific environmental indicators were recommended;
- Other Programme indicators were modified as to reflect also the impact on the environment.

The Programme environmental impact monitoring rated the degree to which the proposed programme indicators are suitable for monitoring environmental impact and recommendations have been made for their adaptation, as shown in **Annex 2**.

Based on the evaluation of the indicative activities with possible impact on the environment the monitoring indicators presented in **Annex 3** were proposed regarding the monitoring framework of the programme as well as the use of specific environment indicators.

4. REASONS FOR CHOOSING THE PROGRAMME, IN THE LIGHT OF ALTERNATIVES

Many alternatives were considered during the programming process. These alternatives have to some extent been considered because - inter alia - of their alleged environmental impacts.

The no implementation alternative was assessed and compared in the SEA Report with the final alternative of the Programme and the result showed a favourable score for the Programme's alternative. The final alternative, although having positive impact, cannot solve all the existing environmental problems as identified in the Environmental Report.

5. CONCLUSION

As mentioned in chapter 3.2 above, most of the comments and recommendations received during SEA procedure were integrated into the Programme.

All comments received as well as the comments and recommendations from the programming team are outlined in the ANNEX 1 to this SEA statement.

The Environmental Report was taken into consideration while completing the Romania - Ukraine Programme and will continue to be taken into account during its implementation.

ANNEX 1

Comments and observations of the consulted authorities and public

Item	AUTHORITY	COMMENT	SEA EVALUATORS COMMENTS	ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SEA EVALUATORS	MA REACTION
	1	2	3	4	5
ROMANIA					
1.	National Administration "Romanian Water"	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>a) In chapter 4 to be used the information and data related to the "water resources and quality" from the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Somes - Tisa River Area Management Plan; - Prut - Barlad River Area Management Plan; - Siret River Basin Management Plan; - Danube River Delta Danube River Area Dobrogea and coastal waters Management draft Plan. <p>These plans were published on the websites of the Romanian Waters National Administration and Somes – Tisa, Prut – Bârlad, Siret, and Dobrogea Coastal Water Branch.</p> <p>b) To add in chapter 6 related to relevant plans/programmes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Strategy for Risk management at medium and long term flood (period 2010 ÷ 2035) - Agreement between the Government of Romania and the Government of Ukraine regarding cooperation on border water management <p>c) In the case of projects relating to water resources, obtaining the relevant agreements according to national legislation in force (for Romania- agreement from the National Administration of Romanian Waters, or of the</p>	Proposals fully accepted	Appropriate changes to the report	Agreed with recommended action

Item	AUTHORITY	COMMENT	SEA EVALUATORS COMMENTS	ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SEA EVALUATORS	MA REACTION
	1	2	3	4	5
		<p>relevant Basin Administration from the area of the projects) and in the case of cross border waters also from the authorities in Romania/Ukraine;</p> <p>d) Modification of the impact assessment for the indicative activities that can be related to water status from Priorities 3.1 and 4.2 and LIPs</p> <p>e) Modification of the monitoring indicator proposed for Priority 4.2 and LIP</p> <p>f) In chapter 8 related to the measures to reduce the impact on the environmental aspect water, to be completed with “aquatic ecosystems”</p>			
2.	Ministry of Culture	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>g) To introduce „archaeological sites” in the indicative activity with possible impact on the environment under Priority 2.1;</p> <p>h) Because of priority 2.1 to introduce a short description of the historical and cultural sites existing on the Programme Area</p>	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.
3.	Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest – Department for Climate Change	<p>Proposal:</p> <p>i) To add in chapter 6 related to relevant plans/programmes the “National Strategy on Climate Change 2013-2020”</p>	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.
4.	Ministry of Health	<p>Proposal:</p> <p>j) Modification of the expression related to public medical services – emergency room facilities and hospitals</p>	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.
5.	Ministry of European Funds	<p>Proposal:</p> <p>k) To correct some inconsistencies in description of Partnership Agreement with EU and Danube Strategy</p>	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.

Item	AUTHORITY	COMMENT	SEA EVALUATORS COMMENTS	ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SEA EVALUATORS	MA REACTION
	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest – Department of Waste, Contaminated Sites and Hazardous Substances	Proposals: l) To add in chapter 6 related to relevant plans/programmes the following: - National Waste Management Strategy; - National/Regional Waste Management Plan. m) To mention that the future projects financed by the Programme have to comply with the principles and directions regarding waste management from NWMS, NWMP, RWMP	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.
7.	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Proposals: n) To remove the expression “Direction for Agriculture and Rural Development” with “Direction for Agriculture of County.....” o) To introduce a specific environmental monitoring indicator “ <i>Land surface affected by the implementation of the measures</i> ” for the first indicative activity of Priority 4.2	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.
8.	Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest – Department for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control	Requests: p) To modify the environmental aspects for the indicative activities to reflect more accurately their impact	Proposals fully accepted.	Appropriate changes to the report.	Agreed with recommended action.

Item	AUTHORITY	COMMENT	SEA EVALUATORS COMMENTS	ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SEA EVALUATORS	MA REACTION
	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest – Department of Biodiversity Ministry of Environment, Water and Forest	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>q) In chapter 3 to reformulate what can be the impact on biodiversity when the Programme is not implemented;</p> <p>r) The area of national and international interest should be mentioned and described, too;</p> <p>s) To make a more detailed description of the methodology used for the assessment of the impact of the indicative activities on each environmental aspect (table 7.2);</p> <p>t) To introduce a measure for keeping and preservation of the species and protected habitats that can be affected by the Programme;</p> <p>u) The selection of the alternative (chapter 9.1) of the Programme has to consider a criterion related to the minimum impact on biodiversity.</p>	<p>Proposals fully accepted, with the exception on point s) – the impact on biodiversity is negative according to the impact assessment presented in table no. 7.2 of the SEA Environmental Report.</p> <p>On the other environmental aspects that were taken into consideration the impact is neutral or positive.</p>	Appropriate changes to the report	Agreed with recommended action
10.	Council of Satu Mare County	<p>Proposals:</p> <p>v) To introduce to TO2, priorities P1.1 and P1.2 and to TO3 priority P2.1 more specific indicative activities related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organising trainings to learn the Romanian/Ukrainian language for the minority of both countries and for people that have no connection with Romanian/Ukrainian language; - Creating common research groups for Romanian/Ukrainian language; - Organising courses for dissemination of Romanian/Ukrainian culture and civilization 	Proposal not accepted	No changes to the report	Not accepted because the activities proposed are included in the indicative activities of P1.1, P1.2 and P2.1. The proposals can be defined as projects idea financed by the Programme

Item	AUTHORITY	COMMENT	SEA EVALUATORS COMMENTS	ACTIONS RECOMMENDED BY THE SEA EVALUATORS	MA REACTION
	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Council of Botosani County	Proposal: w) To introduce in chapter 2.2 – Programme Area the 7th border crossing with Ukraine, namely Racovăț - Diakivți.	Proposal not accepted	No changes to the report	Not accepted because this border crossing in present is not operated and there is no information that in future will be open.
UKRAINE					
12.	Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) and Ministry of Economic Development and Trading (MEDT)	Point of view (Letter no.5/3-6/4401/20 th of April 2015) x) There is specific legislation for the environmental impact assessment of the projects with economic activity, but not at all for plans or programs. SEA Protocol was not ratified. Currently a Law regarding SEA is in public debate y) Nominated a person from MENR to participate to the consultation on the evaluation of the environmental impact of the Programme	Taken into consideration	No changes to the report	Agreed and invited to participate to the public consultation held in Cernauti on 27 th of May 2015

SEA recommendation for the thematic objectives priorities of the Programme

Thematic objectives	Priority	Assessment indicators	Recommendations
TO2 - SUPPORT TO EDUCATION, RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT & INNOVATION Objective 1: <i>Develop education and support research and innovation at the level of the Programme area by facilitating the cooperation at local, regional and central level</i>	P1.1 Institutional cooperation in the educational field for increasing access to education and quality of education	In order to see the effects on the environment of the proposed indicative actions it is necessary to include an additional indicator for the Programme " <i>Number of educational institutions rehabilitated / modernized</i> ". It can be determined without difficulty together with the proposed indicator for the Programme	Rehabilitation/modernization/ extension/ equipment procurement for the educational infrastructure will fulfill all the environmental requirement and will be in line with best environmental practices like energy efficiency, waste management
	P1.2 Promotion and support to research and innovation	The proposed monitoring indicator for the Programme " <i>Number of institution using Programme funds for cooperation in R & D and support of innovation</i> " can reflect also the impact on the environment	Rehabilitation/modernization/ extension/ equipment procurement for the research and innovation infrastructure will fulfil all the environmental requirement and will be in line with best environmental practices like energy efficiency, waste management
TO3 - PROMOTION OF THE LOCAL CULTURE AND PRESERVATION OF HISTORICAL HERITAGE Objective 2: <i>Preservation of the cultural and historical heritage in the eligible area, support the developing of local culture,</i>	P 2.1 Preservation and promotion of the cultural and historical heritage	The proposed monitoring indicator for the Programme " <i>Number of improved cultural and historical sites</i> " can reflect also the effects on cultural and historical heritage of the implementation of the projects financed under the indicative actions of this priority	<p>The technologies used for restoration, conservation and consolidation of cultural and historical monuments should be chosen so that their impact on environmental aspects to be minimized.</p> <p>Choosing and applying the proper restoration, conservation and consolidation technologies so as to</p>

<p><i>specific cultural identities and the cultural dialog contributing to an enhanced attractiveness of the eligible area.</i></p>			<p>avoid the impact on flora and fauna species and on aquatic ecosystems in the eligible area</p> <p>For ensuring security and valorization of monuments and cultural and historical objects energy efficient solutions should be taken into account and also the use of an integrated waste management if the case</p>
<p>TO7 - IMPROVEMENT OF ACCESSIBILITY TO THE REGIONS, DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORT AND COMMON NETWORKS AND SYSTEMS</p> <p><i>Objective 3: Improve public transport services, infrastructure and ITC cooperation and networking</i></p>	<p>P 3.1 Development of cross border transport infrastructure and ICT tools</p>	<p>Monitoring priorities effects revealed the need for an additional indicator for the program:</p> <p><i>"Number of environmentally friendly (carbon-proofed) cross-border transport initiatives developed "</i> that clearly reflect how indicative activities will support reducing the environmental impact of transport.</p> <p>The second indicator proposed by the Programme, namely <i>"Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads"</i> can also reflect the positive impact on the environment of the implementation of such indicative actions</p> <p>The action on facilitating</p>	<p>Construction, rehabilitation, modernization, enhancement of cross-border transport infrastructure will have to undergo the EIA / SEA procedure (where required by the legislation) and where appropriate through a proper evaluation to see the impact on the Natura 2000 network.</p> <p>Transboundary consultations under the Espoo Convention should be considered when transboundary impacts occur.</p> <p>Choosing construction/ rehabilitation/ widening roads technologies with low emissions of particulate matter, avoiding contamination of soil and water by liquid fuel or other construction materials during execution period.</p> <p>Choosing routes that do not affect species of flora, fauna and aquatic ecosystems.</p>

		multimodal transport should be reflected in the indicators. We recommend rewording the indicator on the number of joint strategies to reflect and multimodal transport	
TO8 - COMMON CHALLENGES IN THE FIELD OF SAFETY AND SECURITY Objective 4: Addressing common challenges concerning access to health, management of natural and anthropic risks and emergency situations, cross border security through joint projects	P 4.1 Support to the development of health services and access to health	The proposed monitoring indicators for the Programme “ <i>Number of medical service infrastructure units improved</i> ” and “ <i>Population covered by improved health services as a direct consequence of programme support</i> ” will reflect the impact on the population and public health of the indicative actions	Developing health facilities or improving them will consider all environmental legislative requirements regarding air, water and soil quality, including waste management principles. It will consider the impact on biodiversity when appropriate.
	P 4.2 Support to joint activities for the prevention of natural and man-made disasters as well as joint actions during emergency situations	<p>The indicator “<i>Number of population affected by the implementation of measures</i>” initially proposed for the monitoring of these activities coincided with one of the Program indicators “<i>Population benefiting from flood protection measures</i>” and will reflect the positive environmental impact</p> <p>We recommend that the second proposed indicator for the Programme “<i>Number of joint actions (exchanges, training, study visits, joint planning</i>”</p>	<p>The solutions chosen for disaster prevention should be designed so as not to affect the flora, fauna and aquatic ecosystems in these areas.</p> <p>The development of infrastructure for monitoring and intervention in case of emergency (eg buildings) should be in line with all applicable environmental requirements and apply the best environmental practices for ensuring the quality of air, water and soil and waste management.</p>

		session, etc.)" to be modified to reflect also the LIP " <i>Clean River</i> " and to add to the number of common action or to the report on monitoring indicators " <i>new maps made or updated databases created, systems / structures made, equipment purchased</i> " in order to monitor the impact of all indicative actions of this priority. An additional indicator was proposed for the monitoring of the environment: <i>Land surface affected by the implementation of the measures</i> ¹	
	P4.3 Prevention and fight against organised crime and police cooperation	The indicator proposed by the Program " <i>Number of modernised facilities of police, border police, custom services from the eligible area</i> ", can monitor positive environmental impact	Construction, renovation or modernization of police / customs / border police / gendarmerie should consider all environmental legislative requirements regarding quality assurance of air, water and soil, including waste management principles.
LARGE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS	«Clean river» Dunărea (OT8) 4.2	The indicator proposed by the Program " <i>Number of joint actions, including soft operations, as well as joint infrastructure investments in the field of emergency situations and the prevention of man-made disasters</i> " reflect the	

¹ Specific environment indicator

		positive environmental impact due to measures of rehabilitation / modernization of wastewater pumping stations and the monitoring and quality control of the Danube	<p>Realization of large infrastructure projects will have to undergo the procedure EIA / SEA and where appropriate through a biodiversity assessment to see the impact on flora, fauna and aquatic ecosystems.</p> <p>Transboundary consultations must be considered under the Espoo Convention, where transboundary impacts occur.</p>
	Improving the cross-border infrastructure – opening the gate to Europe (OT7) 3.1	The indicator proposed for the Program " <i>Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads</i> " may reflect the positive environmental impact due to the rehabilitation of the existing road between Kranoilsk - Upper Vicovu	
	Regional Cooperation for Prevention and Fighting of Cross-border Crime between Romania-Ukraine (OT 8) 4.3	Indicator proposed in Program " <i>Number of modernized facilities of police, police border and custom services from the eligible area</i> " may reflect the positive environmental impact due to strengthening / modernization / extension of police premises	
	Improvement of the population safety and security level in the cross-border area by enhancing the joint training and cooperation actions in emergency management (OT) 4.1	One of the two indicators proposed in program namely " <i>Number of medical service infrastructure units improved</i> " may reflect the positive impact on the population and public health	

Monitoring indicators recommended

Thematic objectives	Priority	Recommendation submitted as part of SEA procedure
TO2 Support to education, research, technological development & innovation	P 1.1 Institutional cooperation in the educational field for increasing access to education and quality of education	Including an additional indicator for the Program: „ <i>Number of rehabilitated / modernized educational institutions</i> ”
	P 1.2 Promotion and support to research and innovation	None
TO3 Promotion of the local culture and preservation of historical heritage	P 2.1 Preservation and promotion of the cultural and historical heritage	None
TO7 Improvement of accessibility to the regions, development of transport and common networks and systems	P 3.1 Development of cross border transport infrastructure and ICT tools	Including an additional indicator for the Program: “ <i>Number of environmentally friendly (carbon-proofed) cross-border transport initiatives developed</i> ” Modification of an indicator in order to include activities related to multimodal transport
OT8 Common challenges in the field of safety and security	P 4.1 Support to the development of health services and access to health	None
	P 4.2 Support to joint activities for the prevention of natural and man-made disasters as well as joint actions during emergency situations	Completion of the proposed indicator related to joint activities with “ <i>new or updated maps, databases, systems / structures, purchased equipment, etc</i> ” Modification of the indicator in order to include activities for reducing the impact of disasters caused by man (including the project Clean river). Use of an environmental specific indicator: <i>Land surface affected by the implementation of the measures</i>

	P 4.3 Prevention and fight against organised crime and police cooperation	None
Large infrastructure projects	“ «Clean river» Danube	Completion
	Improving the cross-border infrastructure – opening the gate to Europe	None
	Regional Cooperation for Prevention and Fighting of Cross-border Crime between Romania-Ukraine	None
	Improvement of the population safety and security level in the cross-border area by enhancing the joint training and cooperation actions in emergency management.	None