Overview of returned questionnaires IMPEL-CP workshop Doing the right things, FINAL. **Please note: the overview should be seen as a simplified summary. For details, see the collection of completed questionnaires itself. This overview has no legal status.**

		Aus (StUI?)	Bel (BIME)	Bul (RIEW)	Cyp (DLI)	Cz (CEI)	Den (county)	Est (EI)	Fra (Drire)	Ger (StUA)	Gre (HEI)	Hun MfEW	Ita (ARPAT)	Lat (SES)	Lit (REPD)	Net (VI)	Nor SFT	Pol (ChIEP)	Por (EGI)	Slovak (SEI)	Slove (IRSEP)	Spa (Basque)	Swe (CAB)	Tur (MEF)	UK (SEPA)
Administration																									
1.1.a	Level?	Regional	Regional	Regional	National	National.	Local	National	Regional	Regional	National	National	Regional	National	National.	National	National	National	National	National	National	Regional	Regional	National	Regional
	Staff?	4	60	No answer	No answer	> 600	20	240	No answer	100	32	1500	4	200	177	570	250	1740	70	No answer	545	5	600	2000	No answer
1.1.b	Superior?	Plant authority is primary responsible. Inspection authority: technical coordination	Shared responsib. by regional and local authorities.	Under Moe	Labour insp. Is the only inspecting auth. In Cyprus	Under MoE	Most under autonomy. Cooperation with County.	Under MoE. Only inspectorate at state level	Authority for permits is on Frèfet level and decides on enforcement	Operates under Ministry of Agriculture, Environment and Rural areas as superiour authority.	HEI is special authority, under MoE.	Under MoE	Coordinates inspections for 5 provinces on Seveso.	Under MoE	Regional departments is responsible to State inspectorate	Under MoE.	Under MoE	Under MoE	Under MoE.	SIE provides support to regional inspectorates.	Under MoE.	Is delegated to Basque government.	Region provides 49 local authorities with knowledge.	Inspectorate is responsible. Cooperation with Provincial directorates.	Charging schemes must be approved by Scottish Executive.
Inspection plan																									
2.1.a	Ins. Plan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.	Yes, a kind of.	Yes	Yes, for plants which need a licence.	Yes.	Yes	Yes, for Seveso legislation..	No inspection plan. In National env. policy plan.	Yes, local/ district agencies have such plan.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	No	Yes, developed from several key documents.
2.1.b	Scope	5 years. Scope is according to recommended examination activities. Area: the province of Styria. Inspection covers default of the RMCEI. Schedule of inspections is valid for 5 years. Plants are specified in yearly programmes.	5 years planning. 80% is preventive inspections, 20% is re-active (complaints, incidents, accidents).	Yearly. Weekly schedule. 50% signals/ complaints, 50% planned Mainly IPPC, water usage, waste treatment, Seveso,. Freq: 1) on basis of permissions; 2) missing permissions. Goal: more "from desk" inspections	To ensure that comp operate as permitted. Focus in 2006: VOC (99/13), IPPC near residential areas, emissions large combustion plants, selfmonitoring, PM10.	Long term planning by directorate CEI (strategic .plan) ; annual by 10 indiv. Inspectorates, who integrates needs from national and reg. scale. Results are monitored by written and e-documents.	Four years. Area: municipality. Scope: environmental management / protection in general. More re-active then pro-active. Industry is resp. for self monitoring.	Current plan was set up early 2006. For whole country. Frequency: 1 inspection a year (IPPC large companies); 1 per 3 years (more then 1 permit); 1 per 5 years (1 permit);	A (2000 install): 1 inspection a year, B (8000 install, Seveso and IPPC) 1 inspection 3 year, C (23000 install) 1 in 10 year. Each year, 10% of total has to be checked unexpected. Also focus on: self monotiring, controls by third party; EIA, etc.	By RMCEI, timeframe: continuas and unlimited. It covers all EC legal requremens Also pro-active actions like compliance ass. And promotion. Also long term planning.	On a year basis by internal procedures . Basic elements: compliance promotion, and creating proper partnership.	Plan covers one year's activity, for whole area of competence of inspectorate: controlled installations and EC legal requirements. Plan covers room for non routine, unplanned inspections (based on complaints), and accidents. Pro-active inspections are not in use.	Focus: Seveso. Planning: long term planning. No inspection priorities set in daily practise	Five years. 2004 – 2008, implementation by Env. Action plan	Plan is developed for 1 year. Are adopted by Regional insp. Each inspector has insp. plan. Focus on install. listed in RMCEI. 15 EU directives are covered. Focus on compliance checking, not on promotion. Some regions do planning 3 months; State promotes longer plans.	For longer period, unlimited in time. Parts are yearly reconsidered, i.c. prioritisation of legislative tasks. Scope: 250 tasks of enforcement of legislation. Area: Whole country. Re-active and pro-active activities. Since this year: longtime planning for all prior tasks.	No particular timeframe; parts are based on long term planning. Prioritisation is based on a national register of installations, which again is based on risks, env. impact, size of installations, location, etc.	Annual and quarterly . Seveso and IPPC, focus on large enterprises. Plan includes inspection goals and total # of inspections planned.	Covers 1 year. Is developed in last 3 m of each year. Routine inspections (IPPC, Seveso II), reactive inspections, monitoring inspections, admin. inspections. 96/61, 99/13, 76/464, 99/31, 91/271, 96/82, etc. Also pro-active activities	Yearly. Approved by MoE. Long term planning and effectiveness are no part of the plan.	Yearly. Contains compulsory all installations. 3 Priorities: IPPC, Seveso, VOC install. Also action oriented issues. Also active and reactive activities. Activities are monitored weekly. Does not contain long term planning.	In inspection and control plan 2003 – 2007: 4 year, for Basque region. Mainly focus but not only to IPPC. Pro-active activities, routine inspections, re-active activities, monitoring compliance.	Every inspecting authority has duty to plan and carry out inspections. 1 year now, will be 3 year in future. Scope is larger then RMCEI. Focus: how often every plant should be visited and things to control. Area is the county. More then IPPC. Plan covers re-active, pro-active and monitoring activities.	Priorities by comments from provincial directorates. Also balanced distribution amongst industrial sectors. Industrial density and environmental impact are factors for priority setting.	Plan covers all regulatory activities for range of regimes. Reactive inspections on bases of incidents/ complaints. On bases of experiences forecast for inspections for next year. Pro active inspections: based on advisory role of SEPA. 12 month period.
2.1.c	Criteria	To defaults of national laws, related to types of installations. Intervals vary from 1 to 5 years.	Risk assessment and priority setting. Planned inspections: risk/impact of installation and conditions of permits. Unplanned inspections: public complaints.	Plan does not include explicit criteria. Priorities yearly set by RIEW. 1) risk of install & environ. Impact; 2) # of complaints and written signals	EC requirements, environm. Impact, complaints, state of local environment	Size of plants, risks, complaints, etc.	Level of environmental pollution. Level of compliance. Complaints.	Environm. Impact, risks, lever of performance /compliance, complaints. Includes principes for yearly workspLans. Special project for more efficient criteria for prioritization! 1st outcomes in march 06	Ad A: by national guidelines, B and C: local criteria	1. routine insp. 2, special directed inspections, and 3. non routine inspections. Criteria: risk of install., state of local environm., level op compliance, and complaints.	Environmental impacts and risks, state of local environm., compliance level, IPPC install.	IPPC installations shall be inspected once a year. Legal considerations, list of polluting activities special guidance, and staff capacity are criteria, but also env. impact, risks, state of local environment, performace / compliance level, experiences, etc.	Risk index. (Quantity of dangerous chemicals, area, other information)	Proportionality, identical actions with similar situations, transparency, stricness, honesty	State encourages IMPEL report "Planning of inspections and reporting". Priorities for next year by MoE. Listed criteria in Q are relevant.	On regulatory level: state of risk and compliance behaviour, classified in compliance and risk indicators. Compliance indicator is used to calculate compliance effort on yearly basis. Criteria: risk and non compliance rate.	Parts of the plan are based on the national register and procedures, which describes frequency, how comprehensive inspections will be, etc. Also earlier expe-rien-ces play a role, amongst criteria as envir. risk assessement, location, changes in legislation, etc.	1. aims of inspections, 2. list of controlled products, 3. total # of inspections, 4. # of complex inspections, 5. # of problem inspections, and others: see Q.	Idinitific. Of industrial sectors yearly and type of inspection campaigns. Crit: risks of emissions, complaints, comp. record, self monitoring data, complexity of facilities, residential areas, etc.	Environm. Impact and risk of install, state of local env. Level of performance and compliance, complaints	Environm. Impact and risk of install. level of performance install., complaints. Also obligations from MoE. Now started: project prioritisation inspection recourses.	Pollution potential mainly IPPC and Seveso, special enviorm. Problems, areas with envir. Interest, new env. Laws, of with low degree of compliance, complaints, random inspections.	By differentiated inspection methodology, reference to national environmental objectives. Priority to large plants, huge impact, high risks, many complaints, low level of performance.	No inspection plan.	Defined by risk assessment methodology and manual. Overall risk assessment: number of inspections and associated regulatory effort.
2.1.d	Coop.	Plan of 2004 was issued by plan authority responsible for "legal coordination of env. inspections".	With local authorities, by MoU. Plan is drafted by own organisation.	Approval by minister. Coop. with 2 districts.	Only by labour department. Others have no responsibil.	Drafted and appr. by own org. Inspectorate can coop. with region.	Drafted by own inspectorate. Now also with public meetings; they are asked on priorities. Final decision by City Council.	Drafting by inspectorate, with some support from MoE on priorities. Alost no other cooperation	Drating by national auth. and regional inspectorate, During execution coop. with HSA and Water insp.	Drafted and decided by federal state ministry	Exclusive drafting by HEI, taking into consideration input from local and regional auth.	Regional inspectorare prepars the plan, and is approved by the minister. In few occasions combined inspections (like HSE)	Drafting by: no answer given. Cooperation with local authorities.	Only drafted by own onrganisation. Coop. with regional boards. Final decision by MoE.	Drafting by city/district. Cooper. in complicated cases. Plans are approv. by Region.	By inspectorate, in cooperation with policy makers. Final decision by MoE. Further no cooperation.	SFT makes the plan, but gets suggestions from counties. Also dialogue with other national inspection authorities.	Inspection plan prepared by Vovoid. Coop with municipality is possible. Final decision by Vovoid dir.	Drafted by own Inspectorate. Input is coming from licensing entities. Plan is approved by MoE.	Drafted by SIE, but coop. with other authorities. MoE takes final decision	Drafted by own inspectorate, approved by MoE.	Drafted by own organisation, after 2 rounds of internal and external consultation. Approval by regional government.	Drafted by own organisation. Approved by deputy governor. For Seveso plants plan drafted with other departments.	No inspection plan.	Drafted and maintained by SEPA. On specific topics partnership with other agencies.
2.1.e	Public	Publication of inspection results via internet is foreseen. Has to be done (not voluntary) by the responsible authorities. Only aggregated info is published now.	Annual work plans are available for public, by www. Voluntary.	No obligation. Reporting annual basis.	No, only by issueing or renewing permits.	Not available for public. Reporting: voluntary	Once per year: reporting to Danish EPA. Available for public; by local newspapers, libraries, city offices, www. Very few ask to see the report.	No obligation and pusblishment so far. Is volutarny	Press release, emissions on www. Now ideas for publishing inspection reports on www.	No elements for public reporting. Info is transferred i.c.w. 2003/4. Now preparing 2003/35.	Via www: under contruction. Annual report of RMCEI for EC is available for public.	Summary reports are made available for the public.	Reporting is required, but does not contain elements for public.	Elements of public reporting via www. This reporting is voluntary	Annual plan by State via www. to public. "What and when" is not communicated to public.	Awareness building by "table of eleven", on reasons for non compliance. Plan contains also communication strategy. Report is available on www. (voluntary)	Annual report is publised on internet.	Via www.: % realisation of aims. Access i.c.w. Aarhus	Yearly public report on www., includes plan next year and results prev. year. Is voluntary.	Yes, via different ways. Via media and press releases. Is voluntary or levally required, depends on subject	For public available on request. Reporting is voluntary. Also annual report for MoE.	Via www. Important principle: transparency and right to information. Now ideas for communication procedure in the plan.	All (inspection) papers are public. All 4 years environment report, about outcomes. Also yearly report with statistics on regulatory activities.	No inspection plan.	Yes, on SEPA website. Risk basesments for major plants are published each year on internet to inform stakeholders.
2.1.f	Man-tl	Not in classical sense. However: more focus on efficiency and priorities in change of organisation should be managed.	4 months reviews. Per department progress is monitored monthly. Various other tools as performance assessment tools.	Is ground for budget, capacity & technical equipment	To document and prove need for human and $ recourses	Used as tool in in the Strategy Plan	Inspection programme has to be done in compliance with inspection plan. Goes not in detail into recourses, knowledge and tools.	Setting human and $ recourses	Plan is 1 of 5 indicators in negotiation about $ between national and regional authr.	For exchange of knowledge, and use of data tools. Not for steering hum cap. and $.	Plan is adjusted to capability of HEI; optimum allocation of human cap., $, etc.	Plan is not used as steering model vor human capacity. All inspection data are availabe for experts; data are used for exchange of knowledge inside the organisation.	No answer	No answer	Plan is also tool for having recourses	Yes.	Is not used as management tool during the year, exept for allocating personel recourses. Management aspects are vital, like personal and $ recourses, databases, and involvement of top level.	Plan contains amongst other tools the budget. Results of inspections are registered in data bases.	Yes, for human rec., financial, etc.	Used for preparation inspection programmes by regional inspectorates	Yes, special in human capacity, exchange of knowledge.	Ambition: to switch from indicators (as fines) to reduction of env. Risks of sites. Training of inspectors, management of information, database, steering human recourses, etc.	Done y some principles. Depends on emission rate and performance level.	No inspection plan.	Corporate plan includes specific targets to be achieved; these are monitored and assessed. Inspections must be prioritised.
2.1.g	Eff.	Evaluation of plan is foreseen before expiration in 2009.	Self evaluation, external evaluations and audits.	% compliance	Comparing annual air quality. Trends in emissions.	Evaluation strat. plan: quarterly. Yearly evaluation: inspection plans as well.	For every activity in the plan: set of "criteria of success". Monitoring is expected to be done.	Criteria are under elaboration	Annually	Twice a year: evaluation of electronics documentation	Ongoing improvement: env. Performance of installations as index.	Yearly reports are prepared; quantity of inspections, actions taken, and amount of fines imposed.	No answer	No answer	Efficiency: % executing. Each 3 months measured.	Via 12 indicators, grouped in "inputs", "outputs", "intermediate outcomes", and "final outcome".	Is difficult. Trends are coming up which provde usefull information for ongoing development of plans.	Improvement state of envir. Quantity of realised agreements, quantity of put tickets, - punishments, - penalties.	Evaluation regularly. Number of inspections carried out is main quant. Result.	Yearly; on fulfilling its targets. No criteria are used on effect. Or efficiency.	Effiency is monitored weekly, and evaluated monthly.	Plan to introduce in the tool the inputs to inspection (human and other recourses) and the benefits (env. Risk reduction, etc.)	# of inspections, # of injunctions, # of legal proceedings. Evaluated once a year. Focus on improvements.	No inspection plan.	n.a.
2.1.h	Rev?	Adjustment is to be accepted in 2009.	Plan is flexible. New priorities are re-discussed. 5% of workload is reserved for unforeseen actions.	No revision forseen. Circumstances are replected in new annual plans. Changed legislation: discussion at regular meetings.	New/changing: taken into account in examination.	Plans: in accordance with valid national legislation, related to current or serious problems. If legislation changes: plan can be changed.	Changing legislation is covered in the plan. Also by quality management system.	Once a year	Programme is a 3 year programme, plan will be revised in 2007.	In case of special necessities based on latest findings, or by changing legislation	New or changing leg. is adopted in inspection plan revision	Because plan is prepared each year, changing legislation can be taken into account. Annual revision seems to be adequate.	No answer	No answer	Is legally required. New legislation is taken into account.	New list on priorities is made every year and forms basis for operational planning. New legislation is taken into account.	Plans provide annually input for changes in priorities and in regulations.	None. Is however possible.	No.	Plan can be revised if necessary	In special occasions. (changing legislation, special requests of ministry)	Next revision in 2007. New legislation is included every year in annual programme.	Is revised continuously, but yearly. Also for new legislation.	No inspection plan.	Annually. New legislation and emerging issues are assessed to consider the organisational impact / resourcing requirements

Overview of returned questionnaires IMPEL-CP workshop Doing the right things, FINAL. **Please note: the overview should be seen as a simplified summary. For details, see the collection of completed questionnaires itself. This overview has no legal status.**

		Aus (StUI?)	Bel (BIME)	Bul (RIEW)	Cyp (DLI)	Cz (CEI)	Den (county)	Est (EI)	Fra (Drire)	Ger (StUA)	Gre (HEI)	Hun MfEW	Ita (ARPAT)	Lat (SES)	Lit (REPD)	Net (VI)	Nor SFT	Pol (ChIEP)	Por (EGI)	Slovak (SEI)	Slove (IRSEP)	Spa (Basque)	Swe (CAB)	Tur (MEF)	UK (SEPA)
Inspection programme																									
2.2.a	Ins. Prog	Yes.	Yes, annual basis. Detailed plans are worked out by each staff member.	For each type of inspection (IPPC, etc.)	Yes	Yes, for technical branches (air, water, waste)	Yes, every year.	Yes	Yes	Yes, it follows the inspection plan	Yes, precisely followed by HEI.	Annual plan contains the activities, mainly focussing on permitting. 14% of work is dealing with (re-active) inspections.	Yes, for Seveso legislation	Yes	Yes, annual programmes by region.	Yes, its made out of the strategy plan.	Yes.	Performed in accordance with national instruction.	Yes	Yes	No detailed programme. Each inspector prepares own programme. From time to time programmes for special targets actions.	Plan is implemented by annual programmes.	It is the same thing as inspection plan.	Yes.	Yes, developed from documents forming the inspection plan.
2.2.b	Prep.	Prepared by Agency, in agreement with plant authorities. Task is given to authorities in whole province.	Totally by own inspectorate	Totally, by REIW	Totally by Labour dept., every December	Prepared by directorate, adopted by individual inspectorates	By local government, but must comply with agreement DEPA and national municipality association (frequency – types on installations)	By inspectorate, with support from MoE in prep. Phase	By each DRIRE on basis of inspection plan and annual priorities	By Federal ministry. For Seveso II detailed inspection programme by other ministry	Exclusively by HEI. Taking into account: complaints, indicents, accidents, etc.	Not applicable.	By own organisation	Inspec. Programme by regional boards. General conclusion by central org.	Yes, local/ district agencies have such plan. Are adopted by Regional insp. Each inspector has insp. Plan.	By own inspectorate. Final decision by Head. During plan development is contact with other authorities for cooperation.	Plan is made by SFT with suggestions from reional authorities, who make their own inspection programmes as well.	By vovoidship	By inspectorate	Prepared by regional inspectorates, on basis of approved inspection plan	There is no insp. Programme	By own organisation. With collaboration of local administrations.	By own organisation.	By own organisation. Approval by MoE.	Created, maintained and carried out by SEPA. Sometimes joint programmes with other agencies.
2.2.c	Scope	Plants are specified in yearly programmes. See also 2.1.b	Industrial activities, SME's, incineration plants, individuals, covering wide ranges of aspects.	Covers all inspected installations, EC legislation, i.a. 96/61, 96/82, 85/337, 2001/80, 94/63, 76/464, 92/43, etc.	VOC (99/13 and 94/63), dust cement installation, 2nd half 2006: focus on IPPC install.	Programme pose methods of checking activities.	Licensing, inspecting and enforcing. Renewed every year.	Focus = one year. Includes list of install. To be inspected for every regional department. Programme = based demands of (EU) legislation.	Each year. Covers a list of inspections with information per company	Arrangements for routine and cyclic inspections. Also for non routine inspections. Time frame: differs from 1 yr. (Seveso II), 2 yrs (IPPC) and 3-6 yrs. for small install.	Issued on monthly bases.	Not applicable.	Scope: Seveso directive	By manual of environmental inspectors. Enterprises are grouped by size, potential and actual impact, type of activity. Grouped by A, B and C cat.	15 EU directives	At this moment 1 year, 250 legislative tasks. This year: development of a four-years programme.	On annual basis. It describes activities for inspection department including some for the regional authorities. Is basis for work planning of inspectors.	One to several days, in range from single to many problems. From one to a dozen EU directives.	Is elaborated each month, inspections must be achieved until end of month. EU leg: see above. Covers: name of plants to be inspected, name of inspectors, geograph. Area.	Scope by inspection plan, time frame is 3 month. All EU regulations and directions are covered.	There is no insp. Programme	Programme sets aims for a year regarding with recourses, qualification/ training, …, new legislation, communication, info management, changes in procedures and sectors/ activities.	All regulations and directives that have been implemented in national legislation.	Regulations cover 12 national regulations. Scope covers industrial installations from all sectors and all over the country.	On annual bases.
2.2.d	Crit.	Routine and non routine inspections on basis of the denomination of plant authorities. Plant authority decides on necessity and/or priority on plant inspection. Capacity is critical factor.	Subcriteria within: complexity of the company, risk index, emissions, environmental management.	Staff, duration and freq. depend on complexity install, risk, compliance record	Routine inspections: Recent permit: within 6 months; environmental impact; performance/ compliance; close proximity resid. Areas. Non routine: need assessing missions existing installations complaints.	Real environmental impact, occurrence of incidents	State of compliance, level of environmental impact.	Environm. Impact, risks, lever of performance /complaince, complaints. Includes principes for yearly worksplans. Special project for more efficient criteria for prioritization! 1st outcomes in march 06	Freq. are planned after national plan and its criteria. Also: complexity, impact and risks, complaints, accidents, repreted inspections in case of non compliance	Environm. Impact. Risk. Are laid down in different categories. Accidents, incdents, complaints, also criteria for shorter and non routine inspection frequencies.	Env. Impact and risks, env. Compliance, complaints, occurrence of accidents, state of local environment	The same as 2.1.c.	Risk.	Guidelines and frequency on strategic level: A cat: 2-3 /year, B cat: 1-2/year; C cat: once in 2-4 year.. Planning on local level: size of company, branches, load on environment	Each inspector develops own inspection plan; first pays attention to available recourses.	Criteria: tasks with the highest priorities: targets to be reached within 4 years. Routine checks: based on experiences. Non routine checks: based on signals in society; reservation in time is made; based on risk analyses (PRISS)	Is a detailed and operational plan, including time budget, based on inspection plan and criteria described under inspection plans.	Routine insp: Risk of install; envir. Impact; human recourses. Non-routine: incidents; special programmes; complaints; new enterprises.	Routine: level of compliance, level of compl. In case of corrective measures, record, complexity of facility. Non-routine: requests from cabinet or MoE; complaints, accidents, fires, etc.	Level of performance and compliance of installations, environmental risk / impact, occurrence of incidents and accidents, complaints, are used for planning frequencies for routine and non routine insp.	Envir. Impact and risk of installations, level of performance, complaints. This will be base for operational planning.	Non routine: emergency lines, complaints, etc. top priority in case of urgent action. Routine inspections: matching between recourses and frequency and type, by risk assessment tool that has been developed.	Same as above	Routine inspections: Environmental impact, risk, amount of pollution, industrial density of the area, size of installation. Non-routine: by Provincial directorates, with own criteria, like complaints, observations, etc.	Nature of the regime (e.g. water, radioactive substances, etc.) and methodology used. Frequency is based on pollution hazard appraisal, and operator performance assessment.
Information needs																									
3.1.a	Lack	Homogeneous development of inspections in 9 Austrian provinces; Same execution of EU defaults within all EU countries;Practical inclusion from EMAS.	Well defined indicators of performance on the level of inspection.	1. Equipment and software, 2: good practices, 3: human and fin. Recourses	1. recourses: more staff!, 2 contacts with similar organisations technical advice, 3: good examples	Good examples from similar organisations	Not much really, except maybe efficient sanctions	Lack on good examples and qualified staff. Problem for other small countries??	Criteria on environmental impact – inspection frequencies Tools/ indicators to evaluate efficiency. Info to public after inspections	Lack of recourses (qualified staff, budget) and setting priorities on daily work. Electr. Info systems are installed but not consequently used. Checklist is developed and tested now.	Development of the Administration is not completed yet. To be done: laboratories, and legal frame improvements (inspections, penalties).	Lack of recourses give a need for more efficiency. Further there is a need for guidelines for inspections and enforcement.	Good examples	No answer	Good examples for priority setting	Adequate historical database with compliance information on huge numbers of target groups.	There is little information on consequences and effects of inspections. There is a need for measuring the effectiveness of inspection activities.	Lack of staff and budget	Improving coordintion between ministries and inspectorates. To create a data base to access self monitoring data of plants.	No answer	Lack of class. System of installations. Closer cooperation with env. Agency. People with planning experience.	Info on guidelines, good examples, and feasible quality parameters and indicators. Developed method is not fully implemented: these Q arise. Human recourses. Some criteria conflict.	Ask for more and revised / updated guidelines and more recourses.	Now in transposition to new environmental law, also in lights of EU criteria. Recourses are very insufficient.	No clear picture if prioritisation methods and indicators are appropriate: experiences with other MS would be helpful. Limited recourse to assess if prioritisation has been effective.
Additional points																									
4.1.a	Add.?	Contribution at workshop is limited to 2 years experiences from one province. Input will be manly operational experiences.	None	Cumulative impact is important! How to communicate in negative env. Impact as method? Is there good experience?	Link from actions – programmes – plans -> strategies. Modelling is now dominating in strategic decision making.	Appreciates opportunity to exchange experiences	I believe all has been covered!	None	None	None	Critical: : procedure for calculation of administrative sanctions (penalties) to type magnitude of violations,	Some points of attention are given for legal specialities. Also a new initiative on cooperation with Ministry of Interior is described, called "green Commando"	None	None	None	None	None	Would be useful to compare length and content of reports in different countries	None	None	Wants to present their project on classification of installations and Environmental Information System, which is bases for programme setting.	Interesting project! Would like to encourage all people involved and to continue with it.	Is willing to give presentation on priority method.	Pilot runs for education of inspectors on integrated inspections.	None