

***II International Conference. PRTR-España: 2001/2011,
Ten Years of Public Information. CHALLENGES FOR THE
FUTURE. July 3th-4th, 2013. Madrid. Spain.***

OUTCOMES



www.prtr-es.es

PRTR-España

Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente

Correo electrónico/E-mail: info@prtr-es.es

Summary

- 1. Commitment to consensus**
- 2. Conclusions SESSION 1**
- 3. Conclusions SESSION 2**

1.- Commitment to consensus

The **responsibility** for the quality of the data is shared between owners/operators of industrial facilities and competent authorities.

The **commitment to consensus** is the key to a good quality and evolution of the information contained in PRTR registers.



***The owners/operators always have the first responsibility** when reporting data. Authorities have the responsibility of checking reported data and may ask the operator to improve the quality of the data.*

Higher quality data can be obtained through the implementation of:

- **complimentary information that includes efficiency criteria and contextualization**
- **Increase the common criteria** in data collection,
- Development of **guidelines on calculation/measurement** methods agreed between the industrial sectors and authorities.

2.- Conclusions SESSION 1: Public information

1

The **PRTR websites and internet** in general are the main ways to inform to the public, in addition to **social networks** (Twitter, Facebook, etc..).



PRTRs already have these broadcast channels. What can be done to generate a greater public's interest?

Keep working to improve the quality of the data and the public's education towards the use of the information.

It would be interesting to exchange more information between different PRTR websites and social networks, both national and international.

2

PRTR registers can be a **very effective model for international cooperation**. More countries continue to incorporate these tools for the environmental management.



This is potentially very powerful tool.

However, there is a need to search and define criteria of comparability. For example facilitating equivalence tables between different code classifications (Industrial activities, NACE / ISIC, ...).

This meeting itself provided a very good opportunity to cooperate with other countries/organizations. Further cooperation might be explored.

2.- Conclusions SESSION 1: Public information

3

It is evident that the public in general, when consulting PRTR data, **perceives mainly** a figure about the **environmental performance of industries**.



However, **this data may not always be interpreted in the right way**. Additional information needs to be included both at facility level and sectorial level. Data such as volume of production, size, employees, economic activity codes, environmental improvements, BAT implemented, etc., can be made public, always with environmental purposes.

4

It is essential to **help the public to understand and to interpret the data**.



In addition to contextualizing the information, it is essential to send clear messages to the public. Among other actions, it is proposed to:

- **“On line” additional helps/texts that explain the information better.**
- **Activities/workshops** addressed to **environmental journalists** and/or **civil society organizations (NGOs)**.

The use of **electronic tools** and internet platforms (websites, **PRTR: learn**), can help significantly on this point.

2.- Conclusions SESSION 1: Public information

5

It is necessary to **give further added value and usefulness to the data.**



Authorities and organizations are using the information for decision-making process (i.e. environmental policy development and monitoring ...), and also in environmental liability reporting, health, etc.

Messages must be clear, simple and not alarmist.

Linking the information from PRTRs and Environmental permits (IPPC/DEI permits for example) could be useful, as it is already made in the Spanish system (PRTR-España).

3.- Conclusions SESSION 2: data comparability

1

The **exchange of information** among different authorities levels/depts. and, also between industry and governments, is critical not only for improving the validation process but also to optimize the environmental performance of industries.

*Different ways of communication can be used, either **direct** (presential meetings, working groups) **or indirect** (discussion forums "online", webinars) ways. The goal is to see what information is missing and how to integrate it into the PRTRs.*

2

To improve the coherence of data a **common basis needs to be set internationally**. However, the variability of circumstances makes that only agreements on general criteria are achieved.

*Finding alternatives, including the **possibility of establishing equivalence tables** between methods / methodologies used per industrial sectors/substances and/ or geographic areas, for example, are needed.*

These kind of works could be carried out in existing international groups such as for example the EIPPCB TWGs (at EU level) being included in BREFs and BAT conclusions. Or by the TF on PRTR (OECD), or even in the framework of the WGP to the Protocol..

3.- Conclusions SESSION 2: data comparability

3

The **standardization of criteria and methodologies** (per industrial sector, pollutants, etc..) is always possible up to a certain level of consensus. The procedure to standardize usually begin under request.

*A suggestion is to establish technical groups for working in future standardizing rules and criteria. **Exchange of information to provide UNE / EN or ISO standards always updated.** (Equivalence of standards from various organizations: EPA / ISO / UNE / EN, etc..?).*

*In principle, any method/methodology can be valid if it is justified. Therefore, while the standardization works is progressing, **it is important that owners/operators give broader information on methods/methodologies used, not only its name.***

4

Global goal to achieve: **administrative streamlining** of the legal requirements.

***PRTR could be used as an entry route to other information** requirements that PRTR facilities must also comply (Inventories, ETS, POPs, GHGs, etc .) by through extending current questionnaires/on line forms, document management, etc. The Public Authorities should improve their coordination both at different levels and departments and must seek consensus agreements.*

*Furthermore, **it is essential that the competent authority understands the need to simplify the legislation** by homogenization of scopes, areas, activity/substance thresholds, etc.*

3.- Conclusions SESSION 2: data comparability

5

There is great difficulty when trying to analyze the consistency of data among different information requirements.

It is crucial to **take advantages of the strengths** of each of this existing tools/instruments.



*PRTR: **identification of facilities** (point sources)
ETS: **methodologies for CO₂** emission calculations,
National Inventory (EMEP/CORINEAIR): **proposal/development for determination
emission data** to other pollutants / industrial sectors...Also information about the **pollution
from diffuse sources**.
Air quality and water quality networks/inventories, etc.*

6

The improvement of comparability and harmonization among PRTRs have progressed at some degree (for example, efforts made by EU, UNECE, OECD at international level).

Continuous improvement is essential for proper development of information and comparability of data at different scales.



*It is critical to ensure and **continuously improve the feedback mechanisms** from governments / industry / civil society organizations and from the public in general.*

Thank you very much for your participation and for your contributions!

Más información/*More information*

PRTR-España:

www.prtr-es.es

correo electrónico/*e-mail*: info@prtr-es.es

Teléfono/*Telephone*: +34 902 54 53 50

Follow us on Twitter: [@prtr_es](https://twitter.com/prtr_es)