

ANNEX D: RESPONSES FROM PILOT STUDIES TO SURVEY QUESTIONS

Advanced Cancer Risk Assessment Methods

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

Changes in national activities and approaches and other landmark achievements resulting from a Pilot Study activities as identified by its Directors, with special reference to assistance for partner countries: The Pilot Study is aimed at providing scientific basis, information, criteria and methodological tools for the assessment of risks of cancer, together with some risk management criteria. The Pilot Study participants are involved in the effective application of carcinogenic risk assessment in their countries, as researchers and experts of national institutes or agencies charged with this task, or universities and research centers carrying out studies in this field and providing advice to their governments. As a consequence, the Pilot Study activity has provided a suitable occasion for information exchange and discussion and comparison of existing national procedures (this point has made part of the already published book of Pilot Study phase 1). At present, in Pilot Study phase 2, this point has been extended with a significant participation from Partner countries (Belarus, Czech Republic, Lithuania, Moldova). Some Pilot Study phase 1 conclusions have also been presented at the EU expert commission for the methods for the risk assessment of “existing and new chemicals”. It is worthwhile underlining that CCMS has offered to scientists from EU, US, Eastern Europe a suitable occasion for scientific information exchanges and joint research, dealing both with theoretical and practical aspects. In this sense, in my opinion, CCMS Pilot Studies may fill an existing gap in information exchange and scientific cooperation in this field (e.g. E.U. expert groups as a rule include only member from E.U. member countries, and only occasionally some US contribution is provided, while Eastern Europe is not participating; analogous considerations may hold for OECD for this latter point). Moreover, most E.U. working groups and expert groups have to deal with specific practical items, rather than with general principles, and at this level existing national regulations and problems may have a major weight, while during Pilot Study, when dealing with the scientific basis of the problem of improving cancer prevention methods and strategies, it was possible to freely discuss and analyze the various approaches, with the aim of reaching a common position.

Meaningful technology transfer: The Pilot Study was not aimed at transferring technology in a strict sense, but rather at transferring a methodological approach, scientific criteria, and at stimulating cancer prevention activity. As an example, the Pilot Study phase 1 report: “V.J. Cogliano, E.G. Luebeck and G.A. Zapponi (eds): Perspectives on biologically based cancer risk assessment”, NATO Challenges of Modern Society Vol. 23, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher, N.Y., which has included contributions from Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, USA, had and has a good diffusion in western Europe and US, and has also been distributed to new participants of phase 2. The Summary report has also been published in the Central Europe Journal of Public Health (Zapponi and Cogliano, 1998, 684:317-320), also with the aim of diffusing in eastern Europe the results obtained and stimulating colleagues from these countries to participate to phase 2. Moreover, some items reported in the previous point are also relevant to this one.

Contribution to training activities: For economical reasons, also due to the relatively high number of meetings hold in the past, it was not possible to organize an international seminar on the Pilot Study results. However, Pilot Study Directors have been informed of various seminars organized at national level by participants, in which topics of the Pilot Study were included (e.g., in Italy this happened during the last 3 years).

Stimulation of R&D activities: The Pilot Study activity makes part of US/Italian scientific cooperation, signed at Washington in 1998. It has stimulated an important cooperation of experts from Greece, who were and are very active in this field (at the last meeting Greece has participated with 4 experts) with experts of other countries. It has recently stimulated a major interest in experts from Belarus, Czech Republic, Lithuania and Moldova, who are very active in the project. Lastly, by taking into account the indication from CCMS Direction in Brussels, we are at the moment trying to organizing a meeting also considering the consequences of Chernobyl consequences.

Final Draft

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

* As is well known, most eastern Europe countries are at present very interested at criteria, regulations, procedures concerning environment and health, adopted in western countries, also with the aim of making part of NATO and of E.U. (e.g. some partner countries interested to the project or participating to it became NATO member countries in the period within the first and the second phase 2 meetings). This is in my mind an important argument for participation. Moreover, and presumably equally important, there is a main interest in improving health risk prevention strategies also based on western country experience. A support in this field is certainly welcome.

The number of participants from member countries has increased in phase 2 with the participation of Spain, and the "old" participants have largely confirmed their interest. The expectation, in this case, is to improve and extend the work already carried out, also by treating new items (the scheme adopted for present work may clarify this point).

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

Participants from partner countries were very grateful to CCMS for the occasion provided and the support given. In this case, I think, is expected and desired a more extended possibility of information exchange and of effective cooperation. I think that the organization of seminars and courses in eastern Europe might be an important goal. It is also important to organize meetings in these countries, in order to allow more participants to be present. During last year, for several practical reasons and difficulties at local level, it was not possible to organize meetings in eastern Europe.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

Something which I consider a good scientific contribution, jointly produced by experts from different contexts, experiences and disciplines (e.g., the published report).

The possibility of a fruitful cooperation of scientists from E.U, U.S and eastern Europe, in a continuative an long term way. This is very rare, or even not possible, through other means than CCMS/NATO.

The possibility of a cooperation not only dealing with specific and partial topics, but rather with the rationale of a main aspect of health risk prevention, also overcoming the specific national points of views connected with the already existing regulations.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

1. V.J. Cogliano, E.G. Luebeck and G.A. Zapponi (eds): "Perspectives on biologically based cancer risk assessment", NATO Challenges of Modern Society Vol. 23, Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher, N.Y., which has included contributions from Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, USA, and has a good diffusion in western Europe and US, and has also been distributed to new participants of phase 2. For more quantitative details, the publisher could be contacted (my information is based on the funds that authors have received as consequence of a small percentage on books sold).
2. Zapponi G.A. and Cogliano J. (1998): "Dose-response analysis and biologically-based risk assessment for initiator and promoter carcinogens", Summary Report of NATO/CCMS Pilot Study, Cent. Eur. J. Public Health, 684:317-320.
3. There were different papers published by Pilot Study participants, based on their experience during the project. At the moment, however, I have not the details, and I can only mention a paper I have published: Zapponi G.A., Attias L. and Marcello I. (1997): "Risk Assessment of Complex Mixtures: Some considerations on Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Urban Areas", J. of Environmental Toxicology

Final Draft

and Oncology, 16(2&3), 209-214

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

In my opinion, it could be useful to organize some meetings involving representatives of the World Health Organization and E.U. Commissions, dealing with the topic of the Pilot Study. In my mind, this will help exchanges among CCMS Pilot Studies and other organizations. CCMS has produced much good scientific results that not ever have reached all the possible targets in other organizations. This could be an aspect which could be improved without difficulty.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

Included in answer to 6a

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

Based on some discussions we had at the last Pilot Study Meetings, it seems desirable to improve the contribution to training activities. In particular, I think it could be advisable, also from the political point of view, to organize a seminar in some of Partner countries dealing with prevention strategies in the field of environmental health.

See also Question 3 response

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Up to this moment, the interaction with other organizations was limited to the contributions of Pilot Study participants to their activities. As already said, I think that this point needs to be improved, and considered in our future activity. There are no particular problems in exchanges with other Pilot Studies.

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Proposed book:

I Introduction

II Illustrative case studies (metabolic parameters, genetic polymorphism, cell kinetics, receptor-mediated processes, age at exposure, concurrent exposures, pattern of exposure, biomonitoring)

III Joint conclusions

Deprived Urban Areas

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

No reply received yet

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Disaster Preparedness Plans Responding to Chemical Accidents (Health and Medical Aspects)

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

This pilot study provided a forum for international disaster planners and associated health and response personnel to meet and deliberate on ideas and recommendations on how cities and countries can address emergent community public health and response issues. Meetings and workshops were held in key cities in NATO countries where participants discussed common problems and explored possible solutions. As a result, a number of key issues were identified and the commonalities for each country were discussed. Each country then returned to explore the issues within the context of their operating environment and to develop remedies.

In the United States, progress can be measured in a number of different areas. They are as follows:

- * A working arrangement has been established between the Poison Control Centers and the public health system.
- * A reporting agreement between the National Response Center (responsible for notification of environmental releases of hazardous materials) and the public health organizations has been established to ensure that health is involved in the response effort.
- * The current activities associated with terrorism response have increased the activity level of the public health system. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are actively engaged in response preparation. The CDC activities address many of the issues put forward by the CCMS report.
- * Guidance material for hospital decontamination services have been promoted through the Internet and in training programs provided in communities. It should be noted that during the pilot study, Belgium issued directives to their hospitals on the topic.
- * The Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Public Health Service have joint committees and working groups which now address action levels for emergency response.
- * Some of the issues related to risk naturally flow into the establishment of action levels for response. An international group is now working on establishing these levels in a peer review forum.
- * Epidemiological systems have been established for the follow up of releases resulting in significant human exposure.
- * Specialized health response teams have been established for terrorist threats.
- * Health response and planning personnel have been integrated in to single working units in many communities.
- * The response system has recognized, in most areas, the value of including health professionals in their activities.

It should be noted that CCMS studies which engage civilian issues have a major difficulty in creating change. They do not generally have the power to direct or force activities to eliminate the causes of the problems under discussion as would a military directed issue. Rather, it is the informal communicational links which allow the exchange of ideas and approaches which result in change.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

Final Draft

While it is only an impression, I would believe that most members are in attendance to represent the current thought of their country and to ensure appropriate science is used to address the issues presented.

In the case of this study, it was the clear intent to define the issues facing the nations as they attempted to address the health and medical concerns associated with the releases of hazardous materials. Many different specialities from different countries were involved in the study which provided a forum not routinely available. It was also clear from the membership that answers were not expected. Approaches to the problem which would lead to problem resolution were desired.

It is the networking between the professionals which results in success. In 1996 Atlanta, GA, U.S.A. hosted the Olympic Games. A member of the study group called and exchanged e-mail on the preparedness activities in Atlanta so that similar arrangements could be made when they hosted World Cup games. This linkage would not have occurred if it had not been for the study.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

As mentioned in Question 2 the expectations of the group were met. A summary chapter on each of the major issues was developed with the content representing the thoughts of the attendees. Each of the issues also had recommendations for additional work to be performed in the area. It is from that listing that many activities have been undertaken in the US. (See Publication)

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

* Creation of a network of different specialities available for an exchange of ideas to resolve health and medical issues associated with Hazardous Materials.

* Development of a series of recommendations for the issues identified.

* Confirmation of the common issues in the field. There was concern in the initial phases of the study that different issues may be present in each of the countries. Discussion revealed that the issues were common and that the solutions may also be similar. It was also interesting to note that no country had the authority to solve the major difficulties by directive. Solutions appear to be contingent upon training and resources.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

There was only one publication from the study and I have no means to assess the use of the document or its distribution.

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

There are three major improvement areas which would have enhanced the study. The first would be the acquisition of support personnel to work on the study. The membership of the study were experts in their field working full-time in their profession. This limited their time available for study activities. This resulted in a delay in the preparation of the final report and background support of the summary sessions.

The second would involve the attendance of multiple members of the country to allow greater interaction between the different specialities.

A third approach to enhancing the interaction and continued development would be the ongoing meetings of the group. This was a recommendation of the study. It would now be possible to conduct "virtual meetings" on the Internet. This was not available at the time of the study.

Final Draft

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

Ideally it would be desirable for attendees to receive support for their travel from the CCMS. This would allow additional professionals from the countries to attend. It would also permit all countries to participate.

At this time it appears that the majority of interest is focused on military issues. While this is important, there are a number of issues facing the civilian community. Some of the issues merit on-going attention. The current system is not designed for this type of coordinative action a workgroup or focus group could provide. This has the impact of rendering the reports obsolete due to developments in the scientific and political arena

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

A reunion or update meeting should be scheduled to allow for the exchange of current information, assessment of outstanding issues, and to reinforce the networks established during the study. Other organizations in the field routinely meet to harmonize their regulations, investigations, and guidance documents. CCMS does not have programmatic provisions for this activity without establishing a new study

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Many of the countries and their representatives have representation in the other groups. There is the need to involve all organization in many of the issues addressed by CCMS

Pan American Health Organisation

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Environmental Impact Assessment

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

Since the Pilot Study is not finished, no formal evaluation has been made. However, partner country participants in particular, inform us that the pilot study is of main importance for their daily work. The results (workshop minutes and reports) can be applied to have an influence on convincing colleagues and hierarchical staff in making plans or setting up programmes. Usually the host country distributes a lot of information (brochures, reports, papers...) at the workshop. Additional information is distributed between individual participants, depending on one's particular request. No information concerning contributions to training activities and stimulation of R&D activities is available. We aim to collect this information at the finishing workshop of the pilot study.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

The aim of the study is to discuss and compare the different aspects of Environmental Impact Assessment (both procedural and methodological) in order to give recommendations to the authorities for improving the EIA process. Between participating countries a lot of differences exist concerning procedures, scope, methodologies, depth of applied information and evaluation criteria used in environmental impact assessment. The pilot study aims to pursue these fundamental aspects of EIA based upon the experience in the participating countries. The pilot study deals with a complex subject, which has a significant relevance for environmental policy in the different NATO countries. The international recognition of this NATO/CCMS pilot study has increased right from the start of the workshops and the network is now fully admitted next to other international networks such as the EC-network of EIA units and the International Association of Impact Assessment.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

The final findings of six different topics of EIA are bundled in the official publications of NATO/CCMS

- * Methodology, Evaluation and Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment, First Report: evaluation of the EIA Process, June 1993, NATO/CCMS Report n° 197, 165 p.
- * Methodology, Evaluation and Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment, Second Report: Methodological aspects, NATO/CCMS Report n° 201, 246 p.
- * Methodology, Evaluation and Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment, Third Report: Evaluation of public participation in EIA, July 1995, NATO/CCMS Report n° 207, 211 p.
- * Methodology, Evaluation and Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment, Fourth Report: Strategic Environmental Assessment: Theory versus Practice, July 1996, NATO/CCMS Report n° 212, 205 p.
- * Methodology, Evaluation and Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment, Fifth Report: Strategic Environmental Assessment in land use planning, July 1997, NATO/CCMS Report n° 218, 183 p.
- * Methodology, Evaluation and Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment, Sixth report: Quality Control in Environmental Assessment: results of a survey, May 1999, NATO/CCMS Report n° 231, 115 p.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

- * most of the initial participants are still very motivated with fruitful contributions to the workshops the reports; the number of individual participants and participant countries has increased;
- * establishment of network of non-formal cooperation, related to Environmental Impact Assessment and other environmental topics;
- * reports are requested as well in Belgium as abroad by several governmental and non-governmental organisations and research institutes

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

Final Draft

* Report 207 'Evaluation of Public Participation in EIA', none of 200 copies left
* Report 212 'Strategic Environmental Assessment: theory versus practice', none of 200 copies left
* Report 218 'Strategic Environmental Assessment in Land use planning', none of 250 copies left

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

Activities frequency might be improved. Activities include organisation of workshops, drawing up of reports, network development, cooperation with existing associations involved in Environmental Assessment.
Beside the fellowships and visit grants for part of the participants, the Pilot Study has no financial support at all. There is a lack of means to finance activities and to engage people in participating at the activities organisation. Since all research activities at the University are financed by projects, no budget is available for organising additional initiatives as there is the CCMS - pilot study.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

cfr. 6a
Financial support for the Pilot Study organisation in general and for organising workshops and meetings.

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

There is a need to engage a person to support the Pilot Study organisation and daily working. Improved Public Relations work from CCMS to governments, in order to facilitate communication and in order to improve the distribution and application of the knowledge provided by the workshops and reports

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

International Association of Impact Assessment
Due to a lack of means (cfr. 6 and 7) no cooperation exists with other Pilot Studies and international organisations. Cooperation with other international associations might exist on individual participants initiatives.

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

no comment

Indoor Air Quality

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

The Pilot Study has favoured an exchange of information about the issues related to indoor air, the policies adopted by the NATO and Partner member countries, and the technical means available to face the indoor pollution related problems.

The main results of the Pilot Study can be summarised in the following:

- ? increased awareness at academic and institutional level about the importance of indoor air for our society and its impact on the health of the population
- ? better understanding of the inter-relations between the air pollution sources, the building components, the process of building design and construction, the building maintenance and the behaviour of the occupants.
- ? improved knowledge of the differences across climatic regions, countries, and environments as far as indoor air quality and health effects are concerned
- ? comparison and critical evaluation of the policies adopted at national level to protect the indoor environment and prevent health consequences.

How these exchanges have in practice influenced the national policies it is hard to say. In some cases (for instance in Italy) the increased awareness generated by the Pilot Study has contributed to the creation of a specific National programme on Indoor Air. Part of the materials produced by the Pilot Study has been used by other international organisations (f.i. the World Health Organisation, the International Society of Indoor Air Quality and Climate, the European Commission) in their own indoor air related activities.

Due to the extensive printed materials produced by the Pilot Study, the outreach of technical information has been very large. Several books of proceedings, some articles in international scientific journals, and a major international reference book were produced. These materials have circulated in the international literature domain and used at academic as well as institutional levels. The Pilot Study has also prompted the organisation of a NATO ARW on Ventilation requirements in hospitals, that represents a particular problem within the more general subject of the Pilot Study.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

The participating countries were attracted to the study for one of two main reasons: some countries were already aware of the importance of the issue and expected exchange of scientific and professional experience, some others knew very little about the subject and expected to learn more about its importance.

It has however to be recognised that the country attitude toward the Study was largely influenced by the CCMS National Delegate' opinion and by the individual national experts who participated. It is questionable to consider that they officially represented the country.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

I am of the opinion that the Pilot Study fulfilled most of the expectations of the participants.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

The main successes of the Pilot Study have been a very large participation of countries and experts (17 countries, 298 experts), the production of a number of high quality publications, a strong visibility in the countries of the NATO CCMS, and, in the second part of the study, the involvement of the central and eastern Europe countries.

Final Draft

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

1. Pilot Study of Indoor Air Quality; Final Report – CCMS Report 195 – June 1994
2. Indoor Air Quality; A comprehensive reference book – Elsevier, 1995.
3. Erice Statement on Indoor Air Quality for a Sustainable Indoor Environment
12 Things Every Building Owner and Manager Should Know about IAQ
Medical Aspects of Indoor Air Quality
Good Air Quality in Your Home
Indoor Air Quality Planning, Design and Construction Practices: A Team Effort
Set of Publications of the Pilot Study in co-operation with the University of Milan, 1999.
All these publications has had a wide circulation. The no.2 has been used for academic teaching at Universities in the world.

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

The Pilot Study concept is difficult to sustain and carry out unless there is a firm commitment of the leading countries to financially support the programme. This commitment should be declared in written form to enable firm plans to be made.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

The CCMS should launch a Study when there is a consensus about the importance of the subject and the interest of the countries. The CCMS should offer more support to the Pilot Study directors in the dissemination of the products.

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

This question does not apply to our Pilot Study, terminated two years ago. The contents to be inserted in the Table can be derived from the final report which was submitted to CCMS.

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

The interaction with other international bodies has not been always easy. Sometimes the NATO activities are seen as activities competing with the programme of other international organisations. Ideally there would be a synergism, but this may turn out to be difficult unless political arrangements are made at adequate level. When NATO activities overlap with the competences of other organisations, preliminary contacts and talk should secure a positive interaction and co-operation.

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

No comments

International Technical Meetings on Air Pollution and its Application

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

a) The main value of the conference is that it brings together scientist from NATO and Partner Countries for mutual scientific benefit. It has over the years clearly fostered mutual understanding and respect, exchange and visits and collaborative projects. The ITM conference is believed to have had a significant effect on the development of the air pollution sciences in the Partner countries, and let to visits of scientist in the NATO countries. The ITM conference in 1998 took for the first time place in a Partner Country (Bulgaria). I know that the access to information and discussions with colleagues at high scientific level has been very inspiring for Partner Country scientists and have had an impact on the procedures with regard to national activities.

b) The scientific transfer is immense. The proceedings from the ITM conference are published by PLENUM Press (a nice hardbound volume of about 800 pages), and are highly respected. The proceedings from each conference is available worldwide, It sells in about 400 copies

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

The expected outcome necessarily differs from country to country, ranging among the Partner Countries from a wish to establish closer connection to the West in general, to a step in the direction to join NATO (and the EU).

Also, there is a very strong wish among Partner Country scientists for collaboration and for making connections with scientists from the West. The ITM has been a very efficient instrument to foster such collaboration, leading to new projects and transfer of scientific ideas and national procedures.

For the NATO countries, this possibility to meet with scientists from the Partner Countries has been very fruitful, in the sense of the advanced theoretical traditions scientists in these countries are educated in.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

The establishment of contacts between scientists from NATO and Partner Countries, leading to increase collaboration and transfer of scientific tradition and knowledge, has been extremely successful.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

That I managed to make it possible (through CCMS grants) for many scientists from Partner Countries to attend the ITM conferences and meet colleagues from the West. I know that this resulted in projects between NATO and Partner countries (many beyond the NATO umbrella), mutual visits on short and long terms and numerous friendships.

That I managed (together with the Committee) to maintain a high scientific level of the conference; that the PLENUM Press proceedings of the conference are highly respected and often cited in the literature.

That I not only made it possible for scientists from Partner Countries to attend the conferences, but that the conferences are attended by many well established scientists, as well as many young scientists. This creates a high scientific and friendly atmosphere, combined with time for making contacts to colleagues.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

PLENUM Press publishes the proceedings after each conference. The book sells well and are often cited in the literature. It is distributed worldwide. The proceedings are unique in the sense that the discussion

Final Draft

after each presentation is published.

Air Pollution Modeling and Its Application X, Eds. Sven-Erik Gryning & Millan Millan, 1994
Air Pollution Modeling and Its Application XI, Eds. Sven-Erik Gryning & Frank Schiermeier, 1996
Air Pollution Modeling and Its Application XII, Eds. Sven-Erik Gryning & Nadine Chaumerliac, 1998
Air Pollution Modeling and Its Application XIII, Eds. Sven-Erik Gryning & Ekaterina Batchvarova, 2000

All published by PLENUM Press, New York and London.

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

Nothing mentioned

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

More funding to be able to invite more scientists from partner Countries to attend the conferences

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

More funding to be able to invite more scientists from partner Countries to attend the conferences

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Nothing mentioned

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

The above activity is abbreviated ITM conferences. It is a series of conferences held every 1.5 years in North America and Europe. The conferences deal with air pollution modelling; about 150 participants typically attend them from 30-35 countries. The conference runs over a full week covering about 75 oral presentations and 30 poster presentations. PLENUM Press publishes the proceedings.

ITM home page: www.risoe.dk/amv/itm

I have been chairman for the ITM conference series since 1992, and the next ITM, which takes place May 2000 in Boulder, Colorado, will be my last as conference chairman. I have enjoyed the work, especially has it been a pleasure to for me to have possibility to invite scientists from the Partner Countries to attend the conferences, and in this way foster collaboration and mutual understanding between scientists from NATO and partner Countries. This often developed into mutual projects and visits, and influenced national activities. The collaboration with NATO/CCMS, represented by Deniz Beten, on the ITM conferences has been excellent, - smooth and very constructive.

From Sepetmeber 2000:

From 1969-1984 NATO/CCMS organized three pilot studies on air pollution. One of the elements of these studies was regular meetings where scientists and policymakers were able to exchange and discuss scientific progress. The pilot studies ended in 1984, but there was an unanimous opinion that these scientific meetings known as 'International Technical Meetings on Air Pollution Modeling' (ITM) should be continued. The interest was high and it was not difficult to find conveners and funds to guarantee continuation. Since then these meetings were regularly held up to date. The CCMS remained a faithful sponsor, while other funds became available from the convener's institute and the host countries.

The large number of abstracts submitted shows the big interest for the conference. Typically it is possible to accommodate time for only half of the abstracts. The attendance to these meetings is kept to

Final Draft

about 150 participants in order to secure high quality of presentations and discussions, as well as a good working and social atmosphere. During the last years the interest from non-NATO countries has increased. Following the political changes in Europe in 1991 the number of countries represented at the ITM conferences increased by about 50 %. At the latest ITMs typically 30 countries were represented.

An impressive amount of proceedings has emerged from these meetings (published by Plenum Press in 'Air Pollution Modeling and its Application' series covering 14 conferences) containing the scientific progress in this field. These proceedings constitute a valuable source of information and are cited frequently in the scientific literature.

The concept of regular NATO/CCMS International Technical meetings has evolved into a tradition of bringing together experts to discuss application of existing air pollution models and the development of new models to meet emergency needs. The conference series has provided basis for considerable advances in the areas of model development and validation. It has been a forum for sharing experience in model applications under a variety of meteorological and geographical conditions for the benefit of the entire model community. It is characteristic, that the presentations at the conference cover models developed for regulatory purposes in the well established institutions, typically National Environmental Agencies, as well as fundamental studies carried out at universities and research centers. Many presentations are given by young scientists (PhD students).

NATO/CCMS traditionally funds the participation for a number of PhD-students and scientists from Co-operative Partner and NATO countries. NATO/CCMS also funds 3-4 key-note speakers, giving state-of-the-art introductions to main topics. These talks are generally of very high quality, dealing with applied as well as new concepts and trends in air pollution modelling, public and regulatory policies. Generally it is considered an honour to be invited to give a key-note talk at an ITM.

The ITM conference series has always had a strong spirit of cooperation under the NATO/CCMS umbrella, and with the considerable interest from Partner countries to participate in the ITM conferences, it provides an excellent opportunity to create ties between scientist from NATO and Co-operative Partner countries.

Management of Industrial Toxic Wastes and Substances Research

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

From 1993 to 1996 three meetings of the pilot study were held in Greece. During this period 14 countries participated as representatives or speakers at the meeting. These meetings were beneficial to the Mediterranean and Balkan countries that are developing hazardous waste and toxic waste management plans within their countries. Because of the meetings, developing countries were able to learn of legislative and regulatory activities and gained technical knowledge from countries with established activities in these areas. These exchanges of information provided some basis for the development of hazardous / toxic waste management activities in developing countries. Greece, Portugal and Romania especially benefited because legislative aspects of waste management were being discussed in their Parliaments during the period of the pilot study.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

The pilot study identified the general objectives. These are:

- * Defining toxic waste problems in participating countries
- * Exchanging scientific information on disposal and treatment
- * Exchange information on remediation of stressed or degraded ecosystems
- * Discuss legislative aspects of waste management
- * Examine international guidelines for acceptable concentration levels of toxic contaminants
- * Explore European Network countries for future collaboration in waste management

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

The pilot study defined 6 general objectives. Of the 6 general objectives, all were addressed and parts of each objective were completed. First, participating countries, especially Mediterranean and Balkan countries, were able to define their most important waste problems. Second was the technical information exchange regarding waste treatment technologies to solve these most important problems. All countries had interests in incineration and biological treatment technologies. Other aspects such as ecosystem protection, legislation, contaminant concentration levels, and Networking were discussed within the pilot study meetings. Thus, for the limits of the pilot study, both NATO and partner countries benefited by increasing their understanding of hazardous/toxic waste management. The pilot study provides a good introduction to these issues and developed a common understanding.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

The three principal success of the pilot study were:

- * An orientation of toxic/hazardous waste management issues, problems, and treatment technologies to partner countries, specifically Romania, Belarus and Poland.
- * Identification of specific toxic/hazardous waste management problems by individual partner countries.
- * Exchange and transfer of scientific knowledge which lead to collaboration among participating countries.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

- * Publication in the journal Fresenius Environmental Bulletin of a survey regarding toxic wastes in Greece.
- * A meeting was developed and distributed to the participants after each meeting.
- * Information on hazardous waste incineration was widely distributed to each participant after the workshop in incineration.

Final Draft

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

* I would encourage participating, especially partner countries to provide representatives that have good communication abilities and good language knowledge.
* I would organize additional workshops on topic identified by the participants, as appealing to their problems. As an exchange, I would include a workshop on biological treatment technologies.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

I would ask CCMS to consider fellowships for younger researchers from the partner countries, too.

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

CCMS could provide assistance in organising workshops.
CCMS could broaden the fellowships to include partner countries.
These would help my study in the examination of hazardous waste treatment technology.
Possibly CCMS could develop a databank of environmental legislation from NATO and partner countries and make this available through the NATO web site

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

The pilot study director participates and attends international meetings of different European Committees specifically EURACHEM and the Federation of the European Chemical Society (FECS). Information obtained from the pilot study meetings is shared at these committees. European (DAC) and national funds are secured by the pilot study director to establish collaboration with partner countries (current project with Ukraine was developed as a result of the pilot study).

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Pollution Prevention Strategies for Sustainable Development

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

I thought there was a lot less than met the eye in the whole CCMS Pilot Study program. For the most part it seemd to be about having meetings in foreign lands with really minimal accomplishments occurring.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

Nothing mentioned

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

Nothing mentioned

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

Nothing mentioned

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

Nothing mentioned

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

Nothing mentioned

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

Nothing mentioned

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

Nothing mentioned

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Nothing mentioned

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Nothing mentioned

Protection of Astronomic and Geophysical Sites

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

The NATO study could be considered as a start in creating a consciousness of the problem outside the directly concerned scientific environment. This awareness is long to establish and even the environmentalist organisations are only starting to understand that preserving the night is also very beneficial to various forms of life.

Actually, it is an essentially still not a satisfactorily resolved problem but the results of the study could be summarised as follows:

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

Nothing mentioned

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

The main result achieved was to enhance the sensitivity of partners to the necessity of protecting these sites against various nuisances such as light, radio-frequencies, vibrations, magnetic intrusions, etc.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

There have been progress in several countries in which bills for preserving the night sky have been passed locally or globally (Spain, Italy, Japan, Australia and probably several others). Active associations aiming at imposing actions in the field were formed (France, Italy, Japan,...) often in conjunction with the important initiative in the US: the "International Dark Sky Association".

In Radio-frequencies, the results are very poor. I would even say that the situation has actually degraded because of the boom of the telecommunications and portable telephones under the pressure of the powerful International Telecommunications Union. Several bands are still preserved for radio-astronomy, but the perturbations are increasing

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

The publication as a book of the result of the study ("The Protection of Astronomical and Geophysical Sites", Coditions Frontieres, 1992, Paris) allowed to publicise a series of technical recommendations as well as a description of the principal causes. This steered up further studies and actions. The most important follow-up of the study intended to extend to all countries the sensitivity to the problem. This was done through a UNESCO Conference in 1992 (Proceedings published by the Cambridge University Press under the title "The Vanishing Universe") and various other conferences under the responsibility of the International Astronomical Union.

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

Nothing mentioned

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

Final Draft

Nothing mentioned

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

Nothing mentioned

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Nothing mentioned

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

The specificity of this study does not permit to answer most of your questions. I hope that the present text nevertheless gives you useful hints.
Outline table filled from memory as the Director no longer holds files

Remedial Action Technologies for Contaminated Land and Groundwater, Phases I, II and III

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

Since the pilot study began in 1980, the basic technical and regulatory approaches for addressing contaminated land have been developed, addressed and shared by the various participating countries. While some countries have progressed internally at a faster rate in addressing these problems, the pilot study has served as a venue for sharing the approaches to and solutions of these problems. The pilot study has enabled all Alliance countries and Partner countries the opportunity to learn from the experiences of other countries. These apply equally to legislative and regulatory and technical approaches. Over the past several years, Partner countries have extensively participated in the pilot study and have benefitted from the Alliance experience. Organizations such as CARACAS and NICOLE which address risk assessment and technical issues emerged from the pilot study and serve as forums to further discuss and solve contaminated land problems throughout Europe.

The pilot study has gone to great lengths to make the information available. The information is currently available on the NATO web site and the USEPA web site. In addition all reports are printed and distributed to country representatives (multiple copies) and participants. And yearly, a master CD is updated with the reports produced from the current year meeting. This CD contains all reports produced by the pilot study. For the past two years, the annual meeting has had a focus topic. This topic is addressed by a 1-2 day seminar within the annual pilot study meeting. A report from these focus areas is produced. Copies of all information in the various format are provided to CCMS. In addition to the formal technology transfer efforts of the pilot study, pilot study member diffuse the information and publish within their countries. Members also attend conference and seminars and report on pilot study activities or technologies discussed within the pilot study.

Pilot study members have participated beyond the pilot study through the development of such forums as CARACAS and NICOLE. Pilot study materials and expertise greatly enhance the activities of these and other groups. The pilot study has gone to great lengths to ensure that its information is readily available to everyone.

A US/German bilateral agreement was entered into during Phase I of the pilot study. This agreement provides for the exchange of technical data and comparison of quality assurance systems. This agreement is still in effect. Use of pilot study reports is used at several universities in the United States in environmental courses addressing remediation

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

At the end of the original study (1980-1984), the initial work on defining contaminated land was completed. With the formation of Phase I (and subsequent Phase II & III), there has been tremendous expectations by all the participating countries. At the end of Phase II, I believe many countries believed that information on technologies had been adequately transferred from one country to others. With the Phase III planning, I realized that a new format was needed to meet the participants' expectations. A special session was designed that would in depth address a specific topic. The three sessions held in 1998, 1999, and 2000 addressing treatment walls, natural attenuation, and decision support systems were very successful and exceeded the expectations of participating countries. Since the pilot study is willing to change to meet the needs of its members, the pilot study is highly successful and well received by all members.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

The expectations are exceeded by the events. Information is readily available and accessible. Special sessions provide focused interactions on areas of common interests. One measure is by the willingness of the countries to host meetings. This has become very prestigious for the hosting country. Meeting

Final Draft

locations are established for the duration of the pilot study.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

1. Ability to transfer information among Alliance and Partner countries. Printed reports, web reports, and comprehensive CDs. The ability to develop the reports and produce them in the various formats has been the visible standard of success for the pilot study.

2. The ability to change. At the end of Phase II, I believe many thought that technologies had been extensively discussed. However, in-depth discussions of specific technologies did not occur in the previous phases. With the development of the focused technical sessions (change), all pilot study participants expressed a renewed interest.

3. Integration of all Alliance and Partner countries into the pilot study. The professionalism among the members is exceptional. In essence there is an open-arms approach for Partner countries and other countries where the technical level of expertise is below other countries. This results in a pilot study where everyone is willing to contribute and share

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

The principal publications of the pilot study are:

1. 1980-1984 report. Published by Plenum Publishing.
2. Phase I Report (1988-1991). Published by US EPA.
3. Phase II Reports (1992-1997). Published by US EPA.
4. 1998 Annual Report. Published by US EPA. (Phase III)
5. 1999 Annual Report. Published by US EPA. (Phase III)
6. 2000 Annual Report. Published by US EPA. (Phase III)
7. 1998 Special Session Report on Treatment Walls. Published by US EPA. (Phase III)
8. 1999 Special Session Report on Monitored Natural Attenuation. Published by US EPA. (Phase III)
9. 2000 Special Session Report on Decision Support. Published by US EPA. (Phase III)

All the above reports are on the Pilot Study CD and NATO and EPA web sites. These are updated yearly to reflect new publications.

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

The pilot study continually changes and improves to meet the needs of the participants. As needed the pilot study will do this. So for now, there are no needs.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

If possible, I would hope that a CCMS representative could attend on of the pilot study meetings. I think this reinforces the commitment that each country makes in assigning a country representative to the pilot study.

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

CCMS has excellently supported this pilot study. Web site, travel grants, fellowships, etc. have all been made available to the pilot study. If CCMS continues its current level of support, the pilot study will continue to be a success.

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

The Pilot study has and continues to interact directly and indirectly with OECD, UNEP, ECE, and other transnational European groups such as CARACAS and NICOLE. Pilot study members serve on committees of these organizations and transfer information both to and from the pilot study. Members

Final Draft

from these other organizations also periodically attend pilot study meetings. At this years meeting, CARACAS, NICOLE, OECD, and UNEP have been invited to attend. The purpose for the interaction is improved communications. And information transfer.

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Reply also received from van Veen and

Nothing mentioned

Remedial Action Technologies for Contaminated Land and Groundwater, Phases I, II and III

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

The pilot has not influenced any Netherlands activities. The Netherlands is quite internally oriented with respect to contaminated land. This is improving now. The technology transfer is restricted to the knowledge transfer. The pilot has had a limited contribution on "commercial" technology transfer. Especially the special sessions have contributed to this knowledge transfer. The pilot has not contributed to training activities.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

In the study one can bring information and one can get information. I expected that some Dutch consultants/contractors who bring information would be very happy with the study as a "marketing" platform. In the study an enormous quantity of information becomes available. However, the more developed the national policy is, the less is this information relevant. The front runners bring much and get a little.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

I am a little bit disappointed in the interest of Dutch consultants and contractors. Maybe the platform was not the marketplace they expected. However, as said, the Dutch are internally focused. I am not disappointed in the information which comes available. However, it is not easy to digest.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

Success factors are:
- the increased number of countries
- the number of east European countries, it must be an excellent forum for those countries
- the study as a breeding place for other more focused networks like ad hoc common forum etc.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

The principal publications
- the tour tables
- the special session
- the availability of all information on CD

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

The study should more promote itself in e.g. Consoil so that the "soil" community is better informed on the outcomes and activities of the study.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

- The information is enormous but hardly accessible. NATO should support (finance) digestion projects to make all this information more accessible and identify trends and headlines
- NATO should support initiatives coming from the platform like the initiative for a treatment wall network.

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

Final Draft

As stated under 7. The support of NATO should be extended to some pilot study supporting projects, like the digestion project and to new initiatives.

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

The study serves as a breeding place for other more focused networks like ad hoc common forum etc.

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

Review of Environmental Projects of the Caspian Sea for the planning of Future Activities

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

The development of natural resources (e.g. fisheries and oil and gas fields) and environmental protection (from pollution, eutrophication and desertification) of the Caspian Sea region are important for the economic growth and well-being of the riparian states of Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Russia and Turkmenistan. Despite its great importance for the region, the status of the Caspian Sea from the point of view of international law is yet unclear. On the other hand, the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the rise of the Newly Independent States has had a profound impact on the socio-economics of these countries, as well as on scientific research in the region. While each new state has its own program subject to economical constraints, there has been little incentive or economical means to carry out studies whose results could be used for rational, integrated environmental management for the entire Caspian Sea region.

The Pilot Project was the first fact-finding study to be carried out after the social/political changes of the 1990's, and therefore has served to unite various scientific groups, as well as official representatives of riparian countries for the first time to give them a chance to discuss the problems and elaborate on the scientific approaches needed to solve them. Because the scientific infrastructure and cooperation during the previous Soviet epoch was either out of touch with the outside world or insufficiently developed in some of the countries, the need for open cooperation motivated by the Pilot Study has brought the Caspian Sea problems into better focus, both inside the region and elsewhere. The urgency and criticality of the problems associated with eutrophication and environmental consequences of hydrocarbon extraction, combined with scientific motives, i.e. the basic laboratory-like features of the Caspian Sea, climate interactions in an enclosed coastal sea, make the region a rewarding candidate for modern scientific investigations. The discussion on the elements of technological and scientific cross-fertilization that could be realized with other regions of the world with similar problems, e.g. the neighboring Black Sea, is also a valuable contribution of the Pilot Study, for raising awareness and attention between participating scientists. Compared to the past, this is a tremendously different approach that promises to bring Caspian Sea to the forefront of science and generate attention towards management.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

The Pilot Study had multiple purposes: (i) to review regional environmental problems and their physical and socioeconomic background, (ii) to review past and present activities related to the environment, (iii) to identify regional / international scientists and Institutions who would be interested or endeavour to take part in the scientific research, (iv) to identify data sources, methodologies needed, and make

Final Draft

a survey of parties capable of planning scientific investigations and making environmental management plans for the future. With such a broad investigation of the environment and the supporting regional structures, the Pilot Project took the more demanding and generalised route of inquiry, carrying the focus from immediate but day-to-day needs of the individual countries or interest groups to a strategy for the development of effective environmental management tools, based on systematic understanding of the regional climate system and its functioning. The outcomes expected from the study were reviews of past and ongoing activities including national and international projects, literature, interested scientists and institutions, as well as an evaluation of observation and predictive modelling systems and technology with a special view on the needs of the Caspian Sea. The outcomes of the project were required to form the first step of cooperative scientific investigations needed for a basic understanding and effective management.

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

The Pilot Project largely realized its objectives by generating a discussion of the scientific problems, past and present activities and the required scientific approaches. The short term project was established in 1998 and chaired by Turkey. Scientists from Azerbaijan, Belgium, Germany, Greece, Kazakhstan, Russia, Ukraine, Turkey, Turkmenistan and USA, NATO, and the ambassadors of Turkmenistan (Ankara) and Norway (Baku) participated in the CCMS project meetings.

The project reviewed the objectives and the accomplishments of all Caspian Sea programmes, whether completed or ongoing, and compiled the information on existing gaps of knowledge in the region. Utilizing this information, the Project ended up with a Caspian Sea Science and Implementation Plan. The plan basically covers the recommendations for future work aimed at resolving the missing elements in environmental research in the region. The plan identifies the specific anthropogenic and natural causes of environmental problems in the region, and the gaps of knowledge to quantify key variables and processes to be studied. Integrated assessments and scientific investigations of the environmental changes in the Caspian Sea region are identified as the starting point for tools leading to successful predictions and for fruitful scientific collaboration and management

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

The Caspian Sea is a relatively undisturbed habitat and an enduring natural reserve for its indigenous and other species. With recent changes, its ecosystem could face irreversible damage. The strategy for its protection and preservation brings into focus the need for the adequate prediction of further environmental changes in the system. In this way it appears that we have a great deal to learn from the Caspian Sea. On the other hand, the Caspian Sea deserves world wide attention as one of humanity's last reserves, and in its present state of a threatened sanctuary, would greatly benefit from experiences obtained elsewhere. Within this context the successes of the Pilot Study are: (i) the identification of past and present activities and the gaps in knowledge, (ii) the realisation of communications between scientists

Final Draft

from the riparian countries as well as those from outside the region,
(iii) the planning of future research directions, with inputs from the present experience and the identification of the needs.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

NATO / CCMS Pilot Project - Review of Environmental Projects of the Caspian Sea for the Planning of Future Activities, Nov. 1999, NATO/CCMS Technical Report No. 239, 129 pp.

The report is available from NATO/CCMS, it has also been printed and circulated to interested parties

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

The Pilot Study is the result of contributions from scientists from a number of countries, with active interest and experience in the Caspian Sea, although a great number of other potential contributors could not be enlisted. Direct contacts could not be established with a great number of scientists in the region. It was easier to collect information on international activities, while it was generally harder to obtain information on national activities.

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

The mechanism of CCMS could be greatly improved if more scientists from the countries involved could participate in the action. Nomination of the people generally follows official routes through national coordinators of each country, and this may partly restrict participation. If better direct communications by a network of scientists and approval by CCMS authorities could be established, that could increase participation of relevant people

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

The form of additional support that could be provided by the CCMS could be meetings with wider participation organised at host scientific organisations on a particular topic of discussion, or short term exchange visits by lead scientists at these institutions

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

Caspian Environment Programme (CEP)

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

None mentioned

Review of Ongoing Black Sea Projects for the Planning of Future Activities

What do you perceive to be the benefits of the Pilot Study?

Changes in national activities and approaches and other landmark achievements resulting from a Pilot Study activities as identified by its Directors, with special reference to assistance for partner countries:

*The Science Plan which emerged from the Pilot Study was utilised as a base for several national and international project for the development the environmental conditions in the Black Sea.

*The Black Sea Regional Committee of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO decided to use this document as base for the development of the black Sea global Ocean Observing System.

Contribution to training activities:

*Utilizing the Pilot Project activities, Black Sea oceanographic community scientists developed their own programs by having consultancy from the NATO countries scientists.

What is your view on the outcomes NATO and Partner countries expected from the Pilot Study on joining, and the reasons for this view?

1) All partner countries expectation is in the direction that Pilot Projects eventually will to international project(s) providing them finance to continue their research.

2) Pilot Project will persuade the decision makers and policy makers to follow up the conclusions and recommendations made by the Pilot study.

3) Pilot Study will lead to collaborative work among NATO and partner countries

How do these expectations compare with what has actually been realised?

Partially partner countries expectations were realised as a consequence of the Pilot Study since an international organisation finance a four year project in the Black Sea. The project was based on the Science Plan of the Pilot Study. The Project presently is ongoing and eight institutions from all Black Sea partner countries are participating.

One of the black Sea partner countries decided to change their legislations in order to participate all international activities.

Please outline what you see as being the 3 principal successes of your Pilot Study?

1) The Pilot study managed to bring prominent scientists from NATO countries and partner countries and work together.

2) Pilot Study lead to an international project in the region.

3) Partner countries changed their oceanographic research policies to full-fill their obligations for the improvement of the Black Sea environmental conditions.

What are the three principal publications of your Pilot Study, their accessibility and, if possible, how widely they have been used?

no answer

Final Draft

Are there any aspects of your Pilot Study which could be improved?

no answer

Are there any aspects of CCMS that could be improved?

no answer

Is there any additional support CCMS could provide for your Pilot Study?

no answer

How does your Pilot Study interact with other international organisations ?

no answer

Please add any comments that you feel would be useful but are not addressed by Questions 1 to 8.

no answer