

---

# Environment and Climate Regional Accession Network (ECRAN)

---

Report on ECRAN  
1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> National  
SEA/EIA Workshop in  
Croatia

---

May 2015, Osijek/Split

---

**ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMA REGIONAL NETWORK FOR ACCESSION - ECRAN**

**TRAINING REPORT**

**Activity No. 2.4**

**Environmental Assessments, Task 2.4.4. Train the Trainers Programme on EIA  
and SEA**

**11-12 May 2015, Osijek, Croatia**

**18-19 May 2014, Split, Croatia**



This Project is funded by the  
European Union



A project implemented by  
Human Dynamics Consortium

## Table of Contents

I.	Background/Rationale.....	1
	General information about the ToT on SEA and EIA and national workshops in Croatia .....	1
	Current state of the affairs in the specific sector in Croatia .....	1
II.	Objectives of the training.....	3
	General objectives.....	3
	Specific objectives .....	3
	Results/outputs .....	3
III.	EU policy and legislation covered by the training .....	4
	A brief overview of existing capacities regarding SEA/EIA in Croatia at the county level .....	4
IV.	Highlights from the training workshop .....	6
	How the training will be further used in following capacity building .....	8
	ANNEX I – Agenda .....	11
	ANNEX II – Participants.....	15
	ANNEX III – Presentations (under separate cover) .....	19
	Annex IV - Questioner about Efficiency of SEA Procedure.....	20
	Annex V - Questioner about Efficiency of EIA Procedure .....	22
	Annex VI - Workshop Evaluation Form .....	24



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	
EA	Environmental Assessments
ECRAN	Environment and Climate Regional Accession Network
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
MENP	Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection
MS	Member State
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
SPP	Strategies, Plans, Programmes
RENA	Regional Environmental Network for Accession
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
ToT	Training of Trainers
WG	Working Group
WS	Workshop



This Project is funded by the  
European Union



A project implemented by  
Human Dynamics Consortium

## I. Background/Rationale

### *General information about the ToT on SEA and EIA and national workshops in Croatia*

The 1<sup>st</sup> session of the Training of Trainers on Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scheme, as one of the activities of the Environmental Assessment WG, was carried out in Podgorica (Montenegro) in September 2014. It was designed as a 4-days introductory training session focusing mainly on developing the first drafts of the country specific SEA/EIA training material, as well as on training techniques and skills and planning of the local SEA/EIA training events. It was agreed with all participants that the trainers, nominated by the beneficiary countries, will deliver the SEA/EIA trainings at the local level in their countries.

Representatives of Croatia proposed two 2-day trainings designed for representatives of Counties (regional level). However, during preparation of both events suggestions were made to also invite few representatives of County planning agencies, as well as bigger cities in order to encompass all relevant actors in regional planning and decision making. Representatives of Croatia also expressed the need to cover two specific topics or aspects of SEA/EIA during national workshops – Climate Change and Human Health – as they prove to be challenging to implement on all levels. All above resulted in the following design of the workshops (main topics covered):

#### DAY 1 – SEA:

- Key principles of efficient SEA
- Main stages of SEA process as stipulated by national legislation
- Existing SEA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)
- Challenges in SEA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)
- Linking SEA and planning – focus on screening and scoping (with practical exercises)
- Human health and climate change in SEA (with case examples)

#### DAY 2 – EIA:

- Key principles of efficient EIA
- Main stages of EIA process as stipulated by national legislation
- Existing EIA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)
- Challenges in EIA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)
- Screening (with practical exercises)
- Human health and climate change in EIA (with case examples)

### *Current state of the affairs in the specific sector in Croatia*

The SEA/EIA training relates to two EU Directives – the Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (SEA Directive), and the Directive 2014/52/EU, which recently amended the Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment (EIA Directive).

Although the process of harmonizing the national legislation with the requirements of the EIA and SEA Directives has been concluded in Croatia, especially the implementation of the SEA Directive in



practice proves to be challenging, due to lack of capacity for appropriate implementation on sub-national levels. While there are well established SEA/EIA authorities on national level, the situation at the regional and local level requires further support for implementation of SEA. Since the local authorities/municipalities and other local stakeholders have an important role in SEA implementation, it is important to create a core group of the trainers in Croatia to ensure the knowledge transfer from national to regional level and furthermore from regional to local level.



This Project is funded by the  
European Union



A project implemented by  
Human Dynamics Consortium

## II. Objectives of the training

### *General objectives*

To increase understanding of a good SEA and EIA practice among the regional authorities with the focus on health and climate change issues within SEA and EIA.

### *Specific objectives*

- To explain main steps of SEA procedure;
- To identify main existing challenges in SEA and EIA practice in Croatia and formulate suggestions how to solve them;
- To present how to consider two specific issues – human health and climate change – in SEA and EIA;
- To illustrate good SEA and EIA practice on case examples;
- To improve training skills of trainers involved in the ToT scheme.

### *Results/outputs*

The expected results of the trainings were:

- Increased understanding of a good SEA and EIA practice;
- Suggestions on how to address existing challenges in SEA and EIA practice in Croatia are formulated;
- Increased training skills of trainers involved in the ToT.



### III. EU policy and legislation covered by the training

#### *A brief overview of existing capacities regarding SEA/EIA in Croatia at the county level*

Based on the findings from interviews carried out during EU funded project “SEA Hrvatska” (*project ended in 2014*), as well as considering information on the SEA/EIA system operation in Croatia it can be concluded that the largest deficiency of administrative capacities for SEA/EIA can be found at the county level (*regional level*).

At the county level, usually between 2 and 5 persons have EIA/SEA-related duties altogether in the county departments for environmental protection, as well as in the public institutes of spatial planning. Of course there are exemptions to the above stated rule – in some cases as many as 7 persons, in some as low as 1 person. After the amended SEA legislation enters into force (*currently it is in the process of adoption*), a significant increase of SEA cases both at the county as well as the local level is expected. Thus, counties will have to coordinate SEA procedures for county plans and also will have to provide support to municipalities, where (*except large cities – county capitals*) practically no capacities to deal with SEA currently exist. In light of above prediction it is also important to state that it is common practice on county and local level that the persons dealing with environmental issues take also responsibilities linked to the SEA issues.

The situation is better at the national level – there are officials specifically dealing with SEA and EIA within MENP (*altogether 33 persons including Department for SEA (5 persons) and Department for EIA (5 persons)*), as well as there are experts regarding ENIA at the MENP Directorate for Nature Protection (*10 persons*) and SINP. The capacities of the Ministry of Health can be seen as potential problem, since so far the health authorities have not been involved in SEA. Ministry of Culture has 2 persons at the state level and around 20 officials at the county departments for culture heritage, who are also involved in EIA/SEA processes. Other line ministries are aware of SEA and future requirements – among other reasons also due to necessity of SEA application for operational programmes.

Overall it can be said that capacities to carry out EIA in Croatia are, due to longer period of implementation, considerably higher than in case of SEA. As already stated persons dealing with EIA issues commonly also take responsibilities linked to the SEA issues, which can be considered reasonable, but is (*based on responses from participants*) sometimes confusing and leads to overburdening of individuals, especially on the county level.

Before becoming an EU member state, Croatia was involved in some projects linked to SEA/EIA capacity building like:

- CARDS 2003 project “Environmental Assessment of Development Strategies (SEA)” – EuropeAid/119980/D/SV/HR);
- CARDS 2003 project: Environmental impact assessment - guidelines and training;
- PHARE project “Institutional building and implementation of NATURA 2000 in Croatia”;
- IPA project “Establishment of Centres for Implementation of IPPC at Regional Level in Croatia” (2011 – 2013).

Besides international projects, there are also several university courses addressing EIA/SEA, as well as some NGO trainings



Recently, familiarity and capacity to implement SEA was significantly improved – especially on national and regional level – due to implementation of EU funded project “SEA Hrvatska” (*project ended in 2014*). The goal of this project was to strengthen the administrative capacity and implementation of the SEA in Croatia. Project encompassed evaluation of the relevant legal framework; analysis of institutional development; capacity building training of authorities responsible for environmental protection and implementation of the SEA of plans and programs; preparation of guidelines and manuals for the implementation of the SEA. Overall 19 guidelines (*13 for implementation of SEA in relevant sectorial plans, 3 for execution of procedures on different levels, and guidelines on preparation of SEA, Nature Impact Assessment as well as implementation of different practical methodological approaches*) were prepared, more than 40 workshops with more than 700 participants were carried out and one Training of Trainers on national level was carried out.

However, as explained below, the need for capacity building on SEA/EIA seems to be very high and is welcomed and appreciated. It is one of our conclusion that participants clearly showed progress in terms of understanding the need for SEA/EIA, as well as considerable leap forward from “*How to avoid SEA/EIA?*” towards “*How to properly implement SEA/EIA?*” and “*How to address specific issues through SEA/EIA and use them as a planning support tool?*”.



This Project is funded by the  
European Union



A project implemented by  
Human Dynamics Consortium

#### IV. Highlights from the training workshop

In the below tables you can find a short summary of main discussions led during both workshops. In appendixes you can also find results of “quick questioners”, as well as workshop evaluation filled out by workshop participants.

DAY 1 – SEA	MAIN POINTS DISCUSSED AT THE WORKSHOP
<p>Key principles of efficient SEA</p> <p>Main stages of SEA process as stipulated by national legislation</p>	<p>The discussion was focused on the pros’ and cons’ of current legal framework – on one hand participants clearly demanded clear and well developed legal framework, while on the other hand they were complaining about the rigidity of such system and how difficult it is for them to operate within it. One participant openly asked for development of a standardised – “one size fits all” – SEA form, but at the end it was agreed that this is not possible.</p>
<p>Existing SEA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)</p> <p>Challenges in SEA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)</p>	<p>The above discussion evolved in this part of the workshop into comparison of domestic and foreign legislation and examples. Participants clearly recognised their own practical issues in presented case examples and suggested that more “good vs. bad practice examples” should be discussed in order to implement suggested approaches in their own SEA cases.</p> <p>It was “comforting” for the participants to see that even countries with longer SEA practice have “open issues” that are in process of resolution. This again led to discussion linked to low capacity for good SEA practice in different levels (county and local level) and from different actors – here participants expressed their opinion that the following actors should be involved in similar workshops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department officials responsible for preparation of SPP within their own county administration;</li> <li>• Spatial planning departments/agencies;</li> <li>• SEA practitioners;</li> <li>• Decision makers;</li> <li>• Members of SEA committees.</li> </ul> <p>Such approach would enable equal level of knowledge for all relevant actors and enable them to play their role in SEA process on satisfactory level. The participants also expressed their concern linked to “internal and external” attempts to influence SEA conclusions and decisions that they are facing every day and often find little support by decision makers or even their colleagues in departments responsible for development of SPPs – they still mostly see SEA as “obstacle of the future development”. This is also to some extent linked to rather low number of personnel on county level that is familiar with SEA practice – now this is only an obstacle, but with announced change of SEA legislation, extending SEA practice also to local level, this</p>



	could represent one of the major bottlenecks for future strategic planning processes.
Linking SEA and planning – focus on screening and scoping (with practical exercises)	As this was the main “ <i>practical exercise</i> ” of the workshop most of the discussion was linked to presented end-results of all groups and resolving some uncertainties/issues/dilemmas raised by participants. During the exercises screening and scoping forms, developed through previous EU funded projects, were used in order to promote the usage of this tool and help participants to cover all relevant questions in these SEA steps. As trainers used real examples from few years ago, when SEA implementation was very low in Croatia, participants also received feedback information on how they implemented screening and scoping then and how they would approach it now. They also realised what problems ( <i>that in the meantime developed due to mistakes made at these two crucial SEA steps</i> ) they could have avoided. This led to “ <i>self-evaluation</i> ” of participants in regard to understanding of good SEA practice. The participants also opened the issue of currently rather uncoordinated procedures between spatial planning and SEA and evaluated it as one of the mayor current obstacles in good SEA practice.
Human health in SEA/EIA (with case examples)	Trainers and guest experts decided to change the order of topics and rather went for all encompassing discussion about human health in SEA/EIA practice ( <i>topic of climate change was to be covered on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day</i> ), which proved to be a good decision, as this allowed for quite vibrant debate about how and in how much detail to address human health in SEA/EIA. The discussion opened issues like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>What should be the subject of SEA/EIA - “more narrow human health” or “broader social aspect” (especially linked to SEA)?</i></li> <li>• SPPs are developed with intent to resolve open problems in space and society, but in the flood of “<i>potential negative impacts</i>” their “<i>positive connotation</i>” gets lost due to lack of proper evaluation of the social aspect.</li> <li>• Does in this case SEA current practice fails to deliver its support to SPPs, as it usually doesn’t even try to enhance positive impacts, but just rather superficially states them?</li> </ul>
<b>DAY 2 – EIA</b>	<b>MAIN POINTS DISCUSSED AT THE WORKSHOP</b>
Key principles of efficient EIA Main stages of EIA process as	There was not much discussion at this stage, as participants had more experience with EIA practice. Few legislation and jurisdiction specific questions were posed in relation to specific questions.



stipulated by national legislation	
Existing EIA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)  Challenges in EIA practice in Croatia and EU (through case examples)	Similarly as in case of SEA clearly recognised their own practical issues in presented case examples and suggested that more “ <i>good vs. bad practice examples</i> ” should be discussed in order to implement suggested approaches in their own EIA cases. Again participants expressed their opinion that the main actors should be involved in similar workshops in order to enable equal level of knowledge for all relevant actors and enable them to play their role in EIA process on satisfactory level. The rest of the discussion was mostly linked either to presented case examples or con-going EIA examples carried out by participants, their specific situations and how to approach them.
Screening (with practical exercises)	Similarly to SEA part of the workshop, this was the main “ <i>practical exercise</i> ” of the workshop, so most of the discussion was linked to presented end-results of all groups and resolving some uncertainties/issues/dilemmas raised by participants. As trainers used real examples participants realised what problems ( <i>that in the meantime developed due to mistakes made at these two crucial EIA steps</i> ) they could have avoided. This led to “ <i>self-evaluation</i> ” of participants in regard to understanding of good EIA practice.
Climate Change in SEA/EIA (with case examples)	Trainers and guest experts decided to change the order of topics and rather went for all encompassing discussion about Climate change in SEA/EIA practice ( <i>topic of human health was already addressed on the 1<sup>st</sup> day</i> ). Again, this proved to be a good decision, as also in this case quite interesting debate about how and in how much detail to address climate change in SEA/EIA. The discussion opened issues like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which changes of spatial plans on county level could have impact on climate change or could be influenced by climate change? Should this topic also be considered on local level?</li> <li>• To what degree can we trust climate change scenarios and how to properly use them for evaluation of potential impacts?</li> </ul> Participants also expressed the need for more examples from Croatia to be provided in order to get better perspective on how to deal with this issue in SEA/EIA.

### ***How the training will be further used in following capacity building***

After the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop in Split a workshop evaluation meeting took place with the aim of internal evaluation of the workshops and design of future workshops planned within ECRAN project as well as identification of ideas for development of National Training Strategy. National trainers and ECRAN experts exchanged comments on their performance, as well as overall impressions from both workshops with the aim to learn from practical experience in improve future performance.



Main conclusions of the internal evaluation of the workshops:

- The need for capacity building on SEA/EIA seems to be very high and is welcomed and appreciated. Participants clearly expressed the need for further workshops linked either to specific issues (*e.g. decision making at different stages of procedure, quality control, etc.*) or building capacities of other potential target groups (*e.g. members of committees, planners, SEA/EIA practitioners, decision makers, etc.*);
- In trainers' so-far experience, participants clearly showed progress in terms of understanding the need for SEA/EIA, as well as considerable leap forward from "How to avoid SEA/EIA?" towards "How to properly implement SEA/EIA?" and "How to address specific issues through SEA/EIA and use them as a planning support tool?";
- Implementation of workshops delivering practical group work on real case examples, with only few counties and controlled number of participants proved to be highly efficient, constructive and thus successful. It also resulted in spontaneous and sincere exchange of experiences and opinions between participants, putting the trainers several times into position of "debate moderators" rather than "lecturers/experts/answer providers";
- It was suggested that workshops involving all or several key actors (especially planners, SEA practitioners and decision makers) in the process of SPP development and SEA process should be organised to ensure better understanding from all sides and to improve current level and practice of cooperation;
- Quick surveys through "easy to use – easy to analyse" questioners proved to be highly efficient tool for collection of feed-back information, that will be used in planning and implementation of future workshops and ToT;
- Trainers also gained first-hand experience in conceptual, technical and content organisation of workshops and recognised the value of knowledge gained through participation in ToT. In accordance with lessons learned during the implementation of 1<sup>st</sup> workshop in Osijek the trainers slightly modified the content and way of implementation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop in Split. This also applies to guest lecturers covering the specific topics of Climate Change and Human Health. This shows adaptability and quick response from national trainers, as well as clear intent from all sides to provide high quality workshops, tailored to participants needs.

Suggestions for 2<sup>nd</sup> ToT and 2<sup>nd</sup> round of national workshops:

- Although having workshops for neighbouring counties was "cost-efficient" and contributed to improvement of current communication and coordination between neighbouring counties it also proved to be problematic from the point of view of sharing experiences from different parts of the country. Similar problematics narrowed the debate to a rather limited amount of topics. Thus the proposal was given that in 2<sup>nd</sup> round of national workshops participant counties should be mixed-up in order to see if this will further improve the quality of the workshops;
- Some "technical/legislative issues" such as presentation of changes of EIA Directive proved to be in little of interest to participants, as potential changes to national legislation are still not known. However, due to the fact that Croatia is in the process of amendment of current SEA legislation, and the fact that in 1 year time changes to national legislation on EIA might be



already in draft version, this could be one of the “important topics” to be further included into the workshops. The need for such changes will be assessed during the 2<sup>nd</sup> ToT;

- Although the decision to focus workshops also on 2 specific topics (Climate Change and Human Health) proved to be a good one, the need for further improvement – especially in regard to delivery of case examples from Croatia – was identified;
- The question of expansion of the team of experts was brought up from the point of view that impacts on Natura 2000 were of rather marginal importance for the participants, even if this proves to be one of the very actual issues. The same applies to experts from spatial planning, which proved to be very high on participants’ actual issues. The topic of “Water Framework Directive” was also discussed. The decision was made that these specific issues should be addressed through development of further specialised trainings (*alongside from other important issues*) within National Training Strategy and not within ECRAN project;
- The overall conclusion of the workshops was that in Croatia there is an obvious need for a delivery of ToT for representatives of the county level. This will allow national trainers involved in current ToT to cope with the demand for workshops on implementation of SEA/EIA. Otherwise current team of trainers on national level could be overwhelmed, especially if we keep in mind announced/expected amendment of current SEA/EIA legislation. Despite this conclusion the trainers offered their active participation and help in implementation of any SEA/EIA topic related workshop/training organised by Counties.



ANNEX I – Agenda

**Day 1: Monday 11 May 2015, Osijek**  
**Monday 18 May 2015, Split**

<b>Topic: Strategic Environmental Assessment</b>				
<b>Chair and Co-Chairs: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan, Ana Kovačević, Ivana Lalić (MENP)</b>				
<b>Venue: Hotel Atrium, Domovinskog rata 49 A, Split, Croatia</b>				
Start	Finish	Topic	Speaker	Sub topic/Content
08:00	08:30	<b>Registration</b>		
08:30	08:40	Welcome and introduction	MENP representatives: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ana Kovačević	Introduction to the workshop
08:40	09:15	Introduction to SEA	MENP representatives: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ana Kovačević	Key principles of efficient SEA Main stages of SEA process as stipulated by national legislation Existing SEA practice in Croatia
09:15	09:30	SEA in EU	ECRAN experts: Klemen Strmšnik or Martin Smutny	Main SEA achievements and problems in EU
09:30	10:00	Challenges in SEA practice in Croatia	MENP expert: Ana Kovačević	Facilitated discussion on specific topics to be addressed within the training
10:00	10:30	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
10:30	12:00	Lining SEA and planning, presentation of	MENP and ECRAN experts	Importance of linking SEA and planning process Legal requirements



		examples from Croatia	Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ana Kovačević  Klemen Strmšnik or Martin Smutny	Group work and presentations  Case examples  Concluding discussion
12:00	13:00	<b>Lunch Break</b>		
13:00	14:30	Main challenges in SEA, the most problematic aspects, examples from participant's counties	MENP experts:  Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ana Kovačević	Facilitated discussion on specific topics to be addressed within the training, discussion on problems in implementation of SEA
14:30	15:00	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
15:00	16:00	Human health and climate change in SEA	TAIEX experts:  Mr. Jaroslav Volf  Mr. Jiri Dusik	Differences in addressing health and climate change in SEA and EIA  Methodological approaches and tools  Key issues to be addressed  Case examples
16:00	16:30	Concluding discussion  End of Day 1	To be facilitated by MENP experts and ECRAN experts	QA  Topics to be addressed in Day 2



**Day 2: Tuesday 12 May 2015, Osijek**  
**Tuesday 19 May 2015, Split**

**Topic: Environmental Impact Assessment**

**Chair and Co-Chairs: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan, Ana Kovačević, Ivana Lalić (MENP)**

**Venue: Hotel Atrium, Domovinskog rata 49 A, Split, Croatia**

Start	Finish	Topic	Speaker	Sub topic/Content
<b>08:00</b>	<b>08:30</b>	<b>Registration</b>		
8:30	09:00	Introduction to EIA	MENP experts: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ivana Lalić	Key principles of efficient EIA Main stages of EIA process as stipulated by national legislation Existing EIA practice in Croatia, examples of good practice
09:00	9:30	EIA in EU	ECRAN experts: Klemen Strmšnik or Martin Smutny	Main EIA achievements and problems in EU Key elements of new EIA Directive
9:30	10:00	Challenges in EIA practice in Croatia	MENP experts: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ivana Lalić	Facilitated discussion on specific topics to be addressed further during the day
<b>10:00</b>	<b>10:30</b>	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
10:30	12:00	Screening	MENP experts: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ivana Lalić  The examples from EU will be presented by Klemen Strmšnik or Martin Smutny, ECRAN Expert	Purpose of screening Legal requirements Group work and presentations Examples from EU Concluding discussion



12:00	13:00	<b>Lunch Break</b>		
13:00	14:00	Human health and climate change in EIA	ECRAN experts: Mr. Jaroslav Volf Mr. Jiri Dusik	Methodological approaches and tools Key issues to be addressed Case
14:00	14:45	Quality control in EIA	MENP experts: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ivana Lalić  The examples from EU will be presented by Klemen Strmšnik or Martin Smutny, ECRAN Expert	Role of quality control in EIA system Criteria for EIA quality stipulated by the national legislation Role of advisory committees Examples from EU
14:45	15:15	<b>Coffee Break</b>		
15:15	16:15	Challenges in EIA practice in Croatia	MENP experts: Anamarija Matak, Vesna Montan or Ivana Lalić	Facilitated discussion on main challenges and further development of EIA system (e.g. amendments in legislation in relation to new EIA Directive etc.)
16:15		End of meeting		



## ANNEX II – Participants

11-12 May 2015, Osijek, Croatia

First Name	Family Name	Institution Name	Country	Email
Zorica	Hegeđučić	Virovitica-Podravina County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zorica.hegedusic@vpz.hr">zorica.hegedusic@vpz.hr</a>
Zlata	Karlović	Virovitica-Podravina County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zlata.karlovic@vpz.hr">zlata.karlovic@vpz.hr</a>
Jasna	Baranjec Keserica	Virovitica-Podravina County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:prostor-okolis@vt.t-com.hr">prostor-okolis@vt.t-com.hr</a>
Slobodanka	Janeš	Virovitica-Podravina County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:prostor-okolis@vt.t-com.hr">prostor-okolis@vt.t-com.hr</a>
Silvana	Tvry	Vukovar-Srijem County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:silvana.tvrz@vusz.hr">silvana.tvrz@vusz.hr</a>
Marina	Vlajčić	Vukovar-Srijem County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:vlajcic.marina@vusz.hr">vlajcic.marina@vusz.hr</a>
Antonija	Pavković	Vukovar-Srijem County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:antonija.pavkovic@vusz.hr">antonija.pavkovic@vusz.hr</a>
Goran	Lazarević	Vukovar-Srijem County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:goran.lazarevic@vusz.hr">goran.lazarevic@vusz.hr</a>
Branka	Kuba	Požega-Slavonija County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:branka.kuba@pszupanija.hr">branka.kuba@pszupanija.hr</a>
Renata	Obradović	Požega-Slavonija County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:renata.obradovic@pszupanija.hr">renata.obradovic@pszupanija.hr</a>
Mladenko	Soldo	Požega-Slavonija County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:mladenko.soldo@pszupanija.hr">mladenko.soldo@pszupanija.hr</a>
Renata	Madunić Hajek	Požega-Slavonija County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:renata.madunic-hajek@pszupanija.hr">renata.madunic-hajek@pszupanija.hr</a>
DAanijela	Lovoković	Osijek-Baranja County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:danijela.lovokovic@obz.hr">danijela.lovokovic@obz.hr</a>
Jasna	Gorupić	Osijek-Baranja County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:jasna.gorupic@obz.hr">jasna.gorupic@obz.hr</a>
Gordana	Zelenika	Osijek-Baranja County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:gordana.zelenika@obz.hr">gordana.zelenika@obz.hr</a>
Alma	Keglević	Osijek-Baranja County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:alma.keglevic@obz.hr">alma.keglevic@obz.hr</a>
Ljiljana	Curić	Brod-Posavina County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:ljcuric@bpz.hr">ljcuric@bpz.hr</a>
Ana	Kovacević	Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection	Croatia	<a href="mailto:ana.kovacevic@mzoip.hr">ana.kovacevic@mzoip.hr</a>



First Name	Family Name	Institution Name	Country	Email
Vesna	Montan	Ministry of Environmental and Nature	Croatia	<a href="mailto:vesna.montan@mzoip.hr">vesna.montan@mzoip.hr</a>
Ivana	Lalić	Ministry of Environmental and Nature	Croatia	<a href="mailto:ivana.lalic@mzoip.hr">ivana.lalic@mzoip.hr</a>
Jiri	Dusik	ECRAN	Czech Republic	<a href="mailto:jiri.dusik@integracons.com">jiri.dusik@integracons.com</a>
Klemen	Strmsnik	ECRAN	Slovenia	<a href="mailto:Klemen.Strmsnik@zavita.si">Klemen.Strmsnik@zavita.si</a>
Martin	Smutny	ECRAN	Czech Republic	<a href="mailto:martin.smutny@integracons.com">martin.smutny@integracons.com</a>



18-19 May 2015, Split, Croatia

First Name	Family Name	Institution Name	Country	Email
Hrvoje	Vranjković	Sibenik-Knin County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:hrvoje.vranjkovic@skz.hr">hrvoje.vranjkovic@skz.hr</a>
Zoran	Ševerdija	Sibenik-Knin County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zoran.severdija@skz.hr">zoran.severdija@skz.hr</a>
Živana	Lambaša Belak	Sibenik-Knin County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zivana.lambasa.belak@skz.hr">zivana.lambasa.belak@skz.hr</a>
Marko	Čule	Institute for Spatial Planning of Sibenik-Knin County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:marko.cule@zpu-skz.hr">marko.cule@zpu-skz.hr</a>
Nikola	Veraja	Dubrovnik-Neretva County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:nikola.veraja@dnz.hr">nikola.veraja@dnz.hr</a>
Dijana	Tomašević Rakić	Dubrovnik-Neretva County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:dijana.tomasevic-rakic@dnz.hr">dijana.tomasevic-rakic@dnz.hr</a>
Ivana	Bobanović	Dubrovnik-Neretva County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:ivana.bobanovic@dnz.hr">ivana.bobanovic@dnz.hr</a>
Nikolina	Matuško	Dubrovnik-Neretva County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:nikolina.matusko@dnz.hr">nikolina.matusko@dnz.hr</a>
Erna	Ragužlučić	City of Dubrovnik	Croatia	<a href="mailto:eraguz@dubrovnik.hr">eraguz@dubrovnik.hr</a>
Katica	Prpić	Lika-Senj County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:katica.prpic@licko-senjska.hr">katica.prpic@licko-senjska.hr</a>
Biserka	Polić	Lika-Senj County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:biserka.polic@licko-senjska.hr">biserka.polic@licko-senjska.hr</a>
Jerko	Kostelac	Lika-Senj County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zastita-priode@licko-senjska.hr">zastita-priode@licko-senjska.hr</a>
Marija	Vuković	Split-Dalmacija County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:marija.vukovic@dalmacija.hr">marija.vukovic@dalmacija.hr</a>
Zlata	Lovrić Caprin	Split-Dalmacija County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zlata.caparin@dalmacija.hr">zlata.caparin@dalmacija.hr</a>
Josip	Matić	Zadar County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:josip.matic@zadarska-zupanija.hr">josip.matic@zadarska-zupanija.hr</a>



This Project is funded by the European Union



A project implemented by Human Dynamics Consortium

First Name	Family Name	Institution Name	Country	Email
Antonija	Zrlić Vulić	Zadar County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:prostorno-mateja@zadarska-zupanija.hr">prostorno-mateja@zadarska-zupanija.hr</a>
Nevena	Rosan	Zadar County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:nevena@zpu-zadzup.hr">nevena@zpu-zadzup.hr</a>
Stjepan	Gverić	Zadar County	Croatia	<a href="mailto:zuz@zd.t-com.hr">zuz@zd.t-com.hr</a>
Ana Marija	Matak	Ministry of Environmental and Nature	Croatia	<a href="mailto:anamarija.matak@mzoip.hr">anamarija.matak@mzoip.hr</a>
Ana	Kovacević	Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection	Croatia	<a href="mailto:ana.kovacevic@mzoip.hr">ana.kovacevic@mzoip.hr</a>
Vesna	Montan	Ministry of Environmental and Nature	Croatia	<a href="mailto:vesna.montan@mzoip.hr">vesna.montan@mzoip.hr</a>
Ivana	Lalić	Ministry of Environmental and Nature	Croatia	<a href="mailto:ivana.lalic@mzoip.hr">ivana.lalic@mzoip.hr</a>
Jiri	Dusik	ECRAN	Czech Republic	<a href="mailto:jiri.dusik@integracons.com">jiri.dusik@integracons.com</a>
Klemen	Strmsnik	ECRAN	Slovenia	<a href="mailto:Klemen.Strmsnik@zavita.si">Klemen.Strmsnik@zavita.si</a>
Martin	Smutny	ECRAN	Czech Republic	<a href="mailto:martin.smutny@integracons.com">martin.smutny@integracons.com</a>



### ANNEX III – Presentations (under separate cover)

Presentations can be downloaded from:

[http://www.ecranetwork.org/Files/National\\_workshop\\_on\\_SEA\\_and\\_EIA\\_in\\_Croatia.zip](http://www.ecranetwork.org/Files/National_workshop_on_SEA_and_EIA_in_Croatia.zip)



This Project is funded by the  
European Union



A project implemented by  
Human Dynamics Consortium

## Annex IV - Questioner about Efficiency of SEA Procedure

(filled out with overall results)

### RADIONICA

**Tema: Strateška procjena utjecaja na okoliš (SPUO)**

**Vježba: Učinkovitost postupka SPUO**

<p>Koje aspekte smatrate najvažnijim za učinkovitu SPUO?</p> <p><i>Odredite prioritete oznakom od 1 do 10 (1 = najvažniji, 10 = najmanje važan)</i></p>	
	Način vođenja postupka SPUO od strane nadležnog tijela
	Način sudjelovanja MZOIP/nadležnog upravnog tijela u županiji
	Jasan zakonodavni okvir
	Dovoljan broj i educirani zaposlenici (kod nadležnog tijela, MZOIP, županije)
	Raspoloživost najnovijih znanstvenih i stručnih podataka
	Raspoloživost neophodnih sredstava za rad zaposlenika (informatička oprema, službeni automobili ...)
	Edukacija i stručno usavršavanje o SPUO
	Koordinacija aktivnosti tijekom postupka SPUO
	Praćenje i evaluacija postupka SPUO
	Uspostavljanje savjetodavnog tijela o postupku SPUO (helpdesk)
	Ostali ...
<p>Kakav utjecaj na učinkovitost postupka SPUO imaju sljedeći dionici?</p> <p><i>Odredite prioritete oznakom od 1 do 7 (1 = najvažniji, 7 = najmanje važan)</i></p>	
	Tijelo nadležno za provedbu strateške procjene (nadležno tijelo)
	Ministarstvo zaštite okoliša i prirode/ nadležno upravno tijelo u županiji
	Ovlaštenici (izrađivači strateške studije)



	Tijela i/ili osobe određene posebnim propisima
	Javnost / Nevladine udruge
	Ostale znanstvene i stručne institucije (fakulteti, instituti, zavodi ...)
	Povjerenstvo za stratešku procjenu
	Ostali...

**Within the topic challenges in SEA practice in Croatia, the participants were asked to define priorities important for the efficient SEA, concerning stakeholders and procedural aspects.**

- Concerning stakeholders, majority said that the most important are: (1) the authority competent for implementation of SEA and (2) Ministry for Environmental and Nature Protection / county competent authority and legal persons. The less important are: (1) other scientific and expert institutions and (2) public and NGOs.
- Concerning procedural aspects, majority said that the most important are: (1) clear regulative framework and (2) leadership of the competent authority for SEA. The less important are: (1) tools such as computers and cars available for staff of SEA authority and (2) advice on SEA procedure and practice (helpdesk).



## Annex V - Questioner about Efficiency of EIA Procedure

(filled out with overall results)

### RADIONICA

**Tema: Procjena utjecaja zahvata na okoliš (PUO)**

**Vježba: Učinkovitost postupka PUO**

<p>Koje aspekte smatrate najvažnijim za učinkovitu PUO?</p> <p><i>Odredite prioritete oznakom od 1 do 10 (1 = najvažniji, 10 = najmanje važan)</i></p>	
	Način vođenja postupka PUO od strane nadležnog tijela za provedbu PUO
	Ujednačeni kriteriji kod odlučivanja
	Jasan zakonodavni okvir
	Dovoljan broj i educirani zaposlenici (MZOIP, županije)
	Raspoloživost najnovijih znanstvenih i stručnih podataka
	Raspoloživost neophodnih sredstava za rad zaposlenika (informatička oprema, službeni automobili ...)
	Edukacija i stručno usavršavanje o PUO
	Koordinacija aktivnosti tijekom postupka PUO
	Praćenje i evaluacija postupka PUO
	Uspostavljanje savjetodavnog tijela o postupku PUO (helpdesk)
	Ostali ...
<p>Kakav utjecaj na učinkovitost postupka PUO imaju sljedeći dionici?</p> <p><i>Odredite prioritete oznakom od 1 do 7 (1 = najvažniji, 7 = najmanje važan)</i></p>	
	Tijelo nadležno za provedbu PUO (MZOIP/nadležni upravni odjel u županiji)
	Nositelj zahvata
	Ovlaštenici (izrađivači SUO)



	Nevladine udruge
	Ostala javnost i zainteresirana javnost
	Ostale znanstvene i stručne institucije (fakulteti, instituti, zavodi...)
	Povjerenstvo za PUO
	Ostali

**Within the topic challenges in EIA practice in Croatia, the participants were asked to define priorities important for the efficient EIA, concerning stakeholders and procedural aspects.**

- Concerning stakeholders, majority said that the most important are: (1) the authority competent for EIA and (2) the developer. The less important are: (1) other scientific and expert institutions and (2) public and NGOs.
- Concerning procedural aspects, majority said that the most important are: (1) clear regulative framework and (2) leadership of the EIA competent authority. The less important are: (1) tools such as computers and cars available for staff of EIA competent authority and (2) monitoring and evaluation of the EIA procedure, as well as advice on EIA procedure and practice (helpdesk). More group work on case examples.



## Annex VI - Workshop Evaluation Form

(filled out with overall results)

### RADIONICA

#### STRATEŠKA PROCJENA UTJECAJA NA OKOLIŠ STRATEGIJA, PLANOVA I PROGRAMA (SPUO) I PROCJENA UTJECAJA ZAHVATA NA OKOLIŠ (PUO)

Split, 18.-19. svibnja 2015.

### OBRAZAC ZA EVALUACIJU

Molimo vas da odgovorite na sljedeća pitanja koristeći skalu od 1 do 5

1 = loše, 2 = zadovoljavajuće, 3 = dobro, 4 = odlično, 5 = izvanredno

Pitanje	1	2	3	4	5
Jesu li teme bile dovoljno objašnjene i praktično primjenjive?					
Jesu li izlaganja bila logično osmišljena, te dovoljno jasna i razumljiva?					
Koja je Vaša cjelokupna ocjena radionice?					

#### Komentari i preporuke:

1. Čime bi se radionica mogla poboljšati?
2. O kojim biste temama željeli dobiti dodatne informacije?

#### Answers from participants:

- More examples of good and bad practice.
- More WSs for authorities competent for implementation of SEA on regional and local level.
- More examples of good practice on linking SEA and planning process.
- More group work on case examples.
- Ongoing WSs on SEA and EIA.



This Project is funded by the  
European Union



A project implemented by  
Human Dynamics Consortium