



OFFICIAL STATEMENT
for the
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT of the
Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme





Table of Content:

1	INTRODUCTION.....	7
2	SEA METHODOLOGY AND ITS PARTNERSHIP PROCESS.....	8
2.1	THE SEA PROCESS	8
2.2	STEPS OF THE SEA PROCESS.....	9
2.3	METHODOLOGY OF ALTERNATIVES	16
3	HOW ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN INTERREG V-A ROMANIA-HUNGARY PROGRAMME.....	22
4	HOW PUBLIC OPINION AND THE OPINION OF RELEVANT AUTHORITIES EXPRESSED DURING THE ACTIVITY OF THE ROMANIAN WORKING GROUP FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DURING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT	44
4.1	CONSULTATION ON THE SCOPING REPORT	44
4.2	THE ACTIVITY OF THE ROMANIAN WORKING GROUP FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT.....	50
4.2.1	<i>First meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:</i>	<i>50</i>
4.2.2	<i>Second meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:.....</i>	<i>59</i>
4.2.3	<i>Third meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:.....</i>	<i>71</i>
4.2.4	<i>Fourth meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:.....</i>	<i>80</i>
4.3	COORDINATION WITH PROGRAMMING.....	88
4.4	CONSULTATION ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT.....	95
	ANNEX 1: TEXT OF THE ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR STARTING THE CONSULTATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT	106



ABBREVIATIONS

Term or acronym	Definition
BAT	Best Available Technologies
BREF	BAT Reference Document
CBC	Cross-Border Cooperation
CBR	Cross-Border Region
CTS	Common Territorial Strategy
CP	Cooperation Programme
DRBD	Danube River Basin District
EC	European Commission
EEA	European Environment Agency
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ERDF	European Regional Development Fund
EARDF	European Agriculture and Rural Development Fund
GD	Government Decision
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
IP	Investment Priority
JS	Joint Secretariat
KAI	Key area of intervention
MS	Member State
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OM	Ministerial Decree especially in Romania - Ordin Ministerial
PA	Priority Axis
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
SEA Directive	Directive 2001/42/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 June 2001 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment.
SO	Specific objective
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TEN-T	Trans-European Transport Network
JWG	Joint Working Group
TO	Thematic Objective



Glossary of technical terms

Technical Term	Definition
Adaptation (climate change)	The term used to describe responses to the effects of climate change. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) defines adaptation as 'adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities.' Adaptation can also be thought of as learning how to live with the consequences of climate change.
Adaptive capacity	The ability of a system to adjust to climate change (including climate variability and extremes), to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities and to cope with the consequences.
Article 6(3) appropriate assessment	Article 6(3) of the Habitats Directive requires an appropriate assessment (also referred to as 'Habitats Directive assessment' or 'Natura 2000 assessment') to be carried out where any plans or projects that are not directly linked to the management of that site may have a significant effect on the conservation objectives and would ultimately affect the integrity of the site. Integrity can be defined as the ability of the site to fulfil its function to continue to support protected habitats or species. Annex I to the Habitats Directive includes a full list of protected habitats and Annex II of protected species.
Baseline	A description of the present and future state, if the plan or programme (PP) is not implemented, taking into account changes resulting from natural events and from other human activities.
Best alternative	The state of the environment in the Programme area is to be analysed 'with and without' the implementation of the Programme and an intermediary programme strategy is also to be analysed. The Best alternative is the implementation of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme.
Biodiversity	The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) defines biological diversity as 'the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems' (Article 2).
Climate	Usually defined as the 'average weather', or more rigorously, as the statistical description in terms of the mean and variability of relevant quantities of variables such as temperature, precipitation, and wind, over a period of time. The conventional period of time over which weather is averaged to calculate climate is 30 years, as defined by the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO). (Modified from IPCC)
Climate change	The IPCC defines climate change as 'any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity.' The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) defines it specifically in relation to human influence as: 'a change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere and which is in addition to natural climate variability observed over comparable time periods.'
CO2 equivalent	A metric measure used to compare emissions from various GHGs based upon their global warming potential (GWP). Carbon dioxide equivalents are commonly expressed as 'million metric tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents (MMTCDE)'.
Cumulative effects	The incremental effects of an action PP when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Cumulative effects can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.
Direct effects	Environmental effects caused directly by the implementation of a PP.



EIA Directive	Directive 2011/92/EU on the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment [codification], OJ L 26, 28.1.2012, p.1. The EIA Directive requires that Member States ensure that, before development consent is given, projects likely to have significant effects on the environment because of their nature, size or location are made subject to an assessment of the environmental effects.
Environmental report	Document required by the SEA Directive as part of an environmental assessment, which identifies, describes and evaluates the likely significant effects on the environment of implementing a PP. The SEA Directive states that the environmental report shall mean the part of the plan or programme documentation containing the information required in Article 5 and Annex I.
Fauna	The animals of a particular region or habitat.
Flora	The plants of a particular region or habitat.
Greenhouse gas (GHG)	Any atmospheric gas (either natural or anthropogenic in origin) which absorbs thermal radiation emitted by the Earth's surface. This traps heat in the atmosphere and keeps the surface at a warmer temperature than would otherwise be possible.
Indirect effects	Effects that occur away from the immediate location or timing affected by the implementation of a PP, e.g. quarrying of aggregates elsewhere as a result of implementing new road proposals included in plan or programme (see also secondary effects).
Intermediary alternative	The state of the environment in the Programme area is to be analysed 'with and without' the implementation of the Programme and an intermediary programme strategy is also to be analysed. The Intermediary alternative is based on an alternative programme strategy. Based on the suggestions of the Common Territorial Strategy, the Joint Working Group discussed the proposed priority axes and specific objectives at the 6th Joint Working Group Meeting on 12 December 2013. This alternative was subject to the Scoping Report.
Mitigation (climate change)	A term used to describe the process of reducing GHG emissions that are contributing to climate change. It includes strategies to reduce GHG emissions and enhancing GHG sinks.
Mitigation (SEA)	Measures to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the PP. (SEA Directive)
Natura 2000	An EU-wide network of nature protection areas established under the Habitats Directive. The aim of the network is to assure the long-term survival of Europe's most valuable and threatened species and habitats. It is comprised of Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) designated by Member States under the Habitats Directive and Special Protection Areas (SPAs) designated under the Birds Directive.
Relevant environmental authorities	Authorities which, because of their specific environmental responsibilities, are likely to be environmental concerned by the environmental effects of implementing Cohesion Policy programming documents. These authorities may also include authorities in charge of matters related to environmental health.
SEA Directive	Directive 2001/42/EC on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment, OJ L 197, 21.7.2001, p.30. It requires the environmental effects of a broad range of plans and programmes to be assessed so they can be considered while plans are actually being developed, and in due course adopted. The public must also be consulted on the draft plans and the environmental assessment, and their views must be taken into account.
Significant effects	Effects that are significant in the context of the PP, i.e. a function not just of magnitude or size of effect, but of nature, sensitivity and scale of the receptor.



Zero option	The state of the environment in the Programme area is to be analysed 'with and without' the implementation of the Programme. Zero option, as the first alternative is without the implementation of the programme
-------------	---



1 INTRODUCTION

This document presents the official statement to the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme. This Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Statement has been issued according to the provisions of art. 9(1)(b) of the Directive 2001/42 on the assessment of the effects of certain plans and programmes on the environment (SEA) and accompanies the final Cooperation Programme October 2015, adopted by the EC.

A short summary of the strategic environmental assessment (SEA) of the Programme is presented below, structured according to the followings:

- overview about the methodology and the process of the strategic environmental assessment and the preparation of the environmental report,
- summary of how environmental considerations and opinions expressed by relevant stakeholders were taken into account and have been integrated into the Programme.
- summary of how the opinion of the environmental authorities and the public have been taken into account
- the reasonable alternatives of the Programme
- description of measures for monitoring the environmental impacts of the Programme.



2 SEA METHODOLOGY AND ITS PARTNERSHIP PROCESS

2.1 The SEA process

The SEA of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme is planned and carried out in line with the relevant EC Directive and national legislations and was conducted by the Romanian Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests). The objective of the environmental assessment was to foster the integration and application of environmental and complex sustainability aspects during the preparation process into the Programme. During the SEA process, special emphasis has been put on consultations and communication with partners as well as on the presentation of partners' ideas to planners.

The methodological approach for the strategic environmental assessment process is the following:

1. Identification of the environmental authorities in both partner states
2. Screening statement – decision on whether the SEA is required or not
3. Determination of the Scope and consultation on the Scoping Report
4. Preparation of the Environmental Report (including the activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment, the public consultation and the integration of comments from the consultation process in both member states)
5. Decision on the transboundary effects
6. Integration of recommendations from the consultation process
7. Finalisation of the measures decided concerning monitoring: the significant environmental impacts of the implementation of the programme
8. Ensuring information about the Decision, the elaboration of the SEA statement
9. Approval of the document by the Governments of both member states (The Cooperation Programme document is to be approved by the Governments of Romania and Hungary, having the annexes of the Ex-ante Report and the Report for the Strategic Environmental Assessment.)

The SEA process of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme was started parallel with the elaboration of the programme document. According to Article 4(1) of the SEA Directive the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme has been elaborated during the preparation of the programme as an integral part of the whole programming process.

The scope and methodology of the SEA report was prepared in line with Annex 1 of the Directive. The requirement for the SEA in case of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme has been reasoned and presented in the Scoping Report. (The environmental authorities have agreed that the programme will have a significant impact on the environment and the elaboration of the SEA is necessary.) The determination of the Environmental Report's scope and level of detail have been presented in the Scoping Report and consultation took place with the environmental authorities.

The environmental authorities have agreed on the fact that the programme will have a significant impact on the environment and the elaboration of the SEA process is necessary. The content of the Environmental Report follows the requirements of the Annex I of the SEA Directive. The SEA process and the environmental assessment have been carried out by the same expert team in both partner states, Scoping Report and Environmental Report are joint single reports. In this way two consultation actions were planned with the environmental bodies.

The SEA Directive 2001/42/EC requires that the environmental authorities and the public of the partner states have to be consulted within the SEA Procedure. The prescribed environmental authorities and the national legal requirements have been consulted first with the relevant authorities in both countries. Within the SEA Procedure of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme consultation had been carried out in relation to the:

- Scoping Report
- Environmental Report

First, the environmental bodies were invited to express their opinions on the Scoping Report – including the Screening Statement. The comments and suggestions received in this consultation phase were taken into consideration in the final Scoping Report, in the elaboration of the Environmental Report and in the preparation of the Cooperation programme.

The list of authorities involved was generated in accordance with the Addresses of Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) no. 115849/DM/22.07.2014, no.115882/DM/25.07.2014 (Romania and further updated by the Romanian Ministry of Environmental representative, according to the issues raised during the Romanian Environmental Working Group. These authorities form the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment in Romania. The Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment has convened 4 times and formulated comments and recommendations related to the draft versions of the Environmental Report (19th August 2014, 12th September 2014, 17th October 2014 and 20th November 2014).

The involvement of stakeholders and the involvement of the public in the SEA process was a key element in the consultation of the Environmental Report. The consultation process gave the opportunity to the stakeholders (i.e. institutions, environmental agencies, NGOs, representatives of the public and those target groups that will be potentially affected by the possible environmental impacts of the implementation of the Co-operation Programme) and to the interested public to express their opinion.

In Romania, the environmental authorities are provided with the whole report in English and in national language, the Non-technical summary in the national language. The Programme document was provided in English, with a summary version in Romanian language. In Hungary, the environmental authorities and the public are provided with the whole report in English and the Non-technical summary in the national language. The public consultation period of the Programme document took place between 5th September 2014 and 8th October 2014. Environmental authorities and the members of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment had the opportunity to submit their observations to the programme during its consultation. Nevertheless the draft cooperation programme was accessible together with the Environmental Report for consultation, for information only.

2.2 Steps of the SEA process

The whole Strategic Environmental Assessment process started in 12th December 2013 and planned to be finalised after the consultation of the environmental report with the public in both member states.

STEP of the SEA procedure: Screening	
Date for the undertaken step	12 th December 2013 - 6 th January 2014
Documents for the undertaken step	<p>Precondition: approved TOs and IPs</p> <p>In line with SEA Directive Article 3 and Annex II</p> <p>The Screening statement has been incorporated in the Scoping Report.</p>



		<p>According to the SEA Directive and both the Romanian and Hungarian national legislations, the SEA is automatically required for the programme as it is likely to have significant environmental effects.</p> <p>The screening-scoping process confirmed that there are likely to be significant environmental effects and SEA is required.</p>
Romanian reference	legal	In line with Government Decision no.1076/2004. Art 5. (2)
Hungarian reference	legal	<p>In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §1, §4 and Annex 1</p> <p>In line with the decree the screening statement can be incorporated into the Scoping Report.</p>
STEP of the SEA procedure: Scoping		
Date for the undertaken step		<p>12th December 2013 - 6th January 2014</p> <p>Elaborated Scoping Report: 6th January 2014.</p>
Documents for the undertaken step		<p>In line with SEA Directive Article 3</p> <p>Precondition: approved TOs and IPs</p> <p>The Scoping Report including screening was made available in English language.</p> <p>The screening-scoping process confirmed the scope and the level of detail of the Environmental Report.</p> <p>1. Consultation on the Scoping Report in the Scoping Phase between 19th March 2014 and 15th May 2014.</p>
Romanian reference	legal	In line with the Government Decision no.1076/2004. Art 14. (1)
Hungarian reference	legal	In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §1, § 4 (3) and Annex 1
STEP of the SEA procedure: Setting up of the Romanian Environmental Working group		
Date for the undertaken step		n.r.
Documents for the undertaken step		<p>The Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment was set up at the beginning of the elaboration of the Environmental Report, as Romania became the Managing Authority for the programme. The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) of Romania took over the SEA proceedings.</p> <p>The meetings of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment were in the phase of the elaboration of the Environmental Report. The topics for the meetings of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment are based on the article 6(3) from SEA Directive. The first meeting of the working group was on the 19th August 2014, in Bucharest, where the first version of the Environmental Report has been presented by the participants.</p>
Romanian reference	legal	In line with SEA Directive 2001/42/CE Article 6(3)



Hungarian legal reference	There is no obligation in this regard in Hungary.
STEP of the SEA procedure: Consultation on scoping in Romania and in Hungary	
Date for the undertaken step	19 th March 2014 – 15 th May 2014. The comments incorporated after consultation: 27 th May 2014.
Documents for the undertaken step	<p>In line with SEA Directive Article 5.4 and 6.3.</p> <p>The required documents to be made available are the Draft Scoping Report an executive summary. These required documents were the object of consultation in Romania and in Hungary and have been made available in English language.</p> <p>With regard to the SEA of ETC Programmes and in line with the EC recommendation the JTS translated the executive summary of the Scoping Report into national languages. The environmental authorities were provided with an official letter, the whole Scoping Report in English and an executive summary in the national languages.</p> <p>The information gathered in the framework of the consultation with the Romanian and Hungarian authorities has been submitted to the CP planners and will be taken into account in the preparation of the Environmental Report and of the CP.</p> <p>The relevant documents have been made available on the Hungary-Romania Cross-Border Co-operation Programme 2007-2013's programme's website: https://www.huro-cbc.eu. The comments were received by post or on the following e-mail address: seaconsultation2020@huro-cbc.eu.</p> <p>The official letter was sent to the authorities on 19th March 2014 in both countries.</p> <p>In Romania:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) Impact Assessment and Pollution Control Department communicated that they had no observations on the Scoping Report. The Ministry accepted the scope and the level of detail of the Environmental Report. The formal letter was received on 28th April 2014. ▪ Ministry of Health expressed its opinion on the proposed priority axes. The formal letter was received on 9th April 2014. ▪ The comments received have been integrated into the final Scoping Report and into the Environmental Report. ▪ Decision taken by the General Directorate Pollution Control, Impact Assessment that Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme to carry out the environmental assessment of that. <p>In Romania the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) displayed the Scoping Report for consultation also on the ministry's website: http://www.mmediu.ro/categorie/evaluare-de-mediu-pentru-strategii-planuri-programe/60.ro.</p> <p>In Hungary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The comments received have been integrated into the final Scoping Report and into the Environmental Report. <p>The final Scoping Report incorporated the conclusions of the opinions expressed. The summary description on the process and results of the scoping phase has been elaborated and incorporated into the final</p>
Romanian legal reference	In line with the SEA Directive Article 5.4 and 6.3.



Hungarian legal reference	In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) .§, 1§ 4 (3) and Annex 1
STEP of the SEA procedure: Drafting the Environmental Report	
Date for the undertaken step	Elaboration of the first draft of the Environmental Report: 1st July 2014 – 15 th August 2014.
Documents for the undertaken step	<p>Preconditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CP Final draft 1 2. Approval of the CP FINAL draft 2 <p>In line with SEA Directive Article 5</p> <p>Elaboration of the 1st draft of the Environmental Report on the likely significant effects of the programme on the environment according to Annex I of the Directive, including consideration of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the programme 2. The environmental protection objectives, established at international, community or national level, which are relevant to programme and the way those objectives have been taken into account 3. The likely significant effects on the environment of the programme 4. The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce or offset the likely significant environmental effects of each area of intervention 5. Measures for monitoring environmental effects
Romanian legal reference	In line with the SEA Directive Article 5
Hungarian legal reference	In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §, 7§ 8and Annex 4
STEP of the SEA procedure: Activity of the Romanian Environmental Working Group	
Date for the undertaken step	19 th August 2014 – 20 th November 2014.
Documents for the undertaken step	<p>The Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment has convened 4 times and formulated comments and recommendations related to the draft versions of the Environmental Report draft No1-4.</p> <p>The required documents to be made available were the Draft Environmental Report in Romanian and in English language, the draft programme document in English and the summary in Romanian of the programme document. These required documents were the subject of the activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>First meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The meeting took place on 19th August 2014. 3. The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 8th August 2014. <p>Second meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The meeting took place on 12th September 2014.



		<p>5. The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 5th September 2014. Third meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:</p> <p>6. The meeting took place on 17th October 2014. 7. The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 10th October 2014. Fourth meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:</p> <p>8. The meeting took place on 20th November 2014. 9. The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 13th November 2014.</p> <p>The information gathered during the activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment has been submitted to the CP planners to be taken into account in the preparation of the Environmental Report and of the CP.</p> <p>The final draft Environmental Report incorporated the conclusions of the opinions expressed.</p>
Romanian reference	legal	In line with the SEA Directive Article 5 and 6
Hungarian reference	legal	There is no obligation in this regard in Hungary.
STEP of the SEA procedure: Official information		
Date for the undertaken step		20 th November 2014.
Documents for the undertaken step		<p>The Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment accepted the report on its fourth meeting.</p> <p>The official announcement was sent to the Romanian Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) Directorate for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control on 24th April 2015.</p>
Romanian reference	legal	In line with the SEA Directive
Hungarian reference	legal	There is no obligation in this regard in Hungary.
STEP of the SEA procedure: Consultation on the Environmental Report – public and stakeholder consultation		
Date for the undertaken step		<p>Submission of the consultation version of the cooperation programme and the final draft Environmental Report (including non-technical summary) to the ministries (RO-HU) 6th May 2015.</p> <p>Announcement of the Romanian Consultation via electronic media for the public</p> <p>Announcement of the Hungarian Consultation via electronic media for the authorities and the public</p> <p>The period for consultation was in 30 days from the 6th May 2015 to the 5th June 2015.</p>
Documents for the undertaken step		<p>In line with SEA Directive Article 6.</p> <p>Precondition:</p> <p>Approval of the SEA Environmental Report by the Romanian Working Group for</p>



	<p>Environmental Assessment</p> <p>Approval of the SEA Environmental Report by the JWG before the public consultation (not in this phase)</p> <p>A period of 30 days is set for sending and receiving observations. The required documents to make available are the draft/consultation versions of the CP and the draft Environmental Report and the Non-technical summary.</p> <p>In Romania:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the public consultation in Romania on the official sites of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) and Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the Draft Environmental Report in Romanian and English language, ○ the draft programme document in English, ○ the summary in Romanian of the programme document, ○ a schedule of the SEA procedure, and ○ an Official information on how the partner state (Hungary) has covered the environmental assessment procedure, in order to inform and the public in Romania. <p>were posted.</p> <p>In Hungary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the public consultation in Hungary on the official sites of the Ministry of Rural Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ - the Draft Environmental Report in English language, ○ - the Non-technical summary in Hungarian language ○ - the draft programme document in English, ○ - the summary in Hungarian of the programme document <p>were posted.</p> <p>The interested public will be offered the opportunity to express their opinions through the website in written form.</p> <p>The required documents are available on the websites of the relevant Ministries:</p> <p>In Romania:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on the website of the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration: http://www.mdrap.ro/dezvoltare-regionala/-4970/-7572/-1369 • and on the website of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change in Romania (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) http://www.mmediu.ro/categorie/evaluare-de-mediu-pentru-strategii-planuri-programe/60.ro. <p>In Hungary:</p> <p>on the Prime Minister's Office special website concerning development policy: http://palyazat.gov.hu/</p> <p>The summary of the consultation, the collection and answer on the comments will be incorporated into the final Environmental Report.</p>
<p>Romanian reference</p>	<p>legal</p> <p>The period for consultation take place from the 6th May 2015 to the 5th June 2015</p> <p>Public consultation in Romania took 30 days according to the agreement with the</p>



		Romanian Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) as competent authority for the SEA process. In line with the SEA Directive.
Hungarian reference	legal	The period for consultation took place from the 6 th May 2015 to the 5 th June 2015 Public consultation in Hungary takes 30 days in line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §7, §8 (3). In line with the SEA Directive.
STEP of the SEA procedure: Consultation with third countries		
Date for the undertaken step		n.r.
Documents for the undertaken step		In line with SEA Directive Article 7. In relation to the territory of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme of the cross-border area between Romania and Hungary, the effects on third countries need to be examined related to Ukraine and Serbia. Based on the current information the proposed objectives of the programme and planned activities will not have significant adverse transboundary environmental impacts, third countries would not be affected by a significant adverse cross-border impact, <u>therefore the involvement of and the consultation with third countries is not necessary (justified in chapter 10.)</u> .
Romanian reference	legal	In line with SEA Directive Article 7.
Hungarian reference	legal	In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §9§
STEP of the SEA procedure: Finalisation of the Environmental Report, monitoring issues		
Date for the undertaken step		Based on the consultation and comments the incorporation of the results: two weeks after the end of the consultation period – 18 th June 2015.
Documents for the undertaken step		In line with SEA Directive Article 8, 9, 10 Compliance with the SEA Directive updated final documents including non-technical summary Drafting the official statement in line with Art. 9 (b) of the SEA Directive. The information gathered in the framework of the consultation with the environmental authorities and the public will be taken into account in the finalisation of the CP.
Romanian reference	legal	In line with SEA Directive Article 8, 9, 10 Sending the final Environmental Report to the Ministry of Environment.
Hungarian reference	legal	In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §7, §8 and Annex 4 Sending the final Environmental Report for approval.
STEP of the SEA procedure: Publication on the decision		
Date for the undertaken step		Sending the final Environmental Report to the competent authorities together with the CP: 24 th June 2015.



<p>Documents for the undertaken step</p>	<p>In line with SEA Directive Article 9 (1), 10</p> <p>Government decisions on the CP and Environmental Report.</p> <p>Final Environmental Report including non-technical summary and official statement, available for the authorities and the public.</p> <p>The publication of final Environmental Report and SEA statement within 15 days to sending the final Environmental Report to the competent authorities.</p>
<p>Romanian reference</p> <p>legal</p>	<p>In line with SEA Directive</p>
<p>Hungarian reference</p> <p>legal</p>	<p>To be submitted to Government decision in line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §10</p> <p>In line with Government Decree 2/2005 (I.11.) §11. information will be given on the decision to the environmental authorities and the public, and the CP and the final Environmental Report will be made available including non-technical summary and official statement. The information will contain a summary of how the environmental considerations have been integrated into the programme, how the received comments and findings of the consultations have been taken into consideration and the monitoring measures.</p>

2.3 Methodology of Alternatives

The relevant legislation - both Directive 2001/42/EC, GD 1076/2004 in Romania and GD 2/2005 in Hungary – require the reasonable alternatives of the programme to be considered within the environmental assessment. Where strategic environmental assessment is required by Directive 2001/42/EC, an Environmental Report should be prepared containing reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme identified, described and evaluated.

Cooperation Programmes are special in terms of alternatives, because usually there are no different potential variations to examine – they are generated in the planning process. The Cooperation Programme October 2015, adopted by the EC, is the result of a planning process that started already in early 2013, and was coordinated by the Joint Working Group. As a first step of this planning process the Strategic Territorial Analysis (STA) was carried out analysing the whole cross-border eligible area. The next step was the design of a joint strategy set out to address the main challenges identified and to exploit the joint potentials of the eligible border area. Throughout the planning process an approach was followed which combines evidence-, vision- and participation-based strategy development processes. The joint strategy is the result of an iterative and cooperative planning process.

In the frame of this planning process, consultations with the local stakeholders were delivered to guide not only the analysis and identification of needs, but also the selection of priorities and related specific objectives. Inputs from the consultations were certainly constantly cross-checked and validated using the evidence-base, and confronted with priorities defined on EU level. The elaboration and assessment of further alternatives would only be reasonable, if they were a relevant basis for decisions. The most justified intermediary version of the selection of priorities and related specific objectives should form a basis for an environmental assessment as a reasonable alternative to be evaluated.

Therefore the state of the environment in the Programme area is to be analysed 'with and without' the implementation of the Programme, and an intermediary programme strategy is also to be analysed.



The alternatives analysed:

- The first alternative is without the implementation of the programme..
- The second option is based on an alternative programme strategy. Based on the suggestions of the Common Territorial Strategy, the Joint Working Group discussed the proposed priority axes and specific objectives at the 6th Joint Working Group Meeting on 12 December 2013. This alternative was subject to the Scoping Report.
- The third option is the implementation of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme and it is the best alternative.

The SEA process examined the proposed Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme and the alternatives. The three alternatives are compared against environmental factors suggested by the scoping document to focus on.

“Zero option” - without the implementation of the Programme

Without the implementation of the Programme, each environmental issue would be negatively affected. Biodiversity would not improve or loss of biodiversity would occur, it may even sustain more serious damage. The integrity of the Natura 2000 network cannot be maintained, no growth can be expected in the number species affected by the protection measures.

Negative effects can increase regarding soil erosion. The rehabilitated soil quantity would decrease, and the expansion of infrastructure, industry and settlements would lead to significant or permanent withdrawal of land from agricultural production and to long-term soil sealing.

Regarding the fight against climate change, the current negative trends would continue. The lack of maintenance of water supply systems would lead to microbiological and/or chemical contamination. The lack of reconstruction of water utilities would jeopardise the safety of the services as well.

During the heating period NOX pollution would increase, which in turn would cause health problems (smog). Environmental risk caused by climate change and the volume of possible damage would increase. In the eligible area there is low adaptive capacity for climate change: more frequent weather extremes would result in increased risks of floods and drought.

Regarding the soil protection it would be harmful if there weren't revitalization projects in brownfields.

No improvement in the conditions of terrestrial and aquatic eco-systems, and no further protection against anthropogenic degradation, habitat fragmentation and deforestation would be expected. If these kinds of developments were not completed, that would affect negatively the environment and human population. As a result, the population, health and the conditions of settlements wouldn't improve with respect to noise.

‘Intermediary alternative’

If this alternative was realised, natural habitats would have high risks related to the reduction of wildlife, geological sites and protected species.

The possible impacts on biodiversity will be: habitat reduction, destruction of certain specimens, deterioration of living conditions, unfavourable physiological effects, migration of indigenous species forced by hostile environmental conditions, the conditions of nature conservation will become difficult. The disappearance of some Natura 2000 sites (Lake Pete in Bihor County - Romania).

Soil protection from wind and water erosion would be intensified. The risk of geological damage would decrease.

Regarding the issue of water pollution, the risk of groundwater pollution will become lower. Adequate management of liquid manure and agricultural waste, and the prevention of the development of stagnant waters would be realised.

Regarding the fight against climate change, the increased production of energy from renewable sources would be expected, and also the reduced energy consumption of public infrastructure facilities.

In this version of the programme, brownfields would be revitalized, and energy generation from renewable resources would be facilitated as well as pollution prevention and the mitigation of old burdens.

Sustainable development of transport infrastructure developments is planned.

The following table summarises the content of the intermediary alternative, the chosen TO's, priority axes and investment priorities.

Priority Axes	TO	IP	KAI ¹
PA1: Supporting the shift towards low carbon economy	4. Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors	4/a promoting the production and distribution of energy derived from renewable sources;	KAI A1.1: Support to the production and distribution of renewable energy
		4/c supporting energy efficiency, smart energy management and renewable energy use in public infrastructures, including in public buildings and in the housing sector;	KAI 1.2 Support to improving energy efficiency in public buildings
PA2: Joint protection and efficient use of common values and resources	6. Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency	6/b Investing in the water sector to meet the requirements of the Union's environmental acquis and to address needs, identified by the MS, for investment going beyond those requirements	KAI2.1: Cross-border water protection
		6/c Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage	KAI 2.2: Protection and promotion of joint cultural, historic and natural heritage as tourism destinations
PA3: Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks	7: Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures	7/b Enhancing regional mobility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes	KAI 3.1: Cross-border road development linked to TEN-T

¹ The intermediary version of the CP used the terminology of the key areas of interventions, later modified as investment priorities.



		7/c Developing and improving environmentally friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility	KAI 3.2: Strengthening sustainable cross-border mobility
PA4: Improve employment and promote cross-border labour mobility	8: Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility	8/a supporting the development of business incubators and investment support for self-employment, micro enterprises and business creation	KAI 4.1: Developing cross-border business cooperation
PA5: Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty	9: Promoting social inclusion, combating poverty and any discrimination	9/a investing in health and social infrastructure which contribute to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status, promoting social inclusion through improved access to social, cultural and recreational services and the transition from institutional to community-based services	KAI 5.1: Joint health-care development
		9/b support for physical economic and social regeneration of deprived urban and rural communities and areas;	KAI 5.2 Integrated development of deprived rural and urban communities
PA6: Promoting cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens	11: Enhancing institutional capacity and an efficient public administration, support of actions in institutional capacity and in the efficiency of public administration	11/b Promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions	KAI 6.1: Strengthening cross-border institutional cooperation
		11/b Promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions	KAI 6.2: Strengthening cross-border people-to-people, community-to-community cooperation

Best alternative: 'Development with the implementation of the Programme'

The best alternative comprises the thematic objectives of the Cooperation Programme. It includes the maximum possible expected results in environmental protection. Both countries will be targeted by the objectives of the Programme.

The conditions and functions of terrestrial and aquatic eco-systems will be improved by the reduction of anthropogenic degradation, habitat fragmentation and deforestation. Further damage to designated wildlife, geological sites and protected species can be avoided. The natural diversity of flora, fauna and habitats in the protected area and potential Natura 2000 sites can be preserved.

It is important to prevent negative impacts on soil organic composition, biodiversity and the conditions of water. It can be achieved by the reduction of soil pollution from diffuse sources. Enhanced soil protection from wind and water erosion, the reduction of waste generation, and increasing energy recovery from waste and recycling of waste can be achieved.

The risk of groundwater pollution and the degree of pollution will be reduced by the following measures: change in land use, afforestation, the establishment of wetland habitats and fish ponds, the establishment of rational and integrated surface water management, Natura 2000 grants, organic farming, the modernisation of livestock farms, the spread of extensive animal management, the modernisation of machinery stock and fuel storage facilities, the adequate management of liquid manure and agricultural waste, and the prevention of the development of stagnant waters.

The adverse effects of climate change can be improved by decreasing emissions causing climate change, by improving the quality of ambient air and by the maintenance of emissions within the limits set by legal norms. The impacts on air quality can be minimized by reducing the need to travel. The programme implements lower energy demanding processes, the development of sustainable transport modes and investments in forestry and biodiversity.

The protection of natural and cultural landscape will be ensured. In the human environment the increase of energy generation from renewable resources must be facilitated. Terrestrial and aquatic eco-systems can be protected against anthropogenic degradation, habitat fragmentation and deforestation, and the functions of terrestrial, aquatic eco-systems can be improved.

The implementation of this alternative facilitates improvement of human health by implementing measures aimed at pollution prevention and the mitigation of old burdens. It is also important in the Programme to achieve the protection and improvement of the conditions of settlements with respect to transport (noise and vibration). The protection and improvement of the conditions of settlements with respect to noise can also be achieved.

This version of the programme is the best alternative as it has been improved in an iterative way in cooperation with the team dealing with the programming. The impact of this best alternative on the environment is significantly less than the impacts of the intermediary alternative.

The comparison of the alternatives

The main difference between the intermediary alternative and the implementation of the programme lies in the selected thematic objectives. The difference in the selected thematic objectives is the selection of TO5 - Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management in the programme alternative (Development with the implementation of the programme) and the omission of TO4 - Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors.

Instead of the support to small-scale renewable energy production facilities, the development of local distribution systems of renewable energy and the refurbishment of public buildings in order to increase energy efficiency, the programme alternative (Development with the implementation of the programme) supports the coordinated development of a common risk prevention and emergency response system. The planned programme alternative, development with the implementation of the programme responds to the key environmental problems as negative impact of climate change, more frequent weather extremes result in increased risks of floods and drought. Focus points to be

stressed regarding the targeted territory will be more stressed by the implementation of the programme, like integrating river basin management; the modernisation of forest management (regarding floods, excess surface water and droughts), applying environmentally friendly irrigation, spreading drought tolerant cultures or changing land use, strengthening the integrated approach by the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme'.

The "Zero alternative" was compared with Investment Priorities, as selected for each Priority Axis of the two proposed alternatives, respectively were compared Investment Priorities for each Priority Axis of the two proposed alternatives.

The difference between "Intermediary alternative" and "Best alternative" means that thematic objective TO4 has been replaced with TO5. TO4 is for "Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors", TO5 is "Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management". Given that the rest of the thematic objectives with the related investment priorities identified are the same for the two alternatives, it is proposed to achieve the evaluation of the possible effects of the identified investment priorities only on Priority Axis 1 of the "Intermediary alternative".

The result is that the final version of the programme is the best alternative as it has been improved in an iterative way in cooperation with programming, ex-ante evaluation and the SEA.

The last version of the programme planned the measures by taking into consideration the many-sided analysis of the cross-border area, and the effective ecological, social and economic situation. Consequently, the setting of the objectives is well-founded and matches the requirements of the EU. The required tasks and the planned means of realization are coherent with one another, serving well the achievement of the objectives. All these guarantee the successful realization of the programme and meet the requirements of the global objective and sustainable development.

3 HOW ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN INTERREG V-A ROMANIA-HUNGARY PROGRAMME

The member states for the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme declared the same eligible area. The strategic programming identified the main challenges and potentials of the eligible area based on the statements of the SWOT analysis.

“Based on the detailed analysis of the eligible border area, the identification and categorisation of the most important joint challenges and potentials, on the long-term vision of the area, as well as on the results of extensive consultations with the stakeholders carried out, a coherent strategy has been devised.

Further strengthening relations and improving cross-border mobility are in the heart of this strategy as key conditions of cooperation-based integrated development of the eligible border area. Without easy and quick access across the border, joint actions to address key challenges and making use of the common potentials are almost impossible.

Building on cooperation and gradually improving mobility, there are four (interdependent) main challenges (some of which – if addressed properly – may turn into valuable potentials in the long run) the eligible area intends to address with joint

- a) Increasing employment, enabling joint economic growth through better and more coordinated use of the labour force in the area based on the potentials of specific territories;
- b) Enhancing disaster resilience, facilitating rapid and coordinated response to emergency situations based on the harmonized development and coordinated use of existing capacities
- c) The protection of joint values and resources, using them as attractions to build common thematic routes around and develop mutually advantageous common tourism;
- d) Addressing jointly the challenges of deprived areas – rural and urban -, and health care challenges to provide better services across the entire area, using the existing resources more efficiently and eliminating major inequalities in service provision;²

The strategy is to be implemented through a pool of 6 thematic objectives, 8 investment priorities and 8 connected specific objectives. The summary of the proposed objectives is the following:

TO	Priority Axes	Investment Priority	Specific objectives
TO6.: Preserving and protecting the environment and promoting resource efficiency	PA1: Joint protection and efficient use of common values and resources	6/b Investing in the water sector to meet the requirements of the Union's environmental acquis and to address needs, identified by the Member States, for investment that goes beyond those requirements.	SO6/b: Improved quality management of cross-border rivers and ground water bodies
		6/c Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage	SO6/c: Sustainable use of natural, historic and cultural heritage within the eligible area
TO7: Promoting sustainable transport and removing bottlenecks in key network infrastructures	PA2: Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks	7/b Enhancing regional mobility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure, including multimodal nodes	SO7/b Improved cross-border accessibility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T

² Cooperation Programme – October 2015, adopted by the EC, Chapter 1.1.1.7.



			infrastructure
		7/c Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility.	SO7/c: Increased proportion of passengers using sustainable – low carbon, low noise – forms of cross-border transport
TO8: Promoting sustainable and quality employment and supporting labour mobility	PA3: Improve employment and promote cross-border labour mobility	8/b Supporting employment-friendly growth through the development of endogenous potential as part of a territorial strategy for specific areas, including the conversion of declining industrial regions and enhancement of accessibility to and development of specific natural and cultural resources	SO8/b: Increased employment within the eligible area
TO9: Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and any discrimination	PA4: Improving health-care services	9/a Investing in health and social infrastructure which contributes to national, regional and local development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status, promoting social inclusion through improved access to social, cultural and recreational services and the transition from institutional to community-based services	SO9/a: Improved preventive and curative health-care services across the eligible area
TO5: Promoting climate change adaptation, risk prevention and management	PA5: Improve risk-prevention and disaster management	5/b Promoting investment to address specific risks, ensuring disaster resilience and developing disaster management systems	SO5/b: Improved cross-border disasters and risk management



<p>TO11: Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and an efficient public administration</p>	<p>PA6: Promoting cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens</p>	<p>11/b Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions</p>	<p>SO11/b: Intensify sustainable cross-border cooperation of institutions and communities</p>
---	--	---	---

In general, the implementation of the cooperation programme results in the improvement of the overall environmental condition of the eligible area. However, the envisaged actions have cross-impacts beyond the direct implementation area, and the determination of positive and negative effects also has to be handled.

The SEA process of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme was started parallel with the elaboration of the programme document, and according to the planned timing, it will be completed before its adoption. During the process close co-operation with the programming was planned and was realized. The Screening statement and the scope were elaborated at the earliest possible stage in order to ensure that the environmental effects of implementing the programme will be taken into account during its preparation and before its adoption.

In the frame of the Scoping consultation, some of the stakeholders sent environment-related suggestions that are directly related to the content of the cooperation programme. The received suggestions were transmitted to the planning team of the programme and discussed. The table presents the related responses to each suggestion.



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
<p>Ministry of Health (Romania) received on 19th April 2014:</p> <p>PA3 – Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks, point 7c regarding the developing and improving environment-friendly, low-noise and low-carbon transport systems for promoting sustainable mobility at local and regional level.</p> <p>Suggestion to the intervention area KAI 3.2 “Promoting sustainable cross-border mobility with impact on health”.</p>	<p>Based on the above-mentioned JWG decision on TOs and IPs in the (Common territorial strategy) CTS, the mobility PA3 became PA2, thus KAI 3.2 became KAI 2.2. Nevertheless, the aim of KAI 2.2. “Strengthening sustainable cross-border mobility” is to give a broader interpretation to any of the fields of activity – by not restricting it to health care. Even PA4 Improving the quality and accessibility of health care services receives a standalone chapter. Moreover, PA5 Improve risk-prevention and disaster management deals with those types of activities that precisely match the needs mentioned by the Ministry of Health (RO) above.</p>	<p>The relevant investment priority (IP7c) reads: “Developing and improving environment-friendly (including low-noise), and low-carbon transport systems including inland waterways and maritime transport, ports, multimodal links and airport infrastructure, in order to promote sustainable regional and local mobility”</p> <p>The specific objective is “Increased proportion of passengers using sustainable – low carbon, low noise – forms of cross-border transport”. This specific objective is entirely in line with the IP’s content. The IP’s focus is to promote the use of environmentally friendly transport modes. Any shift to these modes has a clear positive impact on health (by for instance reducing CO2 emission, noise pollution). Nevertheless, as the focus of this IP is not health improvement, we do not suggest to add “with impact on health” to the description. (Measuring the impact would also be very difficult).</p>
<p>Ministry of Health (Romania) received on 19th April 2014:</p> <p>PA5 – Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and any discrimination, point 9a regarding</p>	<p>Based on the general comment, namely fine-tuning of the CTS according to the decision of JWG on TOs and IPs, PA4 Improving the quality and accessibility of health-care services is the relevant PA in terms of health care. The aim of the</p>	<p>Priority axis 4 – IP 9a: “Investing in health and social infrastructure which contributes to national, regional and local</p>

³ In the version of the cooperation programme document bases for the phase of the Scoping Report and Scoping consultation key areas of intervention terminology has been used, but in the final draft version of the CP the terminology of the key areas of intervention has not been used.



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
<p>investing in health and social infrastructure for reducing inequalities in terms of health.</p> <p>Suggestion to the intervention area KAI 5.1 – Joint health care development aimed to improve the health care services for decrease of “health migration”. The intervention area can include investments to improve the medical infrastructure and equipment, the know-how exchange and the common development capacity, to develop a common platform for telemedicine and an e-health infrastructure.</p>	<p>respective KAI 4.1. Joint health care development is to improve access to proper health care services across the eligible area. Rationale on page 67 clearly stipulates the logical needs as well as the types of activities foreseen on page 68 give a clear picture on actions to be supported, namely 4.1.1 investment to improve health care infrastructure and equipment, 4.1.2 know-how exchange and joint capacity development, 4.1.3 development of cross-platform central telemedical, e-health infrastructure, meaning that the comment of the Ministry of Health (RO) entirely matches the proposal presented in the CTS.</p>	<p>development, reducing inequalities in terms of health status, promoting social inclusion through improved access to social, cultural and recreational services and transition from institutional to community-based services”</p> <p>In Chapter 2.4.1.2 9a the proposed types of actions include, among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Investments in health-care and prevention-related infrastructure” ▪ “Purchase and installation of health-care equipment, delivery of training to staff on the use of new equipments” ▪ “Exchange of know-how and capacity building activities” ▪ “Development of telemedical and e-health infrastructure for diagnosis and treatment in order to achieve better patient information system and to reduce health inequalities in access to health services” <p>These types of actions entirely cover the requests of the Ministry.</p>
<p>Ministry of Health (Romania) received on 19th April 2014:</p> <p>PA6 - Promoting cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens, point 11 b regarding legal and administrative cross-border cooperation between institution and citizens.</p> <p>Suggestion to the intervention area KAI 6.1. –</p>	<p>The types of activities of PA6 Promoting cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens, KAI 6.1 envisage actions, such identification of specific joint potentials in cross-border cooperation in various fields, among others also in health-care. As far as the emergency situation concerns, KAI 5.1 Support to the development of joint emergency response and</p>	<p>PA6 – IP 11:</p> <p>“Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions”</p>



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
strengthening cross-border institutional cooperation and KAI 6.2. - strengthening cross-border community to community cooperation by improving the collaboration concerning the health care services and the capacity to respond in emergency situations.	disaster management of PA5 Improve risk prevention and disaster management is planned to finance types of activities such as investments into emergency response and risk prevention facilities and equipment, improvement of emergency response communication, harmonisation of protocols and procedures, joint training and practices of organisations involved in emergency response and disaster management the eligible area. Nevertheless, the types of activities clearly articulate the fields to be supported and separate PA also deals with the topic, there is no need for narrowing field of KAI 6.1 and 6.2 in wording.	<p>Under this IP, interventions are aimed at supporting cooperation for institutions (a), and cooperation for citizens (b).</p> <p>While supporting institutional cooperation concerning health care services and emergency response services are both part of the programme, they are present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in IP 9a (health care) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Exchange of know-how and capacity building activities ○ Harmonized development of specialized services ○ Development of telemedical and e-health infrastructure for diagnosis and treatment in order to achieve better patient information system and to reduce health inequalities in access to health services” ▪ and in IP 5b (emergency response and risk management): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Development and implementation of harmonized standards and systems for better forecasting and natural / anthropogenic risk management in the cross-border area; ○ Setting up the harmonized and integrated tools for risk prevention and mitigation ○ Establishing common rules/legislation and protocols



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
		related to risk prevention and disaster management”
<p>Ministry of Health (Romania) received on 19th April 2014:</p> <p>Regarding the ground water pollution the future action is to stop the growing nitrate contamination by implementing the directives on the waters nitrate concentrations in sensitive areas. The first phase of the water quality programme will be held in 2015 and aims to achieve adequate boron, fluorides, nitrate, arsenic, ammonia, iron, manganese and lead level. Regarding the possibility of surface waters pollution it must be taken agro-technique actions to achieve a good ecological status</p> <p>A potential action in the future could be the noise impact assessment, the impact of noise on health. The noise maps are the basic elements of the action plan to reduce the noise in the most affected areas. The existing noise maps show that despite the efforts made, the main source of noise remain the traffic.</p>	<p>Reducing ground water pollution may be considered in the frame of KAI 1.1 Cross-border water protection and management. According to the decision of the JWG, noise impact assessment is out of scope of the future Cooperation Programme. Despite the importance of these activities, they have a less significant cross-border character. It can be tackled in mainstream Cooperation Programmes in HU and RO.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With regard to agro-technique actions, the types of actions include “Identification of polluting sources, the necessary measures to reduce water pollution” – that facilitates the identification of such actions. ▪ Noise impact assessment, reducing noise per se is not included among the focus areas of the programme selected by the Joint Working Group. Nevertheless, under IP 7c the specific objective is “Increased proportion of passengers using sustainable – low carbon, low noise – forms of cross-border transport” – so the programme is likely to contribute to the mitigation of traffic noise.
<p>National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary) received on 28th April 2014:</p> <p>Suggestion: to support the two countries in actions protecting the thermal water basin</p>	<p>Types of activities foreseen of PA1 Joint protection and efficient use of common values and resources, KAI 1.2 Protection and promotion of joint cultural, historic and natural heritage as tourism destinations are creation and rehabilitation of facilities based on the sustainable use of common geothermal potential of the cross-border area. Moreover under PA 1 KAI 1.1 Types of activities foreseen 1.1.2. deal with protection and sustainable use of the common water basin.</p>	<p>Under PA 1, IP6b includes actions that facilitate the protection of thermal water; nevertheless, the main focus of the IP is the protection of surface water quality.</p> <p>In earlier versions of the programme, under IP6c (“Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage”) “rehabilitation of facilities based on the sustainable use of common geothermal potential of the cross-border area”. Was included among the types of actions. However, the</p>



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
		Hungarian side requested and the JWG accepted the elimination of this action from the programme.
<p>National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary) received on 28th April 2014:</p> <p>Suggestion to PA3: to implement air pollution monitoring systems in main traffic nodes</p>	<p>According to the decision of the JWG, air pollution is out of scope of the future Cooperation Programme. Despite the importance of these activities, they have a less significant cross-border character. It can be tackled in mainstream Cooperation Programmes in RO and HU.</p>	<p>While air pollution is also an important challenge, the JWG had to make a strategic choice, and addressing air pollution is not a major focus area of the programme. Nevertheless, IP 5b (emergency response and risk management) includes the following type of action: "Purchasing equipment for measuring/monitoring environmental parameters" that facilitates certain interventions in the field of air quality monitoring.</p>
<p>National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary) received on 28th April 2014:</p> <p>Suggestion to PA6: the possible co-operation of industrial stakeholders</p>	<p>According to our understanding, industrial stakeholders are for-profit organizations not fitting the portfolio of possible beneficiaries.</p>	<p>It is a question what the commenter considers "industrial stakeholders". The programme does not facilitate direct support of businesses.</p> <p>Being part of the programme, IP 8b is "Supporting employment friendly growth through the development of endogenous potential as part of a territorial strategy for specific areas, including the conversion of declining industrial regions and enhancement of accessibility to and development of specific natural and cultural resources".</p> <p>Under this IP the "Preparation of integrated development strategy and action plans of specific territories" is one of the possible actions. The preparation of</p>



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
		such strategies and action plans not only facilitates, but also necessitates the active participation of also industrial stakeholders.
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County (Hungary) received on 30th April 2014:</p> <p>Suggestion: to inspire the future beneficiaries for the utilization of renewables, such as biomass, geothermic energy, solar power, precision agriculture (application of pesticides).</p>	<p>According to the decision of the JWG the thematic objective 4 (Supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors) is out of scope of the future Cooperation Programme, Despite the importance of these activities, they have a less significant cross-border character. It can be tackled in mainstream Operational Programmes in RO and HU.</p>	<p>No additional comment.</p>
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County (Hungary) received on 30th April 2014:</p> <p>Suggestion to PA3: beside the large scale flood and inland water protection projects the promotion of cooperation between municipalities and agricultural SME's.</p>	<p>The objective of PA3 (in the new version PA1, KAI1.1) is water protection and management. If that requires cooperation between municipalities and agricultural SMEs – no problem with it. Be aware, though, that direct support to enterprises is not part of the proposed programme.</p>	<p>PA1, IP 6b is aimed at “Improved quality management of cross-border rivers and ground water bodies”. The potential beneficiaries are public and non-profit organizations, direct support of businesses is not possible. Nevertheless, some of the actions may require the involvement of SMEs (not as organizations receiving funds, direct support).</p> <p>For instance “Organization of field-related dissemination actions, workshops and seminars and also awareness raising of local population” can also target agricultural SMEs.</p>
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County (Hungary) received on 30th April 2014:</p> <p>Suggestion to PA5 and 6: to incorporate social issues related to the common health care investments.</p>	<p>The social care is an issue of high importance, the infrastructure of social care institutions is mostly inadequate, but according to the JWG decision it does not belong to the selected KAIs and activities. The mainstream programmes may</p>	<p>PA4 – IP 9a is aimed at “Improved preventive and curative health-care services across the eligible area”. It is clearly focusing on health-care development – the types of actions</p>



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
	include the development of social infrastructure.	foreseen all serve this. However, as social institutions are listed among the potential beneficiaries, interventions delivered in such institutions – as long as they serve health-care and prevention purposes – may also be supported.
Government Office of Csongrád County (Hungary) received on 30 th April 2014: Suggestion to PA3: to incorporate developments of environmentally friendly infrastructure (bicycle paths, solar powered transport)	PA2 (former PA3) includes the following related activities suggested in the comment: 2.2.2 Development of cross-border public transport services 2.2.3 Development of key conditions of cross-border bicycle transport	Under PA2 IP7c the specific objective is “Increased proportion of passengers using sustainable – low carbon, low noise – forms of cross-border transport”. Types of actions conducive towards this objective include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Investment into public transport related infrastructure (e.g. low emission vehicles, bus) ▪ Innovative solutions to improve cross-border public transport and reducing transport-related emission ▪ Construction, upgrading / modernization of roads, bicycle roads, path or lane, also by using existing infrastructure elements, where appropriate (e.g. dams, agricultural roads, etc.) These types of actions clearly facilitate the development of environmentally friendly transport forms.
Lower-Tisza Regional Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary) received on 30 th April 2014:	Standalone awareness raising activities may not be supported. Awareness raising may, however, be part of integrated water management, or even	Under PA1, IP6b (water quality), types of actions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Organization of field-related



Suggestions to the content of the CP		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Answer to the Comment ³	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
In general, beside the development of infrastructure, raising the awareness of natural causes should play a role during the programming phase.	disaster management interventions.	<p>dissemination actions, workshops and seminars and also awareness raising of local population”</p> <p>Under PA1, IP6c (protection and promotion of natural and cultural heritage), types of actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Training and awareness-raising campaigns regarding the protection, promotion and development of natural and cultural heritage” <p>Under PA5, IP5b (emergency response and risk management), types of actions include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Awareness-raising activities targeted at specific groups” <p>As presented above, awareness raising is an important element of the programme under various investment priorities.</p>

The Environmental Report presented recommendations that have been considered in the final version of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme. The table below gives an overview on main SEA recommendations of the Environmental Report and how these have been considered in the programme.

SEA Comment / proposal according to Chapter 7.2 of the SEA Report	How the recommendations have been considered in the Cooperation Programme	Further clarification (as per the CP version of 13. 02. 2015)
...during implementation water management actions and effects on natural values also have to be identified. In case of hard installation measures on flood protection, the negative impact on wildlife habitats has to be	Agreed. This requirement has to be presented in the guide for applicants.	



<p>minimized. The improvement of the data collection and monitoring system for a more accurate assessment of water resource balances (quantity, quality) is also needed.</p>	<p>Data collection and the development of quality and quantity monitoring are among the eligible activities under 6b.</p>	
<p>Related to natural and cultural heritage valorisation objective, projects with no landscape changing impacts should be supported. In case of loss of natural factors (trees, green surfaces, etc.) compensation will be implemented, according to the legislation in force. As much as the project is affecting green spaces in the eligible area, it shall be necessary by regulation to replant the affected areas both in Romania and Hungary.</p>	<p>Agreed. These are all important considerations – requirements to be presented in the guide for applicants.</p>	
<p>Special attention should be paid to objectives and actions linked to the improvement of the transport system and the preparation of strategic investments in regional transport infrastructure, the promotion of sustainable freight transport and management. Supporting these actions could lead to an increase in land take, the fragmentation of habitats and additional impact through air and noise pollution in sensitive areas. The effective consideration of environmental and possibly other sustainability aspects has to be ensured, as well as in case of energy planning and coordination actions in order to avoid negative side-effects of growing green energy utilization (e.g. one-sided biomass production, adverse effects on hydromorphology, noise, negative impact on landscape). It is suggested that these settlements shall be supported only under the strict control of and in cooperation with the relevant authorities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Given the size of funding available only smaller scale transport infrastructure development may be implemented. Nevertheless, it is crucial to consider and mitigate any possible negative environmental consequences. This is a requirement to be presented in the guide for applicants. ▪ Wherever relevant, the preparation of Environmental Impact Assessment has to be required. 	<p>Many of the suggestions made as part of SEA process can be best addressed by including requirements or recommendations in the guide for applicants.</p> <p>Therefore, listing the requirements and recommendations to be included in the guide for applicants in a separate document is proposed for consideration.</p> <p>Preparation of EIA is also such a requirement.</p>
<p>Road infrastructure development activities should be limited within the scope of the specific project. In view of the location of each new road site, the plans should be in conformity with the regulatory acts for the use of protected areas, protected sites, water protection, preservation of the cultural-historical heritage, conformity with the sanitary protection zones and sites subject to health protection.</p>	<p>Agreed. Conformity with the relevant regulatory acts needs to be proven by the applicants.</p>	
<p>In case of constructions no materials and substances shall be used, which can lead to any kind of pollution or damage to the ecosystems.</p>	<p>Agreed. This has to be a requirement in the case of all projects that have a construction element. To be presented in the guide for applicants.</p>	



<p>Sharing information is essential for coordination and common development, reducing parallel tasks and duties and providing efficient cross-border cooperation. The application of best practice guidance and benchmarking methods will shorten the implementation period. With the harmonization of the legislative background, project development is expected to be more efficient.</p>	<p>These are important comments for programme implementation.</p> <p>PA 6 is aimed at – among others – strengthening institutional cooperation and eligible activities also include harmonization of the regulatory background.</p>	<p>PA6 – IP 11:</p> <p>“Enhancing institutional capacity of public authorities and stakeholders and efficient public administration by promoting legal and administrative cooperation and cooperation between citizens and institutions”</p> <p>Types of actions under this IP include:</p> <p>“Analysis of the regulatory background in different fields, proposing solutions and actions to harmonize relevant regulations”</p> <p>This clearly addresses the proposal made.</p> <p>I cannot judge, though, whether this comment has relevance for SEA – it has been made as part of the SEA process.</p>
<p>The aspects of sustainable management and protection of environmental resources have to be taken into consideration at the implementation of the specific projects.</p>	<p>This requirement has to be presented in the guide for applicants.</p>	
<p>The specific objectives require non-structural and structural measures. Non-structural methods mainly mean the development of the institutional and legislative backgrounds, with the adoption of best practice and assessment guidance (e.g. relevant guide books), while structural methods reflect on infrastructure-related questions and applying integrated elements. The key elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ application of environmentally friendly methods ▪ special attention on noise generation and air pollution load during the implementation of projects ▪ the sustainable use of environmental elements (soil, natural resources, 	<p>These are general sustainability expectations that need to be included in the guide for applicants in the case of any call.</p>	



<p>etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ environmentally friendly development methods; integrate energy efficiency into horizontal principle ▪ fight against climate change by reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and adjustment to climate change ▪ nature protection (conservation of biodiversity) ▪ energy efficiency <p>The projects selected for financing shall be implemented only after obtaining the regulatory act from the competent environmental authority.</p>		
<p><i>A clear commitment from both countries (RO and HU) is needed with regard to the measures identified in the SEA process for prevention, reduction and, where possible, offsetting any possible significant effects on the environment resulting from the implementation of the Programme.</i></p>		
<p><u>SO6/b Improved quality management of cross-border rivers and ground water bodies:</u></p> <p>Measuring tools have to reflect to the recent questions in the field of protecting water resources and groundwater. The applied methods have to fulfil both legislation and territorial development requirements. It is suggested to examine the possibilities of water transport methods.</p> <p>In case of cross-border water protection and management activities, special attention should be paid to the environmental regulatory acts of investments in the project selection phase. It is necessary to obtain the environmental regulatory acts as a precondition for financing in case of construction projects. The exact procedure will be established in the Applicant Guide.</p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p> <p>Sustainable planning and management could have a positive effect on the protection and preservation of cultural and natural landscapes for example by the reduction of land consumption, or by reducing the effects of transport, and agriculture. In order to achieve these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ any project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the Natura 2000 site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or 	<p>This PA is aimed at improving the quality of the cross-border water basin. That involves different types of activities, all directly and indirectly targeting the mitigation of water pollution.</p> <p>It is clear that the environmental impacts of any intervention need to be presented.</p> <p>Regarding the suggested mitigation measures: these are all relevant measures that need to be introduced in the guide for applicants.</p>	



<p>projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ construction activities shall be limited only within the projects' scope. The use of the existing roads for access should be applied wherever possible ▪ construction materials and waste shall be disposed of only at the places designated for this purpose ▪ the geological environmental risks and risks for geological hazards are to be forecasted and investigated in the affected areas ▪ special build-ups in the territories of the Mining District Authorities are to be discovered and investigated as potential conflicts between the planned investments and the built environment (e.g. oil or gas pipelines) ▪ environmental conflicts caused by the use of non-renewable resources should be investigated ▪ investment under the programme should be designed in a manner that doesnot damage the quality of soil ▪ in case of activities subject to authorization procedure, the place of investments should on land of lower quality and with the use of as less agricultural land as possible ▪ agricultural land is to be used for other purposes only with official authorization ▪ investments should not affect the use of agricultural land ▪ use of renewable energy resources by households should be enforced wherever possible ▪ in order to improve waste management and waste collection of the eligible area consultation activities within the Romanian and Hungarian authorities, awareness raising campaign, communication activities for the public are preferred 		
<p><u>SO6/c Sustainable use of natural, historic and cultural heritage within the eligible area:</u></p> <p>Cadastral registration, nature preservation plans, and their harmonization with flood risk management plans form the basis of determining the intervention methods. The planned interventions have to reflect on the</p>	<p>With regard to the suggested mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The use of green accommodation – green tourism”, ecotourism pattern 	<p>Many of the suggestions made as part of SEA process can be best addressed by including requirements or recommendations in the guide for</p>



plans' short and long term aims, in order to preserve the eligible area's natural and cultural values.

Suggested mitigation measures:

- development of the “Green accommodation – green tourism”, ecotourism pattern is to be preferred
- In case of the creation of thematic routes, tourism products and services based on the natural and cultural heritage new tourist destinations are to be made accessible by environmentally friendly transport modes is to be preferred
- facilitate integrated approach practice, e.g. infrastructure development combined with environmentally friendly tools, climate friendly architectural solutions as preferred if possible
- in case of the loss of natural factors (trees, green surfaces, etc.), measures of compensation will be implemented, according to the legislation in force
- any project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the Natura 2000 site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives
- effective implementation of the measures and conditions contained in the regulatory acts on EIA, EA and CA concerning the construction stage for the particular eligible activity
- the geological environmental risks and risks for geological hazards are to be forecasted and investigated in the affected areas
- special build-ups in the territories of the Mining District Authorities are to be discovered and investigated as potential conflicts between the planned investments and the built environment (e.g. oil or gas pipelines)
- environmental conflicts caused by the use of non-renewable resources should be investigated
- investment under the programme should be designed in a manner that does not damage the quality of soil
- in case of activities subject to authorization procedure, the place of investments should on land of lower quality and with the use of as less

is a focus that may be relevant to include also in the relevant chapter of the CP – this, however, requires JWG decision

- The rest of the mitigation measures are all relevant measures that have to be requirements presented in the guide for applicants.

applicants.

Therefore, listing the requirements and recommendations to be included in the guide for applicants in a separate document is proposed for consideration.

We find that a good solution also for suggesting “The use of green tourism, ecotourism pattern”



<p>agricultural land as possible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ agricultural land is to be used for other purposes only with official authorization ▪ investments should not affect the use of agricultural land ▪ use of renewable energy resources by households should be enforced wherever possible ▪ in order to improve waste management and waste collection of the eligible area consultation activities within the Romanian and Hungarian authorities, awareness raising campaign, communication activities for the public are preferred 		
<p><u>SO7/b Improved cross-border accessibility through connecting secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T infrastructure and SO7/c Increased proportion of passengers using sustainable – low carbon, low noise – forms of cross-border transport</u></p> <p>In accordance with the EU's objective, the application of environmentally friendly transport methods has to be preferred. It not only means the development of infrastructure (inter-modality, bicycle roads, etc.), but also the awareness-raising processes (education, green tourism, promotion, etc.).</p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ noise protection measures should be enforced ▪ air pollution, waste generation and waste management measures should be included, applying environmentally friendly construction methods (e.g. application of silent road surface) and those should be included among the eligible activities is to be preferred ▪ promoting environmentally friendly transport alternatives (bicycle routes, e-car rental) and combined transport orientated projects (P+R, B+R) is to be preferred ▪ any project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the Natura 2000 site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives ▪ the geological environmental risks and risks for geological hazards are 	<p>Promotion is an eligible activity under 6c.</p> <p>Under 7c, we propose to include awareness raising activities (regarding the use of environmentally friendly transport alternatives) among the eligible activities.</p> <p>The rest of the mitigation measures suggested are relevant and need to be introduced in the guide for applicants.</p>	<p>We can still imagine adding “awareness-raising activities” to the types of actions in the CP under IP 7c. If that is not supported, though, including this suggestion in the applicant guide is also an option.</p>



<p>to be forecasted and investigated in the affected areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ special build-ups in the territories of the Mining District Authorities are to be discovered and investigated as potential conflicts between the planned investments and the built environment (e.g. oil or gas pipelines) ▪ environmental conflicts caused by the use of non-renewable resources should be investigated ▪ investment under the programme should be designed in a manner that does not damage the quality of soil ▪ in case of activities subject to authorization procedure, the place of investments should on land of lower quality and with the use of as less agricultural land as possible ▪ agricultural land is to be used for other purposes only with official authorization ▪ investments should not affect the use of agricultural land ▪ in order to improve waste management and waste collection of the eligible area consultation activities within the Romanian and Hungarian authorities, awareness raising campaign, communication activities for the public are preferred 		
<p><u>SO7/c Increased proportion of passengers using sustainable – low carbon, low noise – forms of cross-border transport</u></p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ promoting environmentally friendly transport alternates (bicycle routes, e-car renting) is to be preferred ▪ promoting combined transport orientated projects (P+R, B+R) is to be preferred ▪ the geological environmental risks and risks for geological hazards are to be forecasted and investigated in the affected areas ▪ special build-ups in the territories of the Mining District Authorities are to be discovered and investigated as potential conflicts between the planned investments and the built environment (e.g. oil or gas pipelines) ▪ environmental conflicts caused by the use of non-renewable resources 	<p>Regarding the suggested mitigation measures: we propose for consideration introducing them in the guide for applicants.</p>	



<p>should be investigated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ investment under the programme should be designed in a manner that does not damage the quality of soil ▪ in case of activities subject to authorization procedure, the place of investments should on land of lower quality and with the use of as less agricultural land as possible ▪ air quality considerations should be taken into account when planning bicycle road tracks ▪ in case of road development the development of green areas between the roads and settlements, planting of large deciduous trees and bushes should be enforced ▪ in case of bicycle road developments development of bike stands or bike stations are preferred. 		
<p><u>SO8/b Increased employment within the eligible area:</u></p> <p>Cross-border cooperation enables the improvement of local businesses. The facility development has to be fulfilled with the sustainable usage of natural resources, with the revitalization of brownfields, avoiding the withdrawal of soil capacity.</p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ promoting the utilization of “brownfields” by new infrastructure developments, in order to utilize existing land instead of agricultural land is to be preferred ▪ protection of natural resources by newly constructed facilities, with the application of BAT (Best Available Technologies) tools (e.g mandatory usage of BREF documents) and the application of renewable energy sources is to be preferred ▪ specific attention should be placed on noise generation and air pollution, waste generation and waste management issues and those should be included among the eligible activities when possible ▪ promoting environmentally friendly transport alternatives (bicycle routes, e-car rental) is to be preferred ▪ any project not directly connected with or necessary to the management of the Natura 2000 site but likely to have a significant effect thereon, either individually or in combination with other plans or 	<p>The mitigation measures suggested are all relevant, and they should be introduced in the guide for applicants.</p>	



<p>projects, shall be subject to appropriate assessment of its implications for the site in view of the site's conservation objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ use of renewable energy resources by households should be enforced wherever possible ▪ air quality considerations should be taken into account when planning bicycle road tracks ▪ in case of road development the development of green areas between the roads and settlements, planting of large deciduous trees and bushes should be enforced ▪ in order to improve waste management and waste collection of the eligible area consultation activities within the Romanian and Hungarian authorities, awareness raising campaign, communication activities for the public are preferred 		
<p><u>SO9/a Improved preventive and curative health-care services across the eligible area:</u></p> <p>Health-care development has to be handled by integrated approach also. Facility development has to be implemented with the application of best available techniques (e.g. energy efficiency), but best practice also means the structural institutional development, with the application of available recreational alternatives (medical tourism).</p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ promoting projects in the application of renewable sources by infrastructure development is to be preferred ▪ specific attention should be placed on noise generation and air pollution, waste generation and waste management issues and those should be included among the eligible activities when possible ▪ promoting environmentally friendly transport alternatives (bicycle routes, e-car rental) is to be preferred ▪ effective implementation of the measures and conditions contained in the regulatory acts on EIA, EA and CA concerning the construction stage for the particular eligible activity 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interventions aimed at creating the conditions of medical tourism at the moment are not among the eligible activities – this PA has a clear health-care development focus. The inclusion of medical tourism related developments would require a strategic decision, but given the limited resources available we would advise against it under this PA. 2. The mitigation measures suggested are all relevant and need to be included in the guide for applicants. 	
<p><u>SO5b Improved cross-border disasters and risk management:</u></p> <p>Disaster management has to be handled integrated with the relevant legal obligations, enabling cross-border cooperation. Disaster management</p>	<p>Elaboration of joint disaster management plans is proposed to be added to the eligible</p>	<p>Under PA5, IP 5b, although the elaboration of joint disaster management plans is not</p>



<p>plans have to be elaborated, with common cooperation background.</p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ integration of flood risk management plans and nature protection plans into eligible activities, the damage mitigation tools and drought mitigation tools should be applied wherever possible ▪ raising awareness about climate-conscious behavior to be included as eligible activity implementation of the specific projects when possible ▪ to reduce health impacts of disasters, health impact assessment of disaster-related risks (local and regional scale) should be incorporated into plans and strategies (e.g. land use, building, infrastructure, and economic development plans) and it is preferred to be included as eligible activity ▪ the geological environmental risks and risks for geological hazards are to be forecasted and investigated in the affected areas ▪ special build-ups in the territories of the Mining District Authorities are to be discovered and investigated as potential conflicts between the planned investments and the built environment (e.g. oil or gas pipelines) ▪ investment under the programme should be designed in a manner that does not damage the quality of soil 	<p>activities.</p> <p>We also propose to specifically mention “awareness-raising activities about climate-conscious behavior” at the relevant eligible activity.</p> <p>To reduce health impacts of disasters, health impact assessment of disaster-related risks is also proposed to be added to eligible activities.</p> <p>Addressing flood risks is only one element, with the objective of reducing the risks of pollution caused by flood.</p>	<p>explicitly mentioned, this activity would fit this IP, for instance under the following type of activity:</p> <p>“Establishing common rules/legislation and protocols related to risk prevention and disaster management”</p> <p>It may also be specifically mentioned in the guide for applicants.</p> <p>Under PA1, IP6c, types of actions include:</p> <p>“Training and awareness-raising campaigns regarding the protection, promotion and development of natural and cultural heritage”</p> <p>Given that it relates to the protection of also the natural heritage, it could also include awareness raising regarding climate-conscious behaviour.</p> <p>Health impact assessments of disaster related risks goes beyond the scope and resources of this programme and has limited cross-border relevance.</p>
<p><u>SO11b Intensify sustainable cross-border cooperation of institutions and communities:</u></p> <p>With the coordinated way of sharing information, parallel tasks will be eliminated. With the application of management plans and guidance (based on legal background), administrative burdens will be reduced. With the creation of the infrastructure and IT background, cooperation will evolve between the institutes and communities.</p> <p>Suggested mitigation measures:</p>	<p>People-to-People actions would be an ideal place for environmental and climate-change related awareness-raising activities, and such actions could be incorporated among the indicative actions. The P2P approach, however, is now being challenged and proposed</p>	<p>Under PA 6, IP 11, there are two main focus areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Cooperation for institutions b) Cooperation for citizens <p>“Promoting actions of selective waste collection ...” can fit a) (for instance under</p> <p>“Institutional capacity building</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ promoting action / processes of selective waste collection in offices (e.g. paper reuse, selective waste collection and waste recycling) or in the frame of joint events according to the national legislations in force is to be preferred ▪ supporting civil activities related to local environmental development programmes is to be preferred ▪ supporting local activities in connection with awareness-raising projects (training, educational events, etc.) is to be preferred ▪ supporting as eligible activity: raising awareness related to resource efficiency, climate-conscious behaviour is to be preferred ▪ in order to improve waste management and waste collection of the eligible area consultation activities within the Romanian and Hungarian authorities, awareness raising campaign, communication activities for the public should be preferred 	<p>to be changed to people-to-institutions approach, under which these awareness-raising activities would be less relevant.</p>	<p>and promotion of the EU legislation through training courses, dissemination actions”</p> <p>“Support civil activities related to local environmental development” and “support local activities in connection with awareness raising” can fit b).</p> <p>Although these are not specifically mentioned, they can be included in the guide for applicants.</p> <p>Though not as part of IP11, “raising awareness related to resource efficiency, climate-conscious behaviour” may also be implemented under IP 6c (see above.)</p>
--	---	--

4 HOW PUBLIC OPINION AND THE OPINION OF RELEVANT AUTHORITIES EXPRESSED DURING THE ACTIVITY OF THE ROMANIAN WORKING GROUP FOR ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND DURING THE CONSULTATION PROCESS HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

The outcome of partnership consultations carried out during the SEA process has contributed to the improvement of the quality of the report. The SEA team has made efforts to transfer and communicate comments and recommendations towards the planners, thereby ensuring that the SEA process should contribute to the improvement of the programme quality.

4.1 Consultation on the Scoping Report

The scoping was the first main step within the Strategic Environmental Assessment process of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme with the aim to identify the specific objectives, to determine the current state of the environment and the environmental objectives to be achieved, to summarize the relevant regulatory background and the methodology planned. The Scoping Report determined the framework of the environmental assessment, and also contained the statement on screening. The Scoping Report provided the necessary background information.

The consultation on the draft Scoping Report – including the determination that the programme requires a SEA - took place between 19th March 2014 and 15th May 2014 both in Romania and in Hungary. The Scoping Report was sent out for consultation with the approval of the Joint Working Group of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme. As part of this consultation, the environmental authorities from Romania and Hungary were invited to review the draft Scoping Report. The environmental authorities from both countries were provided with an official letter, the whole Scoping Report and an executive summary in the national languages. The official letter contained information of the SEA process and the stage of the scoping, and an official request to take motion for a resolution. The whole draft Scoping Report was made available on the Hungary-Romania Cross-Border Co-operation Programme 2007-2013's programme's website: <https://www.huro-cbc.eu> and on the website of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests based on the Decision G. no. 8 of 21st January 2015 on the organization and functioning of the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) in Romania www.mmediu.ro.

Both in Romania and Hungary environmental authorities sent comments and observations on the content of the scoping report. The comments and suggestions received in this consultation phase have been taken into consideration both in the final Scoping Report, in the elaboration of the Environmental Report and in the preparation of the cooperation programme.

The received comments on the Scoping Report can be grouped into three types.

1. Relevant Ministries from both countries declared they agree with the Scoping Report, and did not send any other comment. The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests based on the Decision G. no. 8 of 21th January 2015 on the organization and functioning of the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) in Romania also did not receive any comments or suggestions from the public.
2. Relevant authorities sent comments, which are in line with the content of the Scoping Report, and which are comments corresponding to the Scoping Report.
3. Some of the stakeholders sent Environmental related suggestions that are directly related to the content of the operational programme.



Comments in detail:

Grouped by topics and chapters of the Scoping Report the table shows the received comments, and the given feedback integrated into the final Scoping Report. (The topics are given in the first line of each table; related chapters are given in the “Response to the comment” column.)⁴

Topic: Determining the likely significance of effects:		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment and related chapter of the Scoping Report	Is there consistency between the comment and the scoping statements?
Ministry of Rural Development (Hungary): Agreed with the objects of the SEA, the Ministry indicates that both negative and positive effects have to be covered during the evaluation.	Response: all effects will be identified and clarified during the SEA Report with the necessary declarations.	YES
Government Office of Hajdú-Bihar County (Hungary): preliminary studies have to be implemented during the transportation projects (PA3: Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks)	Response: environmental assessment bounded projects will be identified during the SEA Report, in accordance with the relevant legislation background.	YES
National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary): the received comments emphasise the significant environmental impact of the Programme, underlining the cooperation with the relevant authorities during the implementation. The Inspectorate agrees with the aims of the Programme. It is necessary to present the regions noise pollution of the region in the Environmental Report, and in case of significant noise pollution, an action plan needs to be elaborated.	Response: noise pollution has been integrated Related chapter: 4.2.	YES

Topic: Environmental issues and environmental problems:		
Comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment and related chapter of the Scoping Report	Is there consistency between the comment and the scoping statements?
Lower-Tisza Regional Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary): KAI 1.1: application of renewable sources is not	Response: based on the comment of the Inspectorate, KAI 1.1, KAI 2.1, KAI 2.2	YES

⁴ The Scoping Report has been based on the Common Territorial Strategy and the included priority axis and key areas of intervention, as discussed on the 12th December 2013 6th Joint Working Group Meeting. Therefore the wording and the content of the Pas were different as those are in the final CP version.



<p>allowed in Natura 2000 areas</p> <p>KAI 2.1 water preservation should be emphasised in the relevant issue</p> <p>KAI 2.2 protection of biodiversity and natural values (6/c) should be outlined as an independent intervention element (not as a part of KAI 2.2)</p> <p>In general, besides the development of infrastructure, raising the awareness of natural causes should play a role during the programming phase.</p>	<p>should be supplemented with the mentioned criteria. Also, raising public awareness on natural values should be more efficiently emphasised in the PA. The Inspectorate suggests that the protection of natural values should be an independent Key Intervention Area, independent of the protection of biodiversity and national heritage.</p>	
---	---	--

Topic: Environmental policies		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment and related chapter of the Scoping Report	Is there consistency between the comment and the scoping statements?
<p>Ministry of Healthcare (Romania):</p> <p>the priority axes are in accordance with the aims of the Ministry, mainly:</p> <p>PA3: Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks - indicating positive health effects.</p> <p>PA5: Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and any discrimination – development of medical infrastructure</p> <p>PA6: Promoting cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens – cooperation between medical services and institutes.</p> <p>Possible implementation area is suggested with the evaluation of the health impact of noise, based on noise mapping. Based on the noise mapping results, noise-reducing intervention plans would be elaborated. (According to previous experiences, traffic noise is identified as the main source of noise).</p>	<p>Response: Agreed with comment, implementation of strategic noise mapping is mentioned as objective, including relevant indicators.</p> <p>Related chapter: 4.2</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Ministry of Interior (Hungary):</p> <p>as the GD 2/2005 (I.11.) on certain plans and environmental assessments has been modified by GD 100/2014, the SEA has to be completed with the relevant decree.</p>	<p>Response: Agreed</p> <p>Related chapter: 1. and Annex 2</p>	<p>YES</p>

Topic: Environmental objectives and derived guiding questions		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment and related chapter of the Scoping Report	Is there consistency between the comment and the scoping statements?



<p>Government Office of Csongrád County identifies the possible cooperation fields:</p> <p>PA1, with the utilization of renewables, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> biomass geothermic energy solar power precision agriculture (application of pesticides) <p>PA2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development of water reservoirs, cooperating with municipalities and enterprises developing water withdrawal in the Arad region <p>PA3: Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the development of environmental friendly transportation infrastructure (bicycle paths, solar powered transport methods etc). consultation with the national heritage office during the planning phase <p>PA4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development of small enterprises with complex supporting methods (infrastructure, transport) <p>Besides the above mentioned expectations, development of social infrastructures (healthcare institutes) should be emphasised.</p> <p>Base elements of sustainable development should be emphasised in the SEA Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rational soil management ▪ Protection and development of biodiversity ▪ Proper utilization of growing areas in outer branches ▪ Semi-natural grassland management ▪ Landscape structure ▪ Strengthening the cooperation and innovation adaption in the agricultural chain 	<p>Response: The identified expectations are covered by the relevant Priority Axes; detailed objectives are also clarified in each intervention area.</p>	<p>YES</p>
---	---	------------

Topic: Indicators

There were no comments received on this content of the report.

Topic: Baseline:

There were no comments received on this content of the report.

Topic: Methods of the assessment

There were no comments received on this content of the report.



Topic: Structure of the SEA Report

There were no comments received on this content of the report.

Topic: Additional remarks:

Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Answer on the Comment and related chapter of the Scoping Report	Is there consistency between the comment and the scoping statements?
<p>Ministry of Rural Development (Hungary):</p> <p>According to the legislation in force it is necessary to consult with the National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary)</p>	<p>This authority has also been consulted also, and according to the received answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the National Inspectorate for Environment, Nature and Water agrees that the programme has significant effect on the environment - accepts the Scoping Report 	<p>YES</p>
<p>Ministry of Rural Development (Hungary):</p> <p>If it is relevant and the programme has significant effect on third countries, those are necessary to consult with.</p>	<p>The expected environmental impacts on third countries were presented in chapter 7 of this Report.</p> <p>Consultation is planned with third countries in the next phase.</p>	<p>YES</p>

Some of the stakeholders sent suggestions referring to the environment that are directly related to the content of the operational programme. The received suggestions have been summarized and forwarded to the planners of the operational programme.

Suggestions to the content of the CP

Ministry of Health (Romania):

PA3⁵ – Improve sustainable cross-border mobility and remove bottlenecks, point 7c regarding the development and improvement of environmentally friendly, low-noise and low-carbon transport systems for promoting sustainable mobility at local and regional level.

Suggestion to the intervention area KAI 3.2 “Promoting sustainable cross-border mobility with impact on health”

Ministry of Health (Romania):

PA5 – Promoting social inclusion and combating poverty and any discrimination, point 9a regarding investing in health and social infrastructure for reducing inequalities in terms of health.

Suggestion to the intervention area KAI 5.1 – Joint health care development aimed to improve the health care

⁵ The Scoping Report has been based on the Common Territorial Strategy and the included priority axis and key areas of intervention, as discussed on the 12th December 2013 6th Joint Working Group Meeting. Therefore the wording and the content of the Pas were different as those are in the final CP version.



<p>services for the decrease of “health migration”. The intervention area can include investments to improve the medical infrastructure and equipment, the know-how exchange and the common development capacity, to develop a common platform for telemedicine and an e-health infrastructure.</p>
<p>Ministry of Health (Romania):</p> <p>PA6 - Promoting cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens, point 11 b regarding legal and administrative cross-border cooperation between institutions and citizens.</p> <p>Suggestion to the intervention area KAI 6.1. – strengthening cross-border institutional cooperation and KAI 6.2. - strengthening cross-border community to community cooperation by improving the collaboration concerning the health care services and the capacity to respond in emergency situations.</p>
<p>Ministry of Health (Romania):</p> <p>Regarding the ground water pollution the future action is to stop the growing nitrate contamination by implementing the directives on the nitrate concentrations of waters in sensitive areas. The first phase of the water quality programme will be held in 2015 and it aims to achieve adequate levels of boron, fluorides, nitrate, arsenic, ammonia, iron, manganese and lead level. Regarding the possibility of surface waters pollution, agro-technique actions must be taken to achieve a good ecological state.</p> <p>A potential action in the future could be the noise impact assessment, the impact of noise on health. Noise maps are the basic elements of the action plan to reduce the noise in the most affected areas. The existing noise maps show that despite the efforts made, the main source of noise remains traffic.</p>
<p>National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion: to support the two countries in actions protecting the thermal water basin</p>
<p>National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion to PA3: to implement air pollution monitoring systems in main traffic nodes</p>
<p>National Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion to PA6: the possible co-operation of industrial stakeholders</p>
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County(Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion: to inspire future beneficiaries for the utilization of renewables, such as biomass, geothermic energy, solar power, precision agriculture (application of pesticides).</p>
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County(Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion to PA3: besides the large scale flood and inland water protection projects the promotion of cooperation between municipalities and agricultural SME’s.</p>
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County(Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion to PA5 and 6: to incorporate social issues related to the common health care investments.</p>
<p>Government Office of Csongrád County(Hungary):</p> <p>Suggestion to PA3: to incorporate developments of environmentally friendly infrastructure (bicycle paths, solar powered transport)</p>
<p>Lower-Tisza Regional Inspectorate For Environment, Nature and Water (Hungary):</p> <p>In general, besides development of infrastructure, raising the awareness of natural causes should play a role during the programming phase.</p>



4.2 The activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment

The activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment related to the draft Environmental Report took place between 19th August 2014 and 20th November 2014 in Romania. The Working Group has convened 4 times and formulated comments and recommendations related to the draft versions of the Environmental Report draft No1-11.

The members of the Working Group were provided with the Draft Environmental Report versions in Romanian and in English language, the draft programme document in English and the summary in Romanian of the programme document. These required documents were the subject of the activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment.

The environmental authorities expressed comments and observations on the content of the Environmental Report. The comments and suggestions received have been taken into consideration both in the elaboration of the Environmental Report and in the preparation of the cooperation programme.

The received comments on the Environmental Report from the members of the Working Group can be grouped according to the following.

1. Comments and requests that are related to the structure of the report (to be fully in line with the Annex 1 of the Directive as the chapters of the Environmental Report must be in that specific order such as the Annex 1 expresses the requested content)
2. Requests concerning the amendment of chapters, mainly the description of the current state of the environment, the alternatives, the transboundary effects
3. Numerous requests concerned to the amendment of the current state of the environment
4. Comments related to the monitoring chapter, the requests concerning the SEA indicators
5. Some of the members formulated environmental related suggestions that are directly related to the content of the Cooperation Programme.

Comments in detail in the order of the meetings of the Working Group:

4.2.1 First meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:

- The meeting took place on 19th August 2014.
- The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 8th August 2014.
- The following table represents those comments and requests which utmost influenced the structure or the content of the Environmental Report - grouped by topics and chapters of the Environmental Report the table shows the received comments, and the given feedback integrated into the next versions Environmental Report. (The topics are given in the first line of each table; related chapters are given in the “Response to the comment” column.)
- The detailed minutes of the meeting can be found in Annex 1.

Topic: Non-technical Summary:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?



There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.
--	--	------

Topic: Introduction and methodology:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority SEA procedure and schedule: An update is needed according to the decision of the Ministry of Environment on the procedure, e.g. there won't be public hearing.	Level of integration: Fully Response: The SEA procedure and schedule has been updated according to the minutes of the 1 st working group meeting and the decisions of the Ministry of Environment. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 6. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: Annex 1 and Annex 7.	YES

Topic: Outline of the content, main objectives of the programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the environmental report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without the implementation of the programme:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?



<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>In case of Natura 2000 sites the list of SPAs and SCIs are not updated on national level. There is no information the SPAs and SCIs regarding its territory and justification.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The dedicated sites of the two countries concerned Natura 2000, including SPAs and SCIs have already been presented under Chapter 5.1.</p> <p>Hungary: http://www.natura.2000.hu/index.php?p=termegeorze&nyelv=hun</p> <p>Romania: http://www.natura2000.ro/</p> <p>The number of SPA and natural area was updated at national level: 148 + 383.</p> <p>It was specified if the Natura 2000 are totally or partially in Romania and the Program area. The protected area with international relevance, Natural Park Lunca Muresului-sit Ramsar, is mentioned.</p> <p>At the same time we specify the webpages which contain information about Natura 2000 sites from both countries.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity Current environmental conditions – climate change: the CO2 is overrepresented.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The chapter has been revised. As the issue is more related to air and climate factors, it has been replaced.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report:2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Regarding Water management the information used is data from 2011. It is necessary to update it or to explain why these data were used.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The data have been updated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.3.</p>	<p>YES</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>There is no information on forests in the report.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Additional information has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting:</p>	<p>Yes</p>



	5.2. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.	
<p>Association for Bird and Nature Protection "Milvus Group"</p> <p>In case of Natura 2000 sites, what the key environmental problems means? Please clarify the statement „The risk of floods in certain parts of the eligible area is still high.”</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>For further justification an information sources has been provided.</p> <p>At the environmental part:</p> <p>Biodiversity, NATURA 2000</p> <p>The risk of flooding is too high in some protected area.</p> <p>For the justification please view: http://www.1asig.ro/documente/sorin-randasu.pdf)</p> <p>Point of view of the expert: the risk of the flooding is too high in some area-this is a key problem because the repeated flooding process is a factor that can reduce the biological diversity. The program area is characterized by flooding without existence of the protection system.</p> <p>Motivation: after flooding the vegetation regenerate in short time, but suffer a lot of changes. If we don't have measures warning and combated the flooding the entire ecological system can be change.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.</p>	Yes

Topic: Environmental characteristics of the areas to be significantly affected:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	<p>Level of integration: n.r.</p> <p>Response: n.r.</p> <p>Related chapter: n.r.</p>	n.r.

Topic: Environmental objectives and derived guiding questions		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency



		between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: The likely significant effects on the environment		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change The impact matrix needs explanation.	Level of integration: Fully Response: To avoid misinterpretation in evaluation matrix we include one legend with the used symbols. The detailed analysis of the significant probable effects of the program presented in evaluation matrix is filled with explications at the part analyze of significant effects at the level of indicative activities from each priority axes. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.2. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 6.2.	Yes

Topic: The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority Mitigation or optimising measures Are all the proposed measures eligible? Should all the proposed measures be required and the responsibility for the authorized environmental improvement is of the	Level of integration: Fully Response: All the proposed measures have been revised and those are considered as eligible.	Yes



<p>developer? If not, what can be done? Can they become part of the environmental permit application at project level and this is the responsibility of the beneficiary?</p>	<p>The CP planning team will be provided with the proposed measures and the consultant should incorporate those into the cooperation programme or give a justification on that. Ex-ante evaluation will also revise the purposed measures.</p> <p>The following has been suggested as mitigation measure: “effective implementation of the measures and conditions contained in the regulatory acts on EIA, EA and CA concerning the construction stage for the particular eligible activity “</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</p> <p>One of the proposed measures is “protection of natural resources and soil by newly constructed facilities, with the application of BAT tools (e.g mandatory usage of BREF documents)”</p> <p>Please clarify whether it is concerned for natural resources as whole or only for soil, as the soil is part of the natural resources.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The proposed measure relates to natural resources as a whole. The measure was reformulated: protection of natural resources with newly constructed facilities with the application of new BAT instruments.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity Regarding the measures to reduce and/or compensate the considerably harmful environmental impacts:</p> <p>The measures are general and not concrete.</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>The proposed measures have been revised and specified where it has been regarded as necessary.</p> <p>Nevertheless the measures are regarded as concrete as it can be in case and at the level of a co-operation programme.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	Yes

Topic: Alternatives:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –At least	Level of integration: Fully	Yes



<p>two addition alternatives need to be presented in the relevant chapter, these alternatives should follow the previous versions of the cooperation programme. Environmental impacts should be elaborated for these alternatives.</p>	<p>Response: An additional, intermediary alternative has been provided in the relevant chapter.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 8.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>It must be presented in the report, that the best alternative has been selected for the content of the cooperation programme.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Justification has been included in the relevant chapter.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 8.</p>	Yes

Topic: Monitoring and indicators:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>The monitoring measures and indicators are appropriate but they appear to be difficult to monitor, please review and reduce the number as much as possible.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The monitoring indicators have been revised: the number of indicators was reduced from 31 to 23.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</p> <p>How the monitoring indicator “quantity of rehabilitated soil (m3)” quantifiable? Do this kind of indicator available?</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: This indicator was deleted from the list of monitoring indicators. In case of the monitoring indicator “quantity of rehabilitated soil (m3) the available data source has been provided in the table of chapter 11.</p> <p>The rehabilitation is proposed in the cooperation programme, under KAI 1.2.:</p> <p>1.2.1 Rehabilitation, conservation and joint promotion of natural, as well as cultural and built heritage that can be jointly</p>	Yes



	<p>promoted and sustainably exploited.</p> <p>1.2.2 Creation and rehabilitation of facilities based on the sustainable use of common geothermal potential of the cross-border area. The aim of the program is not directly rehabilitation of the polluted lands, but in the projects connected with KAI 1.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>The phrasing and definitions of the whole report has been revised.</p> <p>The glossary has been provided for the abbreviations used.</p> <p>Yes, the environmental indicators should be different from the indicators of the programme.</p>	<p>Level of integration: n.r.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The indicator has been modified.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>The indicator “length of protected areas affected by flood and rainfall (km, km2)” please modify the indicator – without length and km2.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The indicator has been modified.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Although the number of monitoring indicators has been reduced, it still seems a lot. We propose to have an order of their priority, because these indicators will be included in the project, so it should not be too complicated.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The indicators have been shortened again and those have been presented in order of its priority.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	Yes

Topic: Transboundary effects:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental



		Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –Please improve the chapter with concrete justifications.	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The justification has already been given for the un-necessity of consultation with third countries.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 12.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 10.</p>	n.r.

Topic: Structure of the SEA report:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –SEA Directive contains the necessary information to be provided in the environmental report. Please follow the Annex I of the Directive.	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The report has already contained the information required by the SEA Directive. Nevertheless the appellation of the chapters has been tuned to the ANNEX I. of the directive. Besides this the report should satisfy the requirements of the national SEA legislations. Please accept this.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	Yes

Topic: Additional remarks:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Answer on the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Regional Development and Public	Level of integration: Fully	Yes.



<p>Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Please do not use the logo of the current programme. Please use the term cooperation programme instead of the term operational programme, Romania-Hungary instead of Hungary Romania.</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>Corrected.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>With the purpose of standard terminology please revise the terminology of the report in order to set up the unification with the EU terminology.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The phrasing and definitions of the whole report have been revised.</p> <p>The glossary has been provided for the abbreviations used.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	n.r.
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>The terminology of sustainable cross-border mobility is not clear.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>This is the phrasing of the cooperation programme document. Please see the descriptions provided in the text of the programme document under chapter 2.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 2.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	n.r.

4.2.2 Second meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:

- The meeting took place on 12th September 2014.
- The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 5th September 2014.
- The following table represents those comments and requests which utmost influenced the structure or the content of the Environmental Report - grouped by topics and chapters of the Environmental Report the table shows the received comments, and the given feedback integrated into the next versions Environmental Report. (The topics are given in the first line of each table; related chapters are given in the “Response to the comment” column.)
- The detailed minutes of the meeting can be found in Annex 1.

Topic: Non-technical Summary:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental



		Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Introduction and methodology:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority Although now the report is relying on the data available in 2012, we still consider that the information is shallow, with very little data, so we do not believe that this issue is resolved. It should be mentioned why data from 2011 are found.	Level of integration: Fully Response: Chapter 2.6 of the environmental report gives the sources of information. An addition article has been incorporated with the justification of data. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 2. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: Annex 1.	Yes

Topic: Outline of the content, main objectives of the programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – At the part regarding the National Strategy for Ecotourism Development, we ask to mention for the Romanian partner country all the objectives with which it can be proved that the proposed activities and projects in the Program are in line with this strategy.	Level of integration: Fully Response: The proposed activities and projects of the Programme are in line with this strategy, therefore the National Strategy for Ecotourism Development has been mentioned among other relevant policy documents for this programme in which some thematic objectives of the programme are integrated. As the ecotourism is not a stressful intervention of the programme we consider it less important to present the objectives of this	Yes



	<p>strategy.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 3.3. and 3.4.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 1.6.</p>	
--	--	--

Topic: Current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without the implementation of the programme:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>Please don't use the term of development. It is recommended to use support for conservation of natural parks.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The proposed activity is content of the cooperation programme. A suggestion for reformulation has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	n.r.
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>Environmental characteristics – 159 Natura 2000 sites and forestry data - we don't understand if they are summarized or not. We want to have in Program information for each of the 8 counties and for each country. The used data are wrong, please verify them and modify the information in the Program.</p> <p>In the document why can we find only information for Hungary regarding the forest? We want to have the same level of detail for Romania, the Report has to present and analyse the Romanian current situation or environmental analysis of the eligible area at the same time.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The list of the dedicated NATURA 2000 sites of the two countries concerned has been incorporated.</p> <p>The referred sentence has been clarified.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>The presentation of relevant aspects is completed, but we need to have information for each county, we don't want to know the national data, only the eligible area is important. The Agency for Environmental Protection will offer the data.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The list of the dedicated NATURA 2000 sites of the two countries concerned has been incorporated.</p> <p>The list has been presented only with relevance to the eligible area.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p>	Yes



	Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>Special conservation areas: located in Hungary are similar to SCI and SPA words from Romania. In this way Romania has special conservation areas, but under another name. Please pay attention to this aspect and mention it in the documents.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The difference related to the conservation areas in the two countries has been presented in the report.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2. and 3.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control</p> <p>At energy - talking about reactors 3 and 4 at Cernavodă, Romania is committed to invest in the energy sector, including in reactors 3 and 4 at Cernavodă but nothing is mentioned about the nuclear power station in Paks just extending its operating period. Please provide accurate and objective information for both sides. Paks is in the eligible area, but Cernavoda is not. Please delete Cernavoda and insert Paks. it is true, but in this way you have to analyse this subject in detail and to add the nuclear power stations from the neighbouring countries Ukraine, Poland, etc.</p>	<p>Level of integration: n.r.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>As neither Paks, nor Cernavoda -in the eligible area, and there is no connection to the programme, there is no need for detailed information in this respect. The sentence has been removed.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: n.r.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: n.r.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>I found information regarding the hydropower stations in Olt. In the Program it is written clearly that there is cyanide in underground waters in the Hungarian area, but in the Report only the Romanian industrial activity is written about that affects on the underground waters. This statement is wrong.</p>	<p>Level of integration: n.r.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The English version of the Report contains information on energy and electric power plants, including the Olt mini-hydropower plants. Regarding the cyanide the statement has not been found in the English version. As the mentioned hydropower plants are not in the eligible area, the sentence has been removed</p> <p>Arsenic issues in the report are related to both countries.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: n.r.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: n.r.</p>	n.r.
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>In the field of waste management “Removal and disposal of illegal waste deposits will remain a key task”. Information/data regarding waste management at national and municipality level can be obtained from the National Agency for Environmental Protection, the institution in charge of the elaboration of the Annual Report regarding the state of the environmental factors, the document where you can find one separate chapter for “Municipality and industrial waste management.” The EUROSTAT 2012 source mentions the followings</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Additional data has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.5.</p>	Yes



<p>aspects: "If we analyze the data in the last 4 years - 2007-2010 – since 2009 we can see a decrease of generated waste quantity at EU average level and at the same time for the majority of the member states. It can be considered that this evolution is due to the economic crises and not because we had some prevention measures. In the field of municipality, the indicator of waste generation EUROSTAT data shows that in 2010 for Romania the quantity was 365 kg/inhabitant/year, 27% lower than the European level (502 kg/inhabitant/year)". This way, we recommend updating the information/data regarding waste management.</p>		
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>We recommend the following be mentioned at the part geothermal water: in addition to Oradea, it is necessary to mention other resources of geothermal water from Bihor like Marghita, Beius, Sacuieni, Village Tinca, and at the same time it is necessary to mention Satu Mare because they would like to apply for the rehabilitation of the degraded infrastructure which used geothermal waters.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The suggestions have been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>Biodiversity field /Natura 2000 Sites - we propose mentioning that not only Natural Park Apuseni (that has its total area in 3 counties - Bihor, Cluj and Alba) is located in the cross-border area, but also the territories of National Park Cefa are located in the border area which has importance from the natural and biodiversity point of view. This area is a birds protection area also.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Natural Park Cefa has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>Please mention, in addition, for Romania that some localities from Bihor: Beius, Marghita, Sacueni, Tinca and in Satu Mare County are areas rich in geothermal resources.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The suggestions have been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting:5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>The last paragraph regarding the actual state of the environment, we propose rephrasing the entire paragraph "the cooperation in the field of the environment between the two countries is coordinated by a joint team of experts for the Environment that is part of the Joint Romanian-Hungarian Committee that was founded in 2003"- we propose mentioning the Romanian and Hungarian legal frameworks that contain the description of the joint committee of experts. Proposal:</p> <p>"The most important details regarding the cooperation in the field of the environment between the two countries initiated in 2003 are provided in Decision-HG no 91 from 12 February 2014 about the approval of the Protocol of the 9th meeting of the Joint Romanian-Hungarian Committee signed in Budapest on 26 November 2013 for the application of the Agreement</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The suggested text has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>between the Romanian and Hungarian Governments regarding the cooperation in the field of environmental protection that was signed in Budapest on 26 May 1997.”</p>		
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change</p> <p>Replacing the term "diminish" with "reducing the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere"</p> <p>There are two conceptual areas of intervention regarding issues of climate change, such as reducing the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and adaptation. Some of the main issues in reducing the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere can be solved by reducing the energy demand, reducing emissions of greenhouse gases and increasing carbon sequestration through natural structures or by increasing the forests surface. Key aspects in the adaptation could be preparing for extreme weather conditions (drought, protection - to improve water excess).</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The suggested modification has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change</p> <p>” Factors of air and climate, climate changes, Relevance of the environmental problem "was reformulated as follows: Changing air quality and process components of climate change, specifically involve reducing the concentration of pollutants emitted in larger quantities, of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen-oxides, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and other solid, emissions of greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol on reducing ozone layer, such as carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and a series of fluorinated gases; moreover, fighting climate changes also requires increasing the carbon sequestration by natural structures and adoption of policies and measures to adapt to the natural and anthropogenic effects of inevitable global warming; diminish or eliminate pollution situations which most often exceed the limits. Diminish effects causing air pollution globally, which are caused by burning fossil fuels, by certain industrial and agricultural activities, and by the use of substances harmful to the ozone layer and having greenhouse effect.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The suggested modification has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change: "Current status of the environment" paragraph 5 was reformulated as follows: Although related to the heating process there is uncertainty about the precise timing and magnitude of the impact generated, actions to combat this phenomenon should be adopted and implemented immediately by using the volume of information and scientific evidence available.</p> <p>Moreover, in the same paragraph we reformulate the last sentence as follows: In terms of precipitation, according to weather forecasts it is expected a strong decrease in rainfall during the summer months.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The suggested modification has been incorporated, and replaced.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change: In the following paragraph on the effort to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in the period 2013-2020, the last sentence was rephrased as follows: In the post Kyoto period, Romania and Hungary, as EU member states are committed to effectively contribute to EU efforts to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases by 20% by 2020 compared to 1990 emission levels.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The suggested modification has been incorporated, and replaced. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 5. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change: In addition, this paragraph was rephrased as follows, regarding the present situation: According to the emission inventory of greenhouse gas emissions sent this year to the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, representing emissions in 2012, there is a decrease of about 58% compared with 1989.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The suggested modification has been incorporated, and replaced. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.4. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change: "Air and factors of Climate Change" has become "Air and fighting climate change"</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: Air and climate factors, climate change have been changed to "air and fighting climate change". In the several tables of the report the same title has been used as Air and climate factors, climate change. Due to internal consistency the modification has been made in all cases. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Topic: Environmental characteristics of the areas to be significantly affected:</p>		
<p>Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Response to the Comment</p>	<p>Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change - Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control</p> <p>Please delete all the objectives that are not in the eligible area. In the documents we can find negative statements regarding Romania but the Hungarian</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The number of the objectives has been reduced. Related chapter in the version of the</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>negative aspects are overlooked. Please ask the expert to rectify these problems.</p>	<p>SEA Report presented at the meeting: 3.5. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2. and 4.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change - Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control</p> <p>It states that attention must be paid to CO2 emissions in both countries – here more should be said - who, where, how.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: Additional sentence has been incorporated. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 3.5. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.4. and 4.4..</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Topic: Environmental objectives and derived guiding questions</p>		
<p>Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Response to the Comment</p>	<p>Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>Field of Biodiversity, flora, fauna, Natura 2000 the relevant objectives for the environment can be completed with the following:</p> <p>To provide a favourable state of prevention for the protected species and the sustainable use of biodiversity components.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The suggested text has been incorporated. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 8. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 5.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>Regarding the environmental objectives relevant to the environmental factors “water” (surface water, underground water) we propose to mention (for Romanian part) that all the objectives are in line with the National Management Plan for Catchments and in line with the provisions of environmental permit no.23/09.07.2013 issued by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests based on the Decision G. no. 8 of 21th January 2015 on the organization and functioning of the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) Romania:</p> <p>-Ecological restoration/Re-vegetation/Re-naturalization of rivers</p> <p>Specific objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoiding alteration and anthropogenic influences in watershed geomorphology ▪ Achievement of environmental objectives 	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The mentioning has been incorporated in the form of a footnote. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.3. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 5.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prevention of all the surface water damage ▪ Protection, rehabilitation and improvement of surface waters with the aim to achieve the good status of surface waters. ▪ Protection and improvement of all artificial water bodies or waters heavily modified with the aim to achieve one better ecological potential or one better chemical status ▪ Reduction of flood and drought risks ▪ Realization of some artificial lakes, polders and embankment works, regulation of water courses in line with the conservation of wetlands. 		
---	--	--

Topic: The likely significant effects on the environment		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>Impact matrix – PA5 –you don't make a positive evaluation for biodiversity. I agree with Gr. Milvus: Activity type doesn't have to be positive, they can be positive if we talk about one protected area.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Positive evaluation for biodiversity has been given in case of SO6/b and SO5/b, as the nature of these areas of interventions supports the positive evaluation.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 8.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 6.2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>In the case of the projects that will be implemented in the protected areas with negative effects for biodiversity, the evaluation couldn't be positive.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Please see the previous line.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 8.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 6.2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Topic: The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the



		comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Alternatives:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control At the chapter with alternatives the following information must be included: first alternative 0 - if the Program is not implemented and the effects of this on the environment, alternative 1 - what it involves (do not only indicate in the document that there is alternative 1, but describe it) and the impact for the environment, alternative 2 that has to be different from alternatives 0 and 1 (we need to underline the differences of 2 to 0 and 1). We don't want the use of the table, keep it in text format.	Level of integration: Fully Response: The chapter has been supplemented with the description of the different alternatives underlying the differences among those. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 8.	Yes

Topic: Monitoring and indicators:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Regarding the proposal of the updated Monitoring indicators, the representative of the Ministry of Environment suggested that the final list should derive from the Relevant environmental objectives and, also, that the Relevant environmental objectives should be revised also, by merging the similar ones and excluding the ones that do not correspond, as discussed at the meeting. For many of the present indicators, it cannot be established a direct link between the Programme and their performance and therefore cannot be adopted	Level of integration: Fully Response: The chapter for monitoring indicators has been revised. The modified new version of the proposed environmental monitoring system has been incorporated in Chapter 9. The number of the proposed indicators has been reduced and all of them are considered as relevant for the programme. Related chapter in the version of the	Yes



<p>in this form.</p>	<p>SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>We think that we have a large number of indicators that will be assumed in the Program and probably we will have difficulties in the data collection. In the previous programming there were less indicators, we propose to have a reduced number of indicators.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: Please see the previous line. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	<p>n.r.</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control</p> <p>Environmental indicators have to contain the indicators from the Program</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: Please see the previous line. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	<p>n.r.</p>
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>We think that the number of indicators is too high, for example the RO-BG CBC Programme 2014-2020 has a total of 10 indicators.</p> <p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>We want to get to a reasonable number of indicators from the projects, because we have no other option, as you have to justify them in a report. As of now, it is hard to achieve the indicators and report on them.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The chapter for monitoring indicators has been revised. The modified new version of the proposed environmental monitoring system has been incorporated. The number of the proposed indicators has been reduced and all of them are considered as relevant for the programme. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – General Directorate for Climate Change</p> <p>On page 91 modifications performed in the table: Row 4 column 1: Air and fighting climate change Row 4 column 2: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ emission of air pollutants such as NOX, CO, PM10 [µg/m3] ▪ reduce GES emissions (greenhouse gases), equivalent to CO2 (tCO2eq/year) ▪ number of people affected by excess of emission limits in the area of impact (No.) ▪ reduce costs generated by the negative impact of climate changes 	<p>Level of integration: Fully Response: The chapter for indicators has been modified. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 11. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



Topic: Transboundary effects:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Structure of the SEA report:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control</p> <p>The names of chapters were modified in line with Annex 1 from Directive. If we see the first part of the Report, we can find a table where the name of the chapter is not indicated and nor is the place where we can find the information.</p> <p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>It is not a problem that there is more information than required, because the Hungarian legislation requires it. This is not a problem. We refer to the way it is structured: the problem is regarding only the structure.</p>	Level of integration: Fully Response: The whole environmental report has been restructured. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control</p> <p>We have to find in the Environmental Report the summary of the Program content, the objectives and the relation with other plans and programmes. This can be replaced with one annex that contains the legal framework, and it is not correct that the reader has to make the connections between the chapters and the annex (Annex 3). Please correct it.</p>	Level of integration: Fully Response: Chapter 3. of the Report contains the summary of the Program content, the objectives and the relation with other plans and programmes. The whole environmental report has been restructured. In the new structure chapter 2.1.contains information on the legal framework, and the next chapter, the chapter 2.2. contains information on the policy framework. The total list of relevant policies has been presented in an Annex	Yes



	(annex 3) due to its length. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report	
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority We can't find "updated schedule" and the breakdown of Chapters 5.1., and 5.2. Modification has not been performed, only the chapter has been changed	Level of integration: Fully Response: This is not clear what the request means breakdown of the chapters. The report has been restructured. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report	n.r.

Topic: Additional remarks:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Answer on the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate General for Impact Assessment and Pollution Control We need to list the Working Group from Hungary, not only the Romanian.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: There is no working group in Hungary, the Hungarian national legislation does not require working group in Hungary. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report	n.r.

4.2.3 Third meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:

- The meeting took place on 17th October 2014.
- The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 10th October 2014.
- The following table represents those comments and requests which utmost influenced the structure or the content of the Environmental Report - grouped by topics and chapters of the Environmental Report the table shows the received comments, and the given feedback integrated into the next versions Environmental Report. (The topics are given in the first line of each table; related chapters are given in the "Response to the comment" column.)
- The detailed minutes of the meeting can be found in Annex 1.



Topic: Non-technical Summary:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Introduction and methodology:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Outline of the content, main objectives of the programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit The program's relationship with other relevant plans and programmes - few relevant plans, programmes are presented, operational programmes are not mentioned, nor are the transportation master plans, there is a lot missing for each of the two countries, or they are just mentioned, STA which is now being further developed by the MDRAP, etc.	Level of integration: Fully Response: Chapter 3.6. has been supplemented with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Strategy on Climate Change ▪ NSAPBC ▪ National Waste Management Strategy 	Yes



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Strategy for Polluted sites ▪ National Strategy for Regional Development ▪ ROP ▪ TDS ▪ National Strategy and Action Plan for Water Management ▪ National Strategy for Flood Risk Management ▪ Romania's Short- Medium and Long-Term Masterplan for Transport ▪ Danube Transnational Programme <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 3.6.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 1.6.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Forest Resources Management</p> <p>The information presented is not equal for Romania and Hungary. Please present separately Hungary and separately Romania, and present the data at the same level of detail for the whole Programme area.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The chapter 3.5. has been revised according to the requested content. The chapter presents information separately for Hungary and for Romania.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 3.5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2. and 3.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>Topic: Current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without the implementation of the programme:</p>		
<p>Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders</p>	<p>Response to the Comment</p>	<p>Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>It can be observed in general that data from 2010 are used. What is the reason for this?</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The latest available data has been vetted and corrected in case recent data were available.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



	Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Requests that the reason be specified in the Report why the data is not from the current year, because the Commission will have the same issue when reading the Report. At the same time she notes that this issue was raised at the previous meeting of the working group and has not been resolved.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The latest available data has been vetted and corrected in case recent data was available.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Reiterates her request made at the previous meeting of the SEA working group that in the Report references should be made for the Programme area, not the whole territories of the two countries.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Information has been corrected.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Section on soil - mineral extractive industry exists in Hungary as well, not only in Romania, we are again faced with the unequal treatment of the two countries. Are there significant soil degrading factors only in Romania?</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The chapter has been supplemented the statements have been finetuned.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.2.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.2.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>Biodiversity - the key environmental problems do not relate to biodiversity. This type of information is not only repeated in several chapters, but it does not represent what it should. At the section on biodiversity, we would like to see problems regarding biodiversity, etc.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The section has been corrected.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.1.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>Biodiversity, flora, fauna, Natura 2000 - relevant considerations - again presents the protected areas. Some information can be presented very briefly in the introduction, but the information on the protected areas is to be presented here at biodiversity.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Chapter 4.1.2. presents a detailed description on Natura 2000 sites, and protected areas.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.1.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.</p>	Yes



Topic: Environmental characteristics of the areas to be significantly affected:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Environmental objectives and derived guiding questions		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: The likely significant effects on the environment		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the



		comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>Measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for adverse effects – description of possible impacts ... - delivery methods, organization of timetables - they are not effects (correctly: noise emissions, travel time)</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The proposed measures have been revised.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>Measures to prevent and reduce the considerably harmful environmental impacts – the description of the effects on the priority axes implies that these effects are positive, no matter which project is implemented out of the Programme, the impact is positive. In our opinion, in projects that have a construction phase, impact is negative at least during construction. And if the effects were deemed positive, why would you need impact mitigation measures?</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The proposed measures have been revised.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>To prevent, reduce and compensate negative environmental impacts as much as possible, the following measure has to be included: for projects which are implemented in protected areas of EU's interest or in their vicinity, it is necessary to apply for the Natura 2000 conservation license to environmental agencies. Environmental agencies in accordance with the procedure will consider if it is necessary to issue the Natura 2000 conservation license.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The proposal has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	Yes
<p>National Agency for Land Improvement</p> <p>Integration of drought mitigation measures - irrigation should be mentioned from the point of us.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The proposal has been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	Yes

Topic: Alternatives:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental
		Report



		Report?
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>Regarding the chapter on alternatives, I asked you to amend Annex 4, so that the difference between the intermediary and the final option would become clear, and to sum up this difference in one sentence in the text, and describe briefly why you chose the final alternative and what its environmental implications (advantages, benefits) are. This comment has not been resolved and the Table of Annex 4 has been transferred to the main text part. The text part is very confusing. In the final alternative a Priority axes with a thematic objective is missing, and another priority axis appeared with a new thematic objective. This is the difference between the two alternatives, this should be described, there are many things written down in this chapter and which do not say anything and the point is missing. Describe (justify) why the new priority axes and thematic objective are more advantageous than the old. This chapter is very important; please present it correctly (as appropriate).</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The Chapter has been amended with a text under the comparison of the alternatives on the level of the priority axes, what is the difference between the intermediary and the final alternative.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 8.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 8.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>The comparative table - the differences between the old and the new priority axes cannot be seen. The differences should be shown in each line (as environmental elements).</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The Chapter 8. has been amended with a text under the comparison of the alternatives on the level of the priority axes, what is the difference between the intermediary and the final alternative.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 8.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 8.</p>	Yes

Topic: Monitoring and indicators:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>SEA indicators should be easily quantifiable, at programme level, through aggregating such indicators from project level</p> <p>Thus, the beneficiary should be able to collect the indicator at project level.</p> <p>Such indicators, once accepted, at programme level, are reported within the Annual Implementation Reports to be sent to the European Commission, based on MA</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The Directive requires the significant environmental effects of implementing the plan or programme to be monitored “in order, inter alia, to identify [...] unforeseen adverse effects and to be able to undertake remedial action” (Article 10(1)). Annex 2 of the Directive also requires presenting the environmental effects. Responsible Authorities may already monitor implementation of plans or programmes</p>	Yes



<p>and beneficiaries inputs.</p> <p>If the SEA indicators are based on measurement resulting from international databases, then this will pose additional difficulties on the beneficiaries, who may not be able to collect them and thus MA shall not be able to report them further on.</p> <p>Based on the SEA directive, there are no specific provisions as to how the indicators shall be formulated, so we can adopt such indicators as to secure an efficient and reasonable monitoring at programme level.</p>	<p>against their objectives or targets. Some of these may be environmental, but this will not necessarily be enough to satisfy the Directive. In our legal understanding measuring the environmental effects is a requirement of the Directive. The „R” type indicators can measure environmental effects, those of „I” types are rather environmental outputs than effects. Responsible Authorities must ensure when designing their monitoring arrangements that they comply with this provision.</p> <p>Considering the nature of the CP, including infrastructure projects (both in the environmental and in the transport sector) and the requirements of the SEA Directive, the monitoring system should include environmental impact indicators.</p> <p>Nevertheless the chapter for monitoring indicators has been revised. The modified new version of the proposed environmental monitoring system has been incorporated in Chapter 9.</p> <p>All the proposed indicators are quantifiable, the measurement unit has been proposed.</p> <p>Frequency of reporting also has been proposed in case of each indicator. The frequency of reporting depends on the characteristics of the indicator. Therefore in case of result type indicators reporting has been proposed in the frame of the ongoing evaluation.</p> <p>In the last few versions of the chapter on indicators there were no indicators based on measurement resulting from international databases.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>The data provider - who is the authority who provides the monitoring data for the Managing Authority? These data are to be provided for the MDRAP.</p>	<p>Level of integration: None</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>We consider that these data are possible to provide in the frame of the on-going evaluation.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>This aspect is very important because she believes that an important aspect of environmental indicators is that they can be collected from the level of development plans (projects) and their beneficiaries. Where “beneficiary” is written, it should be clearly noted that</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>We consider that these data are possible to provide easily, In case of the marked “I” type ones, it has been amended that beneficiaries of the projects.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>the beneficiaries of the projects are concerned. In accordance with what was monitored during the previous period, to ensure that these indicators are monitored, she believes that the solution is to put it on the information sheet of the project that environmental regulation is necessary if the project belongs to projects that have environmental impact, and it should be reported to the SC if such a project was concerned.</p>	<p>The environmental regulation issue and to provide the data on the level of the projects are issues to be incorporated into the application forms and the project level progress reports.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.</p>	
---	--	--

Topic: Transboundary effects:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of European Funds Directorate General Unit Analysis, Programming and Evaluation</p> <p>The main comment concerns cross-border/transboundary effects (to consultation with a third party) it is not sufficiently justified.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Correlating with the first version of the environmental report we provided additional justification on the likely impact with regard to third countries.</p> <p>The chapter is in line with the SEA Directive.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 10.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 10.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Topic: Structure of the SEA report:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change –</p> <p>There is some information that is repeated in several chapters: in Chapter 3.5 of the geographical position of the Programme - environmental aspects of the most likely affected zone - when we are talking about geographical position (situation), we refer to topography, hydrology, vegetation, fauna, etc. Thus,</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The chapter 3.5. has been revised according to the requested content.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting:</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>the information presented here is not good, not relevant and not specific. We noticed that forestry data for the four counties was introduced here, but here it is necessary to present the relevant data on geographical position.</p>	<p>3.5. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.</p>	
--	---	--

Topic: Additional remarks:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Answer on the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Concerning the previous comment, the consultant has not updated information about the Programme in the Report, at the Joint Working Group meeting of September 15 to 17, the removal of the exploitation of thermal waters from the list of activities was accepted. Again, we emphasize the general remark, and invite the consultant to modify the information contained in the Report to reflect the content of the new Programme version.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: We agree that the Programme and the SEA Report need to correspond. The report has been corrected according to version we received on 28th October.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	<p>Yes</p>

4.2.4 Fourth meeting of the SEA Environmental Working Group:

- The meeting took place on 20th November 2014.
- The official invitation was sent to relevant authorities on 13th November 2014.
- The following table represents those comments and requests which utmost influenced the structure or the content of the Environmental Report. Grouped by topics and chapters of the Environmental Report the table shows the received comments, and the given feedback integrated into the next versions Environmental Report. (The topics are given in the first line of each table; related chapters are given in the “Response to the comment” column.)
- The detailed minutes of the meeting can be found in Annex 1.

Topic: Non-technical Summary:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>Please note that the non-technical summary should clearly outline the environment status in both countries, in the eligible area, should clearly refer to all environmental factors, should include the methodology used and should follow the structure. In this respect, please include the analysis of all environmental factors, as they are in the report, namely: pages 63, 65, 69, 72, 73, etc. It is very important to have in the NTS what is likely to happen in the absence of the programme implementation – point b) Annex I of the Directive</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>The NTS has been revised and improved. The NTS was moved at the end of the document according to Annex I of the Directive.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 1. - NTS</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 13.NTS</p>	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Proposed reformulation - In the mountainous and hilly areas of the Romanian eligible area there are also other diverse subsoil natural resources: hydrocarbons – oil in Timis, Arad and Bihor county – natural gases in Timis county. There can also be found metalliferous and non-metalliferous mineral resources: bauxite from Craiul Mountains, skarn with galena, sphalerite, pyrite, molybdenum, bismuthine from Bihor Mountains, refractory clays (Șuncuiuș and Bălnaca) marble (Chișcău, Băita, Vașcău), compact limestone quartz (in the gorge Borz area – Soimi, Cărpinet, Chistag) in Bihor county; complex ores (pyrite, zinc, lead, gold and silver), iron ore (limonite, siderite), perlite, bentonite (near Orasu Nou and Călinești Oas) in Satu Mare county.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 1. - NTS</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 13.NTS</p>	Yes

Topic: Introduction and methodology:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Bihor County</p> <p>If the consultant refers to the protection of soil and subsoil, the relevant legislation in this area is: Decision no. 1.403 of 19 November 2007 on the restoration of the soil, subsoil and terrestrial ecosystems that have been affected, and Decision no. 1.408 of 19 November 2007 concerning methods of investigation and assessment of soil and subsoil. Please add.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 2.1.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: Annex 3.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>I am under the impression that this introductory part contains information that repeats, I think it should be better structured and shortened.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The information in the chapter has been revised.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 2.</p>	Yes



	Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: Annex 1.	
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration Managing Authority</p> <p>regarding the sources / availability of information please remember to insert footnote in all the cases where data from the eligible area of HU was not available</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 2.6.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: Annex 1.</p>	Yes

Topic: Outline of the content, main objectives of the programme and relationship with other relevant plans and programmes:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	<p>Level of integration: n.r.</p> <p>Response: n.r.</p> <p>Related chapter: n.r.</p>	n.r.

Topic: Current state of the environment and the likely evolution thereof without the implementation of the programme:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>Please restructure the information separately RO-HU. We are referring to the rearrangement of the existing information in order to be able to distinguish information about each country but not to the extent that will affect vision of the report</p> <p>In completion to the comment made by the Romanian Waters Administration on restructuring the information on waters chapter, the Ministry of Environment representative requested that the information will be structured in a similar manner in chapters 4.A.1, through 4.A.7</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Information has been presented separately in case of Romania and Hungary.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: whole report</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: whole report</p>	Yes



<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>Please verify the correctness of the types of climate attributed to the counties and/or countries</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Information has been verified and supplemented for clear understanding.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.1. and 3.5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.1.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Bihor County</p> <p>Regarding Bihor county, it was not written at least a general description of the Natural Park Apuseni and Natural Park Cefa unlike Mures Floodplain Natural Park. We propose to be mentioned in the report Apuseni Natural Park which stretches across three counties (Bihor, Cluj, Alba) and Cefa Natural Park which stretches the Romanian-Hungarian border and represents an important area in terms of environmental protection, nature and biodiversity, and it is a bird protection area. This observation of our institution was expressed in the second Working Group SEA, and we consider it was not taken into account.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: General descriptions of the Natural Park Apuseni and Natural Park Cefa have been incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.4.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>As a formulation we propose</p> <p>With regard to protected areas, the Hungarian side includes over 8500 km² amounting to approx. 17% of the total eligible area and the Romanian side includes 8,329,75 km², also amounting to approx. 17% of the total eligible area.</p> <p>Still, in my opinion it is not clear, do you mean total eligible area belonging to each country?</p> <p>The map below shows equal surfaces.</p> <p>If so we propose:</p> <p>With regard to protected areas, there are over 8500 km² amounting to approx. 17% of the eligible area belonging to the Hungarian side and 8,329,75 km², also amounting to approx. 17% of the eligible area on the Romanian side.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Directorate of Biodiversity</p> <p>According to the environmental legislation in force GEO no. 57/2007 in Romania are four categories of protected areas. The national, community, local and international. According to this classification Natura 2000 sites are not part of the natural areas of national interest. Please waive this claim.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.1.2.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Bihor County</p> <p>We propose a reformulation for this field; the description does not match the current situation in Romania. The Ministry of Environment and Climatic</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated.</p>	<p>Yes</p>



<p>Changes together with the subordinated environmental authorities at national, regional and county level have worked hard to implement the environmental policies in this area in the period 2005-2014. Therefore all rural deposits that were inconsistent with the law were closed and rehabilitated by the local authorities decision. Municipal deposits listed in GD 349/2005 regarding waste landfill closure followed the closure calendar / ecological restoration under the terms negotiated with the European Commission.</p> <p>There were also built new municipal landfills through government funding and / or European funding that service at regional or county level and ensure an integrated / higher management for municipal waste in accordance with European law.</p> <p>Regarding the claims made in the same chapter in this report on the municipal waste recycling rate, we stress that in the present day it is already completed the statistical data entering into the national system (IES - Integrated Environmental System) on waste management for 2012. The final validation of the data is performed by the National Environmental Protection Agency. We recommend as the source of information for this area the National Environmental Protection Agency. Regarding waste management statistics for 2013 have not yet opened the reporting phase.</p>	<p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.2. and 2.5.</p>	
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>Please restructure the information separately RO-HU. We are referring to the rearrangement of the existing information in order to be able to distinguish information about each country but not to the extent that will affect vision of the report.</p> <p>Please note that the geothermal waters do not belong in this chapter. Please transfer the information about the geothermal waters to the 4.A.2. Soil and geological medium</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Information has been presented separately in case of Romania and Hungary.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.3.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.2.</p>	Yes
<p>Bihor County</p> <p>Please note that the enactment of interest for this field in the Romanian legislation is Law 458/2002 on drinking water quality, we ask the consultant to make changes in the report regarding 452 Law that covers other areas of the national economy.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated, necessary modifications have been made.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.6.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 2.3.</p>	Yes
<p>Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Department of Waters, Forests and Fisheries</p> <p>Please highlight the separation between sensitive areas declared by the directive on wastewater treatment - and vulnerable areas (nitrates)</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Sensitive areas have been supplemented with the requested information.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 4.5.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of</p>	Yes



	the SEA Report: 2.3.	
--	----------------------	--

Topic: Environmental characteristics of the areas to be significantly affected:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Environmental objectives and derived guiding questions		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: The likely significant effects on the environment		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: The measures envisaged to prevent, reduce and as fully as possible offset any significant adverse effects on the environment of implementing the plan or programme:
--



Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Managing Authority</p> <p>Instead of permit / notice / licence / accord etc... please insert „regulatory act”, when you refer to the environment</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Corrected.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration – Evaluation Unit</p> <p>Please insert only a few relevant and specific measures.</p> <p>Please take into account that they must be formulated as measures and they must be in line with the AP and IP.</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: The proposed measures have been revised.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Bihor County</p> <p>We propose promoting actions / processes of selective waste collection in offices</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Bihor County</p> <p>Recycling processes are within the competence of authorized economic operators for such activities. We ask the consultant to be consistent with national specific legislation, Law 211/2011 on waste regime</p>	<p>Level of integration: Fully</p> <p>Response: Incorporated.</p> <p>Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 7.</p> <p>Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 7.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Topic: Alternatives:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental
		Environmental



		Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Monitoring and indicators:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Please insert the relevant environmental objectives in order and insert the programme indicators from the previous table where there are none attributed to an objective. Please remove the previous table and adapt this title accordingly. Regarding the description, please specify that the information is available in the programme document.	Level of integration: Fully Response: Incorporated and the chapter has been modified according to the request. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 9. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 9.	Yes

Topic: Transboundary effects:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Response to the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
Ministry of Environment and Climate Change – Please insert arguments in the second column also (you have already written them in this chapter, you need only to copy/paste)	Level of integration: Fully Response: Inserted. Related chapter in the version of the SEA Report presented at the meeting: 10. Related chapter in the current version of the SEA Report: 10.	Yes

Topic: Structure of the SEA report:		
Comments from the Environmental	Response to the Comment	Is there

Authorities and other stakeholders		consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

Topic: Additional remarks:		
Comments from the Environmental Authorities and other stakeholders	Answer on the Comment	Is there consistency between the comment and the Environmental Report?
There were no comments on this content of the report to be presented here.	Level of integration: n.r. Response: n.r. Related chapter: n.r.	n.r.

4.3 Coordination with programming

The information gathered during the activity of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment has been submitted to the CP planners to be taken into account in the preparation of the Environmental Report and of the CP.

The received suggestions have been summarized and responded by the planners of the cooperation programme. The following table presents the received comments or proposals and the response from the planning consultant.

Organisation the comment received from	Comments/Proposals	Related page of the CP	Related chapter of the CP	Planning Response	Consultant
--	--------------------	------------------------	---------------------------	-------------------	------------



<p>National Company of Motorways and National Roads in Romania</p>	<p>Regarding the terms, we have road construction, upgrading and rehabilitation, not rebuilding/reconstruction. To be modified accordingly.</p>	<p>Page 52 Page 56 Page 60 Page 64</p>		<p>The terms requested have been inserted on: Page 47 Page 52 Page 56 Page 60 Page 64 Based on discussion with our desk officer, though, "rehabilitation" may not be an acceptable term / eligible activity. Needs double-checking! Rehabilitation has been later removed.</p>
<p>Ministry of Health</p>	<p>Regarding the Thematic Objective 9: at the Justification for selection, second paragraph: Currently there are cross-border differences – the general condition and the level of equipment of health care facilities in Hungary (especially the hospitals) is better, than in Romania, - The hospitals in Romania do not struggle with infrastructure but possibly with some deficiencies in infrastructure, and not degraded equipment, but possibly obsolete equipment. To be reformulated.</p>		<p>1.1.2 Justification for the choice of thematic objectives and corresponding investment priorities</p>	<p>The relevant text has been reformulated (also taking into account the necessary reduction of character count).</p>
<p>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</p>	<p>Types of actions 5/b Elaboration of detailed maps and data bases indicating natural and technological risks and land use – clarification needed: from where did you take this database and who will be the developer of this database? Please provide us (from the agriculture interest) with details on "land use" - who will be the developer / recipient of this database, and if are included the lands on which there were unwanted natural phenomena, etc. for these maps, there is a single base throughout Europe. If new maps are required in addition to existing ones EC can block funds on agriculture. To</p>	<p>page 35</p>	<p>2.5.1 Investment Priority 5/b</p>	<p>Changes have been made at the Bucharest Technical Meeting.</p>



	<p>be clarified.</p> <p>It should be noted that the way the actions were created was based on the needs of the area; they may have noticed that some maps are insufficient. To be clarified.</p>			
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	<p>Types of actions - Organization of field-related dissemination - workshops and seminars – Besides these ones we also propose Organizing actions for disseminating information</p>		2.1.1 Investment Priority 6/b	The word "actions" has been incorporated.
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	<p>Types of actions - Setting up common rules/legislation and protocols related to risk prevention and disaster management – Instead of Setting we propose Establishing</p>		2.5.1 Investment Priority 5/b	"Setting up" has been replaced with "Establishing".
Directorate for Strategies, Policies, Projects and Fisheries Resources Management	<p>Notes that the European Commission recently changed its view regarding nitrate pollution - impact environmental strategies; from 2014, the entire Romanian territory is covered by this assessment (possibly Hungary also?).</p> <p>The consultant should analyse how and where this evaluation is applicable and if any implication has on the priority axes of the Programme.</p>			<p>True, nitrate pollution of water bodies is present in both countries. At this stage, however, we do not propose additional analyses. Nevertheless, interventions aimed at safeguarding water quality are eligible under PA1, so the selected priorities allow for interventions related to nitrate pollution. No change is necessary.</p>
Apuseni Natural Park	<p>TO6 – Justification for selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These include nature protections areas, medieval monuments - we propose historical monuments - While some of them have already been rehabilitated – and can be rehabilitated as individual values, experience shows that the long-term, sustainable use of these standalone values is problematic - we propose a re-formulation - While in isolation many of these values seem insignificant, 	page 33,	1.1.2 Justification for the choice of thematic objectives and corresponding investment priorities	<p>The word medieval has been replaced with historic</p> <p>Both requested sentences have been reformulated to add more clarity.</p>



	groups of them form a critical mass that – if developed, organized and managed in a coordinated manner – can become attractive for visitors from inside and also from outside the eligible area.- we propose a re-formulation			
Apuseni Natural Park	6/b - Description of the type and examples of actions to be supported and their expected contribution / Types of actions: Organization of field-related dissemination - workshops and seminars - we propose adding awareness of local population	page 44	2.1.1 Investment Priority 6/b	Awareness raising of local population" has been added.
Apuseni Natural Park	PA1 - Result indicators corresponding to the specific objective – we propose a re-formulation: The quality of cross-border surface water and groundwater, depending on chemical and biological parameters that correspond to "good" or "very good" mark		2.1.1 Investment Priority 6/b	We would not suggest to change the indicator with the addition proposed. However, this could be included in the separate paper on indicator methodology. Nevertheless, together with the ex ante team more precise wording is being considered.
Apuseni Natural Park	PA1 output indicators: Capacity of high water drainage reservoirs (programme specific output indicator) – What does this mean? In the CBC area are numerous wetlands that are important for biodiversity. Is it desired their drainage? Or is it desired the construction of 'tanks' to collect the drained water? ... from where is the water drained? This paragraph is very unclear and possible with harmful consequences for the environment. To be clarified, re-formulated.		2.1.1 Investment Priority 6/b	The output indicator has been eliminated.



<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA1 result indicator: Number of overnight stays in the eligible programme area. – we propose a re-formulation: This is not a strong indicator, because you can visit a historic or natural object without the need for accommodation. More relevant is the "number of visitors" for a particular purpose, especially since this number given by those who administer these objectives. We cannot make the connection between tourists staying at a hostel, for example, and the visits made by them in the area. We cannot know if they visit one objective or 10. Maybe there are visitors that are not staying in the area, or not overnight at all, but instead visit many objectives ... Anyway, there is not a direct correlation between the degree of access to objectives and the number of accommodations.</p>		<p>2.1.2 Investment Priority 6/c</p>	<p>This indicator has been discussed and finally agreed. This is a measurable indicator, available from statistics, and also a baseline value can be identified (which is required by the Commission). The indicator proposed is more difficult to measure and no baseline value can be provided. No change has been made.</p>
<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA1 output indicators - 6/c 2 Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status (Common output indicator) – we propose a re-formulation: Number of habitats and species that maintain or have acquired higher degrees of conservation due to the application of the Programme. To be analysed what is more appropriate to be measured/monitored.</p>		<p>2.1.2 Investment Priority 6/c</p>	<p>The indicator proposed is a common output indicator from the list provided by the EC. Wherever possible, these indicators are supposed to be applied without change.</p>



<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA1 output indicators - 6/c 4 Total length of newly built roads – It should be detailed e.g.: The total length of newly constructed roads by natural and cultural objectives, the walking trails, and touristic themes in the protected natural areas. Or more simply and comprehensively formulated: Visiting Infrastructure newly built (no. of km of roads to natural and cultural objectives, trails, touristic themes, number of visitor centres, etc.).</p>		<p>2.1.2 Investment Priority 6/c</p>	<p>1. Road development of any kind under this Priority is only possible if it is linked to an attraction / development of an attraction - standalone road projects are not eligible. 2. the proposed output indicator is a common output indicator - see the previous comment. 3. There is a footnote added regarding the use of this output indicator - it may not even be used. Later the output indicator has been eliminated.</p>
<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA1 output indicators - 6/c 5 Total length of reconstructed roads - First of all reconstructed should be replaced with repaired. In our opinion, at first the visitor infrastructure should be developed for targeted objectives and then the building of roads. What is there to see at the end of a new road? Only after the counting of the visitors and if there is something to see, where to spend time in a pleasant and civilized manner, they will remain in the area and the number of overnight stays can be accurately measured.</p>		<p>2.1.2 Investment Priority 6/c</p>	<p>See the previous answer - we use the exact wording of the EC's common output indicator.</p>
<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA4 result indicator - Options to choose from: - Decreasing rate of deceased patients from leading causes of death - Increasing rate of health status screening in diseases which are leading causes of death - Self - perceived general health has improved based on European Health Interview Survey – We suggest a re-formulation of the chosen option.</p>		<p>2.4.1 Investment Priority 9/a</p>	<p>These have already been modified to indicators (options) reflecting the agreement of the Technical Meeting in Budapest. The current proposal is the number of in-patient days in hospitals.</p>
<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA4 output indicators 9/a 1 Population covered by improved health services – we propose a re-formulation</p>		<p>2.4.1 Investment Priority 9/a</p>	<p>The indicator proposed is a common output indicator from the list provided by the EC (in the ETC regulation). Wherever possible, these indicators are supposed to be applied without change.</p>



<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p>	<p>PA5 result indicator - Satisfaction rate of local administrations with the joint emergency and risk prevention - What unit of measure would have the satisfaction rate of the local government in order to be quantifiable and, therefore, considered one of the "Result Indicators that match the specific objective"? Perhaps it would be more appropriate criteria in the genre: minimum time or efficiency in emergency response. Please clarify.</p>		<p>2.5.1 Investment Priority 5/b</p>	<p>This indicator reflects the agreement made at the Technical Meeting in Budapest. More details regarding the methodology of measurement is provided in the indicator methodology developed by the ex ante team.</p>
<p>Apuseni Natural Park</p> <p>National Administration "Romanian Waters"</p> <p>National Administration "Romanian Waters"</p>	<p>PA6 result indicator- Level of the cross-border cooperation intensity of the public and non-profit organizations – the same comment as above.</p> <p>From the Report and Program we don't understand where the floods and droughts will be introduced. Is it improving transboundary water management (sharing of resources) or risk management? Now they are at PA1 and PA5. In the Program the cross border water is inserted at the second category and we think that this will not have a significant cross border impact.</p> <p>We need to have one clear view where the flooding problems will be inserted in the Program. In JWG we don't have an expert on water. If there is flooding, you should go there and intervene. If you are working on the prevention of floods, and if there are several options for prevention, the differences between the two or more</p>		<p>2.6.1 Investment Priority 11/a</p>	<p>This indicator reflects the agreement made at the Technical Meeting in Budapest. More details regarding the methodology of measurement is provided in the indicator methodology has been developed by the ex ante team.</p> <p>It is a valid comment. Currently flood-related activities are present under PA1 IP 6b, but only as long as the flood has negative impacts on water quality. This limitation stems from the focus of the intervention priority – which is water quality improvement. The relevant type of action is: "Prevention and mitigation of the negative impacts of significant water pollutions caused by flood, collection and use of excess water, measurements for the mitigation of flood risks".</p> <p>Currently flood prevention is not explicitly present in in PA5, IP5b.</p> <p>This issue has already been indicated to the JWG, but the JWG decided to retain PA1, IP6b, which has a focus on water quality, and address floods there (with limitations, however – see our answer above).</p>



	versions need to be pointed out clearly.			
--	--	--	--	--

The final draft Environmental Report incorporated the conclusions of the opinions expressed.

4.4 Consultation on the Environmental Report

The consultation on the final draft Environmental Report took place between 6th May 2015 and 5th June 2015 both in Romania and in Hungary. As part of this consultation, the environmental authorities and the public from Hungary and the public from Romania were invited to review the final draft Environmental Report⁶.

In Romania, for the public consultation the following documents were posted on the official sites of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests) and Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration

- the Draft Environmental Report in Romanian and English language,
- the draft programme document in English,
- the summary in Romanian of the programme document,
- a schedule of the SEA procedure, and
- an Official information on how the partner state (Hungary) has covered the environmental assessment procedure, in order to inform and the public in Romania.

The interested public was invited to express their opinions through the websites in written form.

In Hungary for the public consultation the following documents were posted on the official site of the Prime Minister's Office:

- the Draft Environmental Report in English language,
- the Non-technical summary in Hungarian language
- the draft programme document in Hungarian,

Hungarian authorities and the interested public were invited to express their opinions through the website in written form.

The required documents were available on the websites of the relevant Ministries:

In Romania:

- on the website of the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration: <http://www.mdrap.ro/dezvoltare-regionala/-4970/-7572/-1369>
- on the website of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change in Romania (after the reorganisation Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests)

⁶ The environmental authorities and the members of the Romanian Working Group for Environmental Assessment had the opportunity to submit their observations to the programme during its established interval for public consultation.



<http://www.mmediu.ro/categorie/evaluare-de-mediu-pentru-strategii-planuri-programe/60.ro>.

In Hungary:

- on the Prime Minister's Office special website concerning development policy: http://palyazat.gov.hu/forum_topic_pate/840/filter?offset=0&theme_filter=

Subsequently to the consultation responses being collected, an explanation shall be given showing how the Environmental Report and consultation responses from both countries have been taken into consideration in the final cooperation programme. In both countries the statement on the SEA provides information on how environmental considerations have been integrated into the plan or programme and how the Environmental Report prepared pursuant to Article 5 of the Directive, the opinions expressed pursuant to Article 6 of the Directive and the results of consultations entered into pursuant to Article 7 of the Directive have been taken into account in accordance with Article 8 of the Directive and the reasons for choosing the plan or programme as adopted, in the light of the other reasonable alternatives dealt with.

In Romania the Official information on the Strategic Environmental Assessment procedure of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme informs the public on how the SEA process has been implemented in Hungary. This Official Information includes information on how the environmental authorities and the public were involved in the consultation of the Environmental Report and the contributions received from these stakeholders. The Official information includes: information submitted by the SEA consultant on how the partner state organised the national environmental assessment procedure, in order to inform the public and Romania. This document was posted on the official websites of the Romanian Ministry of Environment and the Romanian Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration, for public consultation.

The results of the consultation on the Environmental Report were as follows:

In Romania:

During the public consultation there were not received any comments and observations from the Romanian public.

In Hungary:

The environmental authorities agreed with the content of the Environmental Report. The content of the report was approved by the environmental authorities. Some of the environmental authorities sent comments which are related mainly to measures to prevent and reduce the considerably harmful environmental impacts. In the frame of the consultation on the Environmental Report, stakeholders also sent environment-related suggestions that are directly related to the content of the cooperation programme.

Relevant comments from the environmental authorities and other stakeholders:

- The geological environmental risks and risks for geological hazards are to be forecasted and investigated in the affected areas.
- Special build-ups in the territories of the Mining District Authorities are to be discovered and investigated as potential conflicts between the planned investments and the built environment (e.g. oil or gas pipelines).
- Environmental conflicts caused by the use of non-renewable resources should be investigated.

- The main purpose of Land Administration of Csongrád County is that sustainability principles should prevail. The qualitative and quantitative protection of land is required in case of all programmes. Soil protection is an essential task of agro-environmental management. The investment under the programme should be designed in a manner that does not damage the quality of soil. Therefore it is required that in case of activities subject to authorization procedure, the place of investments should be made on land of lower quality and with the use of as less agricultural land as possible.
- In order to fulfil the requirements of the Law CXXIX from 2007 on Land Protection the following are suggested: (1) Agricultural land is to be used for other purposes only with official authorization, (2) In case of activities subject to authorization procedure, the place of investments should be made on land of lower quality and with the use of as less agricultural land as possible, (3) Investments should not limit the use of agricultural land.
- The following measures are recommended in order to reduce air pollution in the affected regions: (1) The use of renewable energy resources by households should be enforced wherever possible, (2) Air quality considerations should be taken into account when planning bicycle road tracks, (3) In case of road development, the development of green areas between the roads and settlements, planting of large deciduous trees and bushes should be enforced, (4) Pollen monitoring stations should be included among the eligible activities as in mainly in Romania, there are no pollen monitoring stations, (5) In order to improve waste management and waste collection of the eligible area, consultation activities within the Romanian and Hungarian authorities, awareness raising campaigns, communication activities for the public should be preferred.
- The Non-Technical summary states: “The whole eligible area has a diverse natural environment and is rich in protected natural areas - among others, many NATURA 2000 sites.” NATURA 2000 sites are not the same as protected natural areas, fine-tuning of the above mentioned statement is suggested: “The whole eligible area has a diverse natural environment and is rich in protected natural areas, protected natural areas of community interest and NATURA 2000 sites.”
- The Non-Technical summary presents the major sources of soil degradation including soil erosion due to wind, erosion due to water, landslides, drought and regular excess of humidity in the soil. It is suggested to present other important soil degradation sources, as weeding of grasslands due to the reduction of grazing animals, the extension of invasive weeds.
- It is suggested that in case of bicycle road development, development of bike stands or bike stations is preferred.

Following the comments and observations mentioned above, received from the public and the authorities, the SEA Report was supplemented with measures to prevent and reduce the considerably harmful environmental impacts, listed in Chapter 7.1. and reformulations in the Non-technical Summary.



5 MONITORING MEASURES

According to Article 10 of the SEA Directive, the significant environmental effects of the implementation of plans and programmes shall be monitored in order to identify at an early stage unforeseen adverse effects, and to be able to undertake appropriate remedial action.

The proposed monitoring system is based on the relevant environmental objectives specified in Chapter 5.1. of the Environmental Report. In general, the purpose of environmental objectives is to improve environmental indicators.

As a general rule, the Environmental Report uses the monitoring arrangement proposed for the programming document to avoid confusion and duplication. Therefore, the proposed indicators for the programming document has been analysed from the environmental point of view.

The programme's specific result indicators or the programme's specific output indicators proposed for the programming document cover the most significant environmental effects at programme level. Therefore, only a limited number of new indicators are recommended based on the relevant environmental objectives.

The proposed environmental indicators, the programme specific result indicators or the programme specific output indicators are connected to the relevant environmental objectives. In this way the proposed monitoring arrangements are realistic and may use information generated during the environmental evaluation of the proposed projects. The SEA team proposes to selectively use monitoring indicators to monitor environmental effects based on the characteristics of the projects selected for funding.

The proposed SEA environmental indicators based on the relevant environmental objectives:

Monitoring indicator: I1: number of actions which have impact on habitats in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number,

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions must have impact on the habitats

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS7

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

Monitoring indicator: I2: number of actions which have impact on NATURA 2000 sites in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number.

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions which concern NATURA 2000 sites must have positive impact on that

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS8

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

Specific source for providing the necessary data:

<http://natura.2000.hu>, <http://natura2000.ro>,

EEA - Natura 2000 data - the European network of protected site

Monitoring indicator: I3: number of actions impacting the elimination of pollution sources in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

⁷ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA

⁸ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA



Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions must have impact on the reduction of pollution sources

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS9

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

Monitoring indicator: I4: Number of actions having impact on landscape in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions must have impact on landscape

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS10

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

Monitoring indicator: I5: Number of sustainable routes in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions must contribute to sustainable transport including bicycle roads, sustainable public transport, hiking routes, etc.

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Database of count municipalities in Romania and database of Hungarian Road Company, Monitoring data at JS 11

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

Monitoring indicator: I6: number of actions contributing to the rehabilitated land in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions must contribute to the area of rehabilitated land

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS12

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

Monitoring indicator: I7: number of restored historical, natural and cultural heritage sites in the eligible area

Measurement unit: number

Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)

Baseline: no baseline

Target: all the actions must contribute to the improvement of cultural heritage

Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS13

Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects

⁹ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated

¹⁰ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated

¹¹ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated

¹² or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated

¹³ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated



The proposed indicators of the programming document relevant for the environmental objectives and the proposed SEA environmental indicators based on the relevant environmental objectives:

Legend for the correlation between the priority axes and the monitoring indicator:

++ - strong contribution

+ - indirect contribution

Environmental issue the indicator is relevant for	Relevant environmental objective	The Priority Axis from which the indicator derives and the correlation between the Priority Axis and the Monitoring indicator	Monitoring indicator (that results from the Relevant environmental objective)	Justification on how the indicator links to the specific objective of the PA	Description	Evaluation criteria what is expected as a result
Biodiversity, flora, fauna, NATURA 2000	O1 Protect and improve the conditions and functions of terrestrial, aquatic ecosystems against anthropogenic degradation, habitat fragmentation and deforestation	PA1 SO6/c ++	Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status	Common and programme specific output indicators with environmental relevance for SO6/c	Information is available in the programme document	



<p>Biodiversity, flora, fauna, NATURA 2000</p>	<p>O2 To provide a favourable state of prevention for the protected species and the sustainable use of biodiversity components.</p>	<p>PA1 SO6/b ++</p>	<p>I1: number of actions which have impact on habitats in the eligible area</p>	<p>The actions aim directly at eco-systems, with the improvement of their conditions or with the reduction of unfavourable impacts.</p> <p>The results can be efficiently measured by the specific parameters of the affected habitats.</p>	<p>Measurement unit: number, Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects) Baseline: no baseline Target: all the actions must have impact on the habitats Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS¹⁴ Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects</p>	<p>Positive impacts on wild habitats would be expected.</p> <p>Positive impact on biodiversity would be preferred.</p>
<p>Biodiversity, flora, fauna, NATURA 2000</p>	<p>O3 Preserve the natural diversity of flora, fauna and habitats in the protected area and potential Natura 2000 sites</p>	<p>PA1 SO6/b ++ PA1 SO6/c ++</p>	<p>I2: number of actions which have impact on NATURA 2000 sites in the eligible area</p>	<p>The actions focus directly on the Natura 2000, with the improvement of their conditions or with the reduction of unfavourable impacts.</p> <p>The results can be efficiently measured by the specific parameters of the affected areas.</p>	<p>Measurement unit: number Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects) Baseline: no baseline Target: all the actions which concern Natura 2000 sites must have impact on that Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS¹⁵ Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects Specific source for providing the necessary data: http://natura.2000.hu, http://natura2000.ro, EEA - Natura 2000 data - the European network of protected site</p>	<p>Conditions and conservation of nature protection areas are preferred.</p>

¹⁴ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated

¹⁵ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated



<p>Soil and land use</p>	<p>O4 Limit point and diffused pollution of soil and facilitate soil protection from water and wind erosion.</p>	<p>PA1 SO6/c ++</p>	<p>I4: Number of actions having an impact on landscape and soil in the eligible area</p>	<p>The actions aim directly to natural and cultural heritage, with the improvement of their conditions or with the reduction of unfavourable impacts.</p> <p>The results can be efficiently measured by relevant actions.</p>	<p>Measurement unit: number</p> <p>Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)</p> <p>Baseline: no baseline</p> <p>Target: all the actions must have impact on landscape and soil</p> <p>Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS¹⁶</p> <p>Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects</p>	<p>It is expected that actions with positive impact on landscape and soil quality exceeds the actions with negative impact.</p>
<p>Water (surface waters, ground waters)</p> <p>Air and fighting climate change</p>	<p>O5 Sustainability of water resources, protection of groundwater as sources of drinking water, systematic improvement of the chemical and ecological status of European waters.</p>	<p>PA1 SO6/b ++</p>	<p>Water quality (ecological condition) of crossborder rivers at the measurement points in the eligible area</p>	<p>Programme specific result indicator with environmental relevance for SO6/b</p>	<p>Information is available in the programme document</p>	
<p>Water (surface waters, groundwaters)</p>	<p>O6 Limit water pollution from point and diffuse pollution sources.</p>	<p>PA1 SO6/b ++</p>	<p>I3: number of actions impacting the elimination of pollution sources in the eligible area</p>	<p>The actions to be implemented focus on potential polluting sources in the water basin.</p>	<p>Measurement unit: number</p> <p>Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)</p> <p>Baseline: no baseline</p> <p>Target: all the actions must have impact on the reduction of pollution sources</p> <p>Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS¹⁷</p>	<p>Positive impact on water quality is expected.</p> <p>Decrease of waste is expected.</p>

¹⁶ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated

¹⁷ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated



					Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects
Air and fighting climate change	O7 Improvement and maintenance of air quality within the limits set by the laws.	PA2 SO7/b ++	I5: Number of sustainable routes in the eligible area	The actions aim directly to improve the cross-border road connections. The development of road links contributes to the improvement of air-quality and the reduction of GHG emissions.	Measurement unit: number Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects) Baseline: no baseline Target: all the actions must contribute to sustainable transport including bicycle roads, sustainable public transport, hiking routes, etc. Source of data: Project level progress reports, Database of count municipalities in Romania and database of Hungarian Road Company, Monitoring data at JS ¹⁸ Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects
		PA2 SO7/c ++	Number of cross-border public transport services developed / improved	Common and programme specific output indicators with environmental relevance for SO7/c	Information is available in the programme document
Water (surface waters, groundwaters) Air and fighting	O8 Promoting policies and measures to adapt to climate change.	PA1 SO6/b ++	Number of measurement points positively affected by the interventions (after the completion of the project)	Common and programme specific output indicators with environmental relevance for SO6/b	Information is available in the programme document

¹⁸ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated



<p>climate change</p>		<p>PA5 SO 5/b +</p>	<p>Quality of the joint risk management</p>	<p>Programme specific result indicator with environmental relevance for SO5/b</p>	<p>Information is available in the programme document</p>	
<p>Landscape</p>	<p>O9 Ensure protection of natural and cultural landscape (e.g. by revitalization of brownfields)</p>	<p>PA1 SO6/c ++</p>	<p>I6: number of actions contributing to the rehabilitated land in the eligible area</p>	<p>Revitalization of former industrial sites is closely connected to the preservation of natural landscape, e.g. replacing the usage of soil in case of rehabilitated brownfields.</p>	<p>Measurement unit: number Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects) Baseline: no baseline Target: all the actions must contribute to the area of rehabilitated land Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS¹⁹ Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects</p>	<p>The areas affected by revitalization would be preferred in case of investment actions.</p>
<p>Population and human health</p>	<p>O10 Facilitate improvement of human health by implementing measures aimed at pollution prevention and mitigation of old burdens (e.g. brownfields, mining waste, etc.)</p>	<p>PA4 SO9/a ++</p>	<p>Population having access to improved health services</p>	<p>Common and programme specific output indicators with environmental relevance for SO9/a</p>	<p>Information is available in the programme document</p>	
		<p>PA5 SO5/b ++</p>	<p>Population safeguarded by improved emergency response services (after</p>	<p>Common and programme specific output indicators with environmental relevance for SO5/b</p>	<p>Information is available in the programme document</p>	

¹⁹ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated



			the completion of projects)		
Material assets, cultural heritage inc. architectural and archaeological heritage	O11 Ensure protection of natural and cultural landscape by revitalization of brownfields and protection of natural habitats from fragmentation due to traffic corridors	PA1 SO6/c ++	17 Number of restored historical, natural and cultural heritage sites in the eligible area	The actions to be implemented focus on potential improvement of natural and cultural heritage sites.	<p>Measurement unit: number</p> <p>Frequency of reporting: yearly (if there are any projects)</p> <p>Baseline: no baseline</p> <p>Target: all the actions must contribute to the improvement of cultural heritage</p> <p>Source of data: Project level progress reports, Monitoring data at JS²⁰</p> <p>Data provider: beneficiaries of the projects</p>

²⁰ or by the programme body that shall receive the delegated attribution from the MA or directly by the MA, if the attribution shall not be delegated



ANNEX 1: TEXT OF THE ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR STARTING THE CONSULTATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

ANNOUNCEMENT - Public consultation on strategic environmental assessment Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme

In the course of the environmental assessment procedure for "Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary" Programme, we provide the following documents for public consultation:

- draft programme in English language;
- a summary of the draft programme in Romanian language;
- the environmental report, in English language;
- the environmental report in Romanian language (unofficial translation);
- the timetable of the environmental assessment conducted by Romanian Ministry of Environment, in Romanian language;
- an official information on how Hungary has undergone the environmental assessment procedure, including how the Hungarian public was involved in the proceedings, in English language;
- an information on how Hungary has undergone the environmental assessment procedure, including how the Hungarian public was involved in the proceedings, in Romanian language (unofficial translation).

Comments and proposals regarding the documents can be sent to the e-mail address luminita.andrei@mmediu.ro within 30 calendar days of the date of posting, until June 5th, 2015.