

## SWOT ANALYSIS FOR THE REREP PROJECT

### *“Development of National Environmental Information Systems”*

STRENGTHS (of the project)	WEAKNESSES (of the project)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A network was established that included all the participating countries which also provided a platform for know-how exchange</li><li>• Direct and flexible response to the identified country needs</li><li>• Foundation for the future</li><li>• Clarified priorities for EIS through the action plans in the report</li><li>• Facilitated improvements in the ministries (e.g. in Croatia: establishment of info-centre and EPA)</li><li>• NGOs were involved into the development of EIS</li><li>• We know the situation in the region concerning the monitoring systems</li><li>• Long-term planning of the project</li><li>• Facilitated PRTR development and Aarhus convention</li><li>• Step-by-step approach in management of the project</li><li>• Investments into the EIS insured further development of the systems (Croatia)</li><li>• Framework for NGO involvement into decision making/Aarhus convention/website development by the ministry (Romania, Croatia)</li><li>• Foundation for developing the PRTR directory (Croatia)</li><li>• Countries were strong enough to implement the project</li><li>• Trainings</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Overambitious aims in the first stage of the project</li><li>• High turnover of staff within the project’s beneficiaries, lack of qualified IT staff</li><li>• The funding was sufficient only for the part of Environmental Information Systems</li><li>• Local activities were lacking (Croatian NGO)</li><li>• Insufficient sharing of experience</li><li>• More targeted trainings</li><li>• Project didn’t satisfy all the needs</li><li>• Not all country reports consistent</li><li>• Action plans very broad, not always focused on Environmental Information Systems</li><li>• Limited coordination between REC/EEA/Steering committee</li><li>• Insufficient connection with the Ministries</li></ul>

## SWOT ANALYSIS FOR THE REREP PROJECT

### *“Development of National Environmental Information Systems”*

OPPORTUNITIES (for the project)	THREATS (to the project’s future)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further trainings at the National, Regional and local levels.</li> <li>• Technological infrastructure development (hardware + software)</li> <li>• Supporting development of EPAs</li> <li>• Support drive towards European harmonisation/integration and Aarhus and Aquis implementation</li> <li>• Update national action plans, exploiting further the national action plan items identified and support development of ‘local action plans’</li> <li>• Support stakeholder involvement</li> <li>• Support environmental journalism + independent NGO centres (technical support and capacity building for NGOs)</li> <li>• Trainings in use of SW compatible with GIS, etc.</li> <li>• Explore usability of Open Source software (open access + inexpensive)</li> <li>• Staff exchanges/study tours</li> <li>• Cooperate with EEA/other agencies (BG)</li> <li>• Work with publicly-accessible information centres</li> <li>• ‘help desk’, information reference centres or other support tools (in-country support)</li> <li>• Indicator-based reporting support</li> <li>• Integrate air quality data management</li> <li>• Develop a reporting system at the regional level</li> <li>• REReP as an innovative approach to regional cooperation and knowledge exchange</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertain future for REReP and financial uncertainty. Donor fatigue.</li> <li>• Changing political support. Environment is often not a priority.</li> <li>• High staff turnover in ministries</li> <li>• Inadequate legal frameworks and missing institution building.</li> <li>• Poor development and enforcement of environmental laws. Often weak commitment from industry.</li> <li>• Shifting priorities of the countries, diversification of the needs</li> <li>• Institutional changes in the region</li> <li>• priorities</li> <li>• Pilot project → Difficult to operationalise</li> <li>• Wide variety of ‘current states’</li> <li>• Not adequately addressing the digital divide</li> </ul>