



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
2 July 2015

Original: English

(advance copy)

Economic Commission for Europe

Meeting of the Parties to the Convention
on Environmental Impact Assessment
in a Transboundary Context

Meeting of the Parties to the Convention
on Environmental Impact Assessment in
a Transboundary Context serving as the
Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on
Strategic Environmental Assessment

Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Fourth meeting

Geneva, 26–28 May 2015

Report of the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment on its fourth meeting

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–5	3
A. Attendance	2–3	3
B. Organizational matters	4–5	3
II. Status of ratification	6–9	3
III. Compliance and implementation	10–23	4
IV. Subregional cooperation and capacity-building	24–25	7
V. Exchange of good practices	26–35	7
A. Good practice recommendations on the application of the Convention, to nuclear energy-related activities	26–30	7
B. Seminar on post-project analysis	31	8

C.	Other activities foreseen in the workplan	32	9
D.	Proposed activities not included in the workplan	33–35	9
VI.	Promoting ratification and application of the Protocol	36–39	10
VII.	Budget and financial arrangements and financial assistance.....	40–44	10
VIII.	Inputs to related international processes	45–46	11
IX.	Preparations for the next sessions of the Meetings of the Parties.....	47	12
X.	Presentation of the main decisions taken and closing of the meeting	48	12
Annexes			
I.	Convention questionnaire.....		13
II.	Protocol questionnaire.....		26

I. Introduction

1. The fourth meeting of the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment under the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention) and its Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (Protocol on SEA) was held from 26 to 28 May 2015 in Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by delegations from the following Parties to the Convention and the Protocol and other member States of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE): Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The European Union (EU) was represented by the European Commission. Statements on behalf of the EU and its member States were made by both the Commission and Latvia, which held the Presidency of the Council of the EU in the first half of 2015. A representative of the European Investment Bank (EIB) also attended.

3. Representatives of the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Health Organization (WHO) attended parts of the meeting. In addition, the following non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were present: Caucasus Environmental NGO Network (CENN); European ECO Forum; World Wide Fund for Nature Russia (WWF Russia); and Zoï Environment Network. Two independent experts also attended the meeting.

B. Organizational matters

4. The Chair of the Working Group, Ms. M. Masaityte (Lithuania), opened the meeting.

5. The Working Group adopted its agenda as set out in document ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/1.¹

II. Status of ratification

6. The secretariat presented a report on the status of ratification of the Convention (informal document ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/INF.2), its two amendments and the Protocol on SEA, as well as an informal note prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs on the implications of the entry into force of the first amendment pending fulfilment of the condition set in article 17, paragraph 3, of the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/INF.3).

¹ Documents for the meeting, as well as presentations made available to the secretariat, are available from <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=38654#/>.

7. The secretariat also reported that letters had been sent at the Bureau's request from the ECE Executive Secretary to ministers for foreign affairs and environment of States Parties and Signatories in September 2014 and then again to Parties in March 2015 with regard to the ratification process.² Bosnia and Herzegovina, Ireland and Italy had responded, providing information about their plans and procedures for the ratification of the two amendments and the Protocol; Denmark had replied that the process for the ratification of the two amendments was ongoing; and Switzerland had announced its intention to join the Protocol, but not earlier than the proposed amendments in national legislation — expected in 2018. In addition, the Russian Federation had expressed its intention to join the Convention and the Protocol, as soon as national legislation and procedures on EIA and SEA were in place and harmonized with other national and international legal frameworks.

8. The Working Group welcomed Liechtenstein's recent acceptance and Portugal's recent approval of the first amendment, but noted that 13 ratifications³ were still needed for the amendment to have effect. Delegates then provided information on their plans to ratify the Protocol and the two amendments to the Convention. The Working Group welcomed information from representatives of Azerbaijan, Belgium, Cyprus, Denmark, Greece, Latvia, the Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, the United Kingdom about the intentions of their countries and steps taken or planned towards ratification of the first amendment, and noted Armenia's concerns about the ratification of the first amendment. Representatives of France, Georgia and Greece also reported on their plans to ratify the Protocol.

9. The Working Group urged concerned Parties to ratify⁴ both amendments and the Protocol as soon as possible. Regarding the first amendment, it agreed that, at its next meeting in April 2016, depending on the number of ratifications still needed for the amendment to have effect it would consider avenues for the acceleration of the entry into effect of that amendment, including the adoption of a separate agreement modifying article 17, paragraph 3, and entering into force through a non-objection procedure once a deadline specified in the agreement had lapsed.

III. Compliance and implementation

10. The Chair of the Implementation Committee under the Convention and the Protocol presented the reports on the Committee's thirty-first and thirty-second sessions (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2015/4 and ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2015/6, respectively), as well as a summary of the work at the thirty-third session. Among others, the Committee had discussed the use of electronic tools for online meetings of the Committee, the follow-up to decision VI/2 of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) to the Convention regarding Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus and Ukraine, and a Committee initiative on the United Kingdom. Regarding Belarus, the Committee had not managed to meet the deadline set by the MOP, i.e., it had not been able to reflect in the report of its thirty-third session the conclusions of its thorough analysis of the steps undertaken by Belarus after the adoption of the Committee's report on its twenty-seventh session (decision VI/2, para. 63). The Committee hoped to fulfil that mandate at its thirty-fourth session, scheduled to take place in Geneva from 8 to 10 December 2015.

11. The Implementation Committee Chair also stressed the importance of reporting under the Convention and the Protocol, and encouraged Parties to respond to the Committee's calls for timely submission of national implementation reports in the next

² With regard to the process of ratification, accession, approval or acceptance.

³ Ratifications, accessions, approvals or acceptances.

⁴ Ratify, accede, approve or accept.

reporting round. Addressing issues related to documentation recently received by the Committee on different cases, he recalled that the Committee was neither a scientific body mandated to make a scientific determination of information included in the EIA documentation of a Party, nor a court of law; the Committee's aim was rather to serve Parties and to provide assistance in the proper implementation of the procedural obligations set out the Convention and the Protocol.

12. The Working Group noted information provided by Azerbaijan regarding progress in developing a new law on environmental impact assessment (EIA) and strategic environmental assessment (SEA) further to decision VI/2. It also noted the information reported by France, Romania and Ukraine on the prospective appointment of alternate members to the Committee, further to the amendment of the Committee's structure and functions and operating rules (decision VI/2, annexes I and II); and requested Belarus to clarify its representation on the Committee as soon as possible, following the recent departure of the main member nominated at the the most recent session of the MOP.

13. The Chair of the Working Group briefed participants about the Bureau discussion at its February meeting (Geneva, 5–6 February 2015) concerning compliance cases pending before the Implementation Committee and the Compliance Committee under the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention). The Chair of the Implementation Committee briefly presented the differences between the two bodies, the procedures under the two instruments and the informal cooperation of the Committee with the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee. The Working Group agreed that the Implementation Committee and the Working Group should keep each other informed whenever there was a link between the two Conventions, and invited the Implementation Committee to liaise, as appropriate, with the Compliance Committee under the Aarhus Convention to ensure a coherent and coordinated approach to the interpretation of the two instruments.

14. The Working Group then discussed the proposals of the Implementation Committee for modifying the EIA and SEA questionnaires (see informal documents ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/INF.6 and ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/INF.7). It approved the two questionnaires with a number of amendments and requested the secretariat to revise the documents accordingly and to arrange for their translation into the other official languages of the ECE, if possible as annexes to the meeting report (see annexes I and II). The Working Group also agreed a timetable for distribution and return of the EIA and SEA questionnaires and for the preparation by the secretariat of the draft fifth review of implementation of the Convention and the draft second review of implementation of the Protocol, as set out in informal document ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/INF.5. It requested that the EIA and SEA questionnaires be sent to Parties by 31 October 2015 for completion by 31 March 2016.

15. The Working Group also took note of information by the secretariat on the possibility of an online reporting mechanism, on the basis of a tool in use under the Aarhus Convention. It agreed that in the upcoming reporting cycle all Parties were to report by means of that online tool. Based on the experience gained, in view of the future reporting rounds, the two secretariats should cooperate for any technical improvements of the online tool, as needed.

16. The Working Group reviewed progress in the implementation of technical advice foreseen in or related to the workplan for 2014–2017. It welcomed information from the

secretariat⁵ and the delegations on the technical advice provided to Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus and Georgia under the EU-funded Greening Economies in the Eastern Neighbourhood (EaP GREEN) programme, as well as to Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Federation with the support of Switzerland and Sweden, respectively.

17. The secretariat then presented a draft outline on the planned subregional overview, based on legislative reviews on EIA and SEA combined with information gathered when developing general guidance on enhancing consistency between the Convention and environmental assessment within the framework of State ecological expertise. Paper copies of the draft were distributed to delegates. Taking into consideration that most activities relating to legislative reviews in countries that previously applied a framework of State ecological expertise were ongoing, the Working Group discussed the relevance and the potential added value of the activity, and reflected on the possibility of revising it. Delegates were invited to provide their views and comments on the draft outline presented and proposals for alternative the best possible use of available resources by 15 June 2015.

18. The Working Group took note of the information provided by the secretariat on the launching of the EU-funded project to provide legislative advice to Kazakhstan in the second half of 2015. It also took note of the change of activities, as compared to those in the workplan, due to reduced financing and the focus of the project on the water sector.

19. In the absence of any response from Uzbekistan on carrying out a legislative review on EIA with Switzerland's support, at Switzerland's proposal, the Working Group agreed to reallocate those funds to activities on EIA in Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan.

20. The Working Group welcomed the table of concordance prepared by the editors of the United Nations listing discrepancies between the Protocol's three authentic language versions. At the request of the Bureau, the table had already been sent to France, Belarus and the United Kingdom for their review and comment. The Working Group thanked France for having already reviewed the table, and noted that Belarus and the United Kingdom had only preliminarily considered it. With a view to aligning the language versions of the Protocol, the Working Group invited Belarus, France and the United Kingdom to establish a task force to review the inconsistencies listed and to submit proposals on how to address them, distinguishing between inconsistencies of a technical nature only and those pertaining to substantive issues. Those proposals should be submitted for consideration by the Working Group at its session in April 2016. The Working Group requested the secretariat to arrange for the preparation of a similar table listing discrepancies between the texts of the authentic language versions of the Convention's two amendments. The task force was requested to also review any inconsistencies found in that regard and to prepare proposals to bring the three language versions into line for the Working Group's consideration at its next meeting.

21. The Working Group welcomed the report by the secretariat and the Chair of the Implementation Committee on the preparation of the guidance on the implementation of the Convention. It thanked EIB for its dedicated support to the implementation of the workplan activities under the Convention and the Protocol.

22. The Working Group welcomed the ongoing preparation of a video to promote the benefits of the Protocol in Eastern Europe and the Caucasus.

23. The Working Group also welcomed the publication of a number of texts, or their preparation for publication, including: the reprinting of the Convention text, including the

⁵ See unofficial document "Note on the progress of the implementation workplan activities under the "Greening Economies in the Eastern Neighbourhood" (EaP-GREEN) Programme, as well as activities in Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Federation (Dec 2013–May 2015)".

corrections introduced further to MOP decision VI/6 and the text of the first amendment, in force since 26 August 2014; the electronic publication of the opinions of the Implementation Committee, as well as the amended structure and functions and operating rules of the Committee; and the ongoing preparation of the fourth review of implementation of the Convention and the first review of implementation of the Protocol, which would be published electronically.

IV. Subregional cooperation and capacity-building

24. The Working Group welcomed reports provided by:

(a) Romania, on its plans to organize a seminar on the multilateral agreement among the countries of South-Eastern Europe for the implementation of the Convention (Bucharest Agreement) in late 2015; and to hold a first meeting of the Parties to the Bucharest Agreement in 2016;

(b) The secretariat, on the organization of a workshop for the Mediterranean subregion in Rabat on 14 and 15 April 2015;

(c) Germany, on the organization of the Seventh Seminar on Cooperation on the EIA Convention in the Baltic Sea Region, held in Berlin on 6 and 7 November 2014;

(d) Lithuania, on the arrangements for the Eighth Seminar in the Baltic Sea Region, to be held in Vilnius on 28 and 29 September 2015;

(e) Latvia, on the arrangements for the Ninth Seminar in the Baltic Sea Region to be held in 2016.

25. The secretariat informed the Working Group about the implementation of several other activities for subregional cooperation and capacity-building foreseen in the workplan, notably the organization of a study tour in the Czech Republic from 1 to 5 December 2015 and the arrangements for the subregional conference to exchange experience in drafting EIA and SEA legislation to be held from 19 to 21 October in Georgia. The secretariat also reported that the joint capacity-building activities with the Aarhus Convention for Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia in 2015–2016 had been delayed and might be cancelled.

V. Exchange of good practices

A. Good practice recommendations on the application of the Convention to nuclear energy-related activities

26. The Working Group discussed the terms of reference for the preparation of good practice recommendations on the application of the Convention to nuclear energy-related activities (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2015/3), prepared by the secretariat in consultation with the Bureau. It considered comments by the EU emphasizing the objective of the recommendations, with reference to decision VI/7 (see ECE/MP.EIA/20/Add.1-ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/4/Add.1) and the Geneva Declaration adopted in 2014 (ECE/MP.EIA/20/Add.3–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/4/Add.3, Declaration, paras. A.4 and A.10). It also considered interventions by Belarus, Ukraine and the European ECO Forum. It then agreed on the following general observations:

(a) The good practice recommendations were to serve as guidance for the implementation of the Convention, illustrating good practice through specific examples;

(b) The scope of the document should be delimited within the scope of the Convention;

(c) The relevant MOP decisions and the opinions of the Implementation Committee should be considered as the main sources for the preparation of the document, and, as appropriate, existing relevant nuclear safety instruments (such as the International Atomic Energy Agency standards or those set in the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom Treaty));

(d) The ad hoc editorial group, established by the MOP with a mandate to oversee the development of the draft recommendations should aim for consensus in making recommendations.

27. The Working Group also agreed that the selection of the consultant to the secretariat should be done in consultation with the editorial group.

28. The Working Group then agreed on specific revisions to the text of the terms of reference, and requested the secretariat to arrange for their translation into French and Russian. Subject to the availability of sufficient funds, the first draft of the recommendations would be discussed by the Working Group at its next meeting in April 2016.

29. The Working Group emphasized that it would ultimately be for the MOP to consider and adopt the recommendations. Concerning the budget for the activity, the Working Group thanked Germany for its willingness to contribute US\$ 5,000 in 2016, subject to the availability of funds in the national budget that would have to be adopted by the German parliament later in 2015. It also noted that the EU contribution of US\$ 10,000 from the EaP GREEN Programme funds, which the EU delegation had pledged at the most recent sessions of the Meetings of the Parties, would still be subject to approval by the EaP GREEN Programme Steering Committee at its next meeting (Chisinau, 18 June 2015).

30. The representative of the OECD Nuclear Energy Agency provided a brief account of the activities in that forum. The Working Group welcomed his participation and intervention.

B. Seminar on post-project analysis

31. A representative of Belarus chaired a seminar on post-project analysis in the framework of the current meeting, which had been organized by Belarus with the support of the secretariat and an international expert. The Working Group welcomed the workshop, expressing thanks to the European Commission for moderating the discussions and to the delegations that had contributed with presentations. The Working Group agreed on the following main conclusions:⁶

(a) There is not much experience in applying post-project analysis, and there was a need to further develop that practice at the national and transboundary levels;

(b) Best practice had been developed for some individual projects, including the pilot project on post-project analysis between Belarus and Ukraine for the Khotislavskoye deposits;⁷

⁶ A summary of the presentations and the discussions is available on the web page of the meeting at: <http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=38654#/> under "presentations and statements".

⁷ The project was carried out with financial support from the Environment and Security Initiative.

(c) The provisions of the Convention and other EU and national legislation did not always address the necessity to carry out post-project analysis and did not provide details on how to carry it out;

(d) It was important to include post-project analysis also in bilateral agreements between Parties;

(e) The post-project analysis should already be agreed between States at the stage of the transboundary EIA consultations and be included as one of the conditions in the EIA documentation. Ideally the scoping (i.e., the definition of the scope of the EIA documentation) should cover post-project analysis;

(f) It would be appropriate to consider reviewing the report on *Post-Project Analysis in Environmental Impact Assessment*⁸ published in January 1990 during the next intersessional period with a view to revising the conclusions and recommendations on post-project analysis, taking into account considerations of access to information and public participation.

C. Other activities foreseen in the workplan

32. A representative of EIB confirmed the plans for the workshop to be held at the next Working Group meeting on the global application of the Convention and the Protocol with a focus on non-ECE countries and international financing institutions.

D. Proposed activities not included in the workplan

33. The secretariat reported on the development of good practice guidance on land-use planning, together with the Convention on Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents (Industrial Accidents Convention) and possible inputs from the ECE Committee on Housing and Land Management. The activity had been proposed and would be funded by EIB, with a view to promoting synergies on the application of the Industrial Accidents Convention and the Protocol on SEA. The Working Group took note of the draft terms of reference⁹ and noted that a draft of the guidance was expected to be submitted for its consideration at its next meeting in April 2016.

34. The secretariat provided further information on the overall budget and the activity's potential impact on the implementation of the other workplan activities. The Working Group thanked EIB for its readiness to support the proposed activity and the related organization of a workshop in the framework of the Working Group meeting in April 2016 to exchange experiences on approaches to land-use planning that took due account of the two instruments. It agreed that the inclusion of that activity in the workplan should not interfere with the implementation of activities included in the workplan adopted by the MOP. In that connection, the secretariat reported that, at its fifth meeting (Geneva, 11–13 May 2015), the Working Group on Development under the Industrial Accidents Convention had established a small group of experts on land-use planning to support the deliberations of the Working Group on Development. The Working Group on EIA and SEA agreed that representatives of the Parties to the Convention and the Protocol and other

⁸ United Nations sales publication, No. E.90.II.E.6. Available from <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/conventions/environmental-assessment/enveiapublications/official-publicationsguidance/1990/post-project-analysis-in-environmental-impact-assessment.html>.

⁹ The draft terms of reference are available on the meeting web page as an unofficial document.

stakeholders should also participate in that small group to follow more closely the work on the activity and support the deliberations of the Working Groups, including on the terms of reference for the international consultant, before their finalization. To that end, it invited Parties to inform the secretariat about their possible representation in the small group by 15 June 2015.

35. Finally, the Working Group considered the organization of a workshop to share experiences on receiving legislative assistance. The activity had been proposed by a member of the Implementation Committee representing Armenia at the Committee's thirty-first session (Geneva, 2–4 September 2014) and discussed by the Bureau at its most recent meeting. The Working Group took into account the expression of interest by countries that had received such assistance, and decided that the workshop would take place in the context of the subregional conference to exchange experience in drafting EIA and SEA legislation in Georgia (see para. 25 above). The outcomes of the workshop would be reported to the Working Group's next meeting.

VI. Promoting ratification and application of the Protocol

36. The Working Group welcomed the information provided by the secretariat and delegations on the development of legislation on SEA and the implementation of training and pilot projects under the EaP GREEN Programme foreseen in the workplan. Some of these activities, such as the planned organization of training and a pilot project in Georgia, diverged from the original workplan activities, due to changes in the demand and needs of the recipient countries and also to avoid overlaps with other donors implementing similar activities.

37. The Working Group also welcomed information provided by the secretariat, delegations and the NGOs involved in the development of legislation on SEA, and training and pilot projects in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and the Russian Federation. In Kazakhstan activities would focus on SEA in the water sector; for Kyrgyzstan, technical assistance would not be limited to EIA, but would also extend to SEA; and a project on the pilot application of SEA in the "Strategy of socioeconomic development of the Zabaikal Region until 2030" had been prepared in cooperation with the Russian Federation, but funding was still not certain.

38. The secretariat and a representative of WHO presented two informal pamphlets or "FasTips" from the International Association for Impact Assessment on key issues in impact assessment practice — one on "Health Impact Assessment" and another on "Non-Technical Summary".¹⁰ The Working Group took note of the presentation.

39. The Working Group finally encouraged Parties to submit case studies to the secretariat on the application of the Protocol on SEA by end of September 2015 for consideration at the Working Group's meeting and for their publishing on the Convention website.

VII. Budget and financial arrangements and financial assistance

40. The secretariat presented the biannual financial report for the period to 31 December 2015.¹¹ It was recalled that, further to the implementation of International Public Sector

¹⁰ Available from <http://www.iaia.org/publications-resources/fastips.aspx>.

¹¹ See biannual financial report under item 7, unofficial documents on the meeting web page.

Accounting Standards (IPSAS) by the United Nations,¹² Parties' contributions to the trust fund were to be classified as "non-conditional" as they were directed towards implementation of the workplan in general. That would be the case for all contributions received, unless there was an agreement signed between the donor and ECE. Moreover, the secretariat clarified that, as long as the contributions aimed to implement activities described in the workplan, there should be no requirement for specific financial or substantive reporting other than the current biannual reporting by the secretariat on the use of resources.

41. In the light of the report, the Working Group acknowledged the shortfall between the financial contributions received and the expenditure necessary to fulfil the workplan and the expected functions of the secretariat. It also noted budget losses due to recent currency fluctuations that had mainly affected large contributions. Budget losses had also been experienced under the EaP GREEN Programme for 2015.

42. The Chair said that the Bureau had carried out a selection procedure on the basis of several criteria, such as the activities of the NGOs pertaining to the Convention and the Protocol and especially the financial situation. The Bureau had agreed that experts of the following NGOs would receive assistance for their participation in meetings under the Convention and the Protocol: CENN; EcoGlobe (Armenia); the European ECO Forum; Research Centre for Development and Dialogue (Studio D) (Albania); and WWF Russia. The Bureau had decided not to provide financial support to representatives and experts from States outside the ECE region for the present meeting.

43. In that regard, the secretariat presented a document prepared by ECE with a view to providing an overview of the key challenges to and opportunities for ensuring the sustainability and quality of the support provided by the ECE multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) secretariats in the mid to longer term. The EU took note of the document and recalled decision VI/4-II/4 on budget, financial arrangements and financial assistance. Switzerland welcomed the note and emphasized the need to scale up funding to allow for predictable planning in implementing the workplan through the introduction of the mandatory scheme of contributions based on the United Nations scale of assessments, which could be decided at the next MOP. The Working Group took note of the document and the interventions, and requested Parties to submit specific proposals on sustainable financing by the end of September 2015.

44. The Working Group noted the staff changes in the secretariat since the most recent sessions of the MOPs (June 2014) and the upcoming changes as of 1 June 2015.

VIII. Inputs to related international processes

45. The Chair presented the outcomes of two meetings of the informal network of the representatives of the governing bodies of the ECE MEAs and the Committee on Environmental Policy in October 2014 and April 2015. The Working Group took note of the presentation and welcomed the ongoing efforts of the MEAs and Committee on Environmental Policy Chairs to find joint activities and synergies. The next meeting of the informal network was scheduled to take place in October 2015.

46. The Working Group noted information from WHO on the Environment and Health process, specifically the mid-term review (Haifa, Israel, 28 – 30 April 2015).

¹² See also information provided by the secretariat at the third meeting of the Working Group (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2013/7, para. 41).

IX. Preparations for the next sessions of the Meetings of the Parties

47. The secretariat reported that there had been no expression of interest yet by any Party to host the seventh session of the MOP to the Convention and the third session of the MOP to the Convention serving as the MOP to the Protocol. The Working Group invited Parties to consider hosting the MOPs and inform the secretariat as soon as possible, to allow for the timely initiation of the practical arrangements.

X. Presentation of the main decisions taken and closing of the meeting

48. The Working Group agreed on the main decisions taken at the meeting, as presented by the secretariat. The Chair closed the meeting on Thursday, 28 May 2015.

Annex I

Convention questionnaire

Questionnaire for the report of [NAME OF COUNTRY] on the implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context in the period 2013–2015

Information on the focal point for the Convention

1. Name and contact information:

Information on the point of contact for the Convention

2. Name and contact information (if different from above):

Information on the person responsible for preparing the report

3. Country:
4. Surname:
5. Forename:
6. Institution:
7. Postal address:
8. E-mail address:
9. Telephone number:
10. Fax number:
11. Date on which report was completed:

Part one

Current legal and administrative framework for the implementation of the Convention

In this part, please provide the information requested, or revise any information relative to the previous report. Describe the legal, administrative and other measures taken in your country to implement the provisions of the Convention. This part should describe the framework for your country's implementation, and not experience in the application of the Convention.

Please do not reproduce the text of the legislation itself but summarize and explicitly refer to the relevant provisions transposing the Convention text (e.g., EIA Law of the Republic of ..., art. 5, para. 3, of Government Resolution No. ..., para. ... item...)

Article 1

Definitions

I.1. Is the definition of impact for the purpose of the Convention the same in your legislation as in article 1?

- (a) Yes
- (b) Yes, with some differences (please provide details):
- (c) No (please provide the definition):
- (d) There are no definitions of impact in the legislation

Your comments:

I.2. Is the definition of transboundary impact for the purpose of the Convention the same in your legislation as in article 1? Please specify each below.

- (a) Yes
- (b) Yes, with some differences (please provide details):
- (c) No (please provide the definition):
- (d) There are no definitions of transboundary impact in the legislation

Your comments:

I.3. Please specify how major change is defined in your national legislation:

I.4. How do you identify the public concerned? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) Based on the geographical location of the proposed project
- (b) By making the information available to all members of the public and letting them identify themselves as the public concerned
- (c) By other means (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 2

General provisions

I.5. Provide legislative, regulatory, administrative and other measures taken in your country to implement the provisions of the Convention (art. 2, para. 2):

- (a) Law on EIA:
- (b) EIA provisions are transposed into another law(s) (please specify):
- (c) Regulation (please indicate number/year/name):
- (d) Administrative (please indicate number/year/name):
- (e) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.6. Please describe any differences between the list of activities in your national legislation and appendix I to the Convention, if any:

- (a) There is no difference, all activities are transposed in the national legislation as is
- (b) It differs slightly (please specify):

Your comments:

I.7. Identify the competent authority/authorities responsible for carrying out the EIA procedure in your country (please specify):

- (a) There are different authorities at national, regional, local levels
- (b) They are different for domestic and transboundary procedures
- (c) Please name the responsible authority/authorities:
- (d) There is no single authority responsible for the entire EIA procedure:

Your comments:

I.8. Is there an authority in your country that collects information on all the transboundary EIA cases? If so, please name it:

- (a) No
- (b) Yes (please specify):

Your comments:

I.9. How does your country, as Party of origin and as affected Party, ensure that the opportunity given to the public of the affected Party is equivalent to the one given to the Party of origin's public, as required in article 2, paragraph 6 (please explain):

Article 3 Notification

I.10. As Party of origin, when do you notify the affected Party (art. 3, para. 1)? Please specify:

- (a) During scoping
- (b) When the EIA report has been prepared and the domestic procedure started
- (c) After finishing the domestic procedure
- (d) At other times (please specify):

Your comments:

I.11. Please define the format of notification:

- (a) It is the format as decided by the first meeting of the Parties in its decision I/4 (ECE/MP.EIA/2, annex IV, appendix)
- (b) The country has its own format (please attach a copy)
- (c) No official format used

Your comments:

I.12. As a Party of origin, what information do you include in the notification (art. 3, para. 2)? Please specify (more than one options may apply):

- (a) The information required by article 3, paragraph 2
- (b) The information required by article 3, paragraph 5
- (c) Additional information (please specify):

Your comments:

I.13. As a Party of origin, does your national legislation contain any provision on receiving a response to the notification from the affected Party in a reasonable time frame (art. 3, para. 3, “within the time specified in the notification”)? Please specify:

- (a) National legislation does not cover the time frame
- (b) Yes, it is indicated in the national legislation (please indicate the time frame):
- (c) It is determined and agreed with each affected Party case by case in the beginning of the transboundary consultations (please indicate the average length in weeks):

Your comments:

Please specify the consequence if a notified affected Party does not comply with the time frame, and the possibility of extending a deadline:

I.14. How do you inform the public and authorities of the affected Party (art. 3, para 8)? Please specify:

(a) By informing the point of contact to the Convention listed on the Convention website¹³

(b) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.15. On what basis is the decision made to participate (or not) in the transboundary EIA procedure as affected Party (art. 3, para. 3)? Please specify:

(a) Notified ministry/authority of the affected Party responsible for EIA decides on its own based on the documentation provided by Party of origin

(b) Based on the opinions of the competent authorities of the affected Party

(c) Based on the opinions of the competent authorities and that of public of the affected Party

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.16. If the affected Party has indicated that it intends to participate in the EIA procedure, how are the details for such participation agreed, including the time frame for consultations and the deadline for commenting (art. 5)? Please specify:

(a) Following the rules and procedures of the Party of origin

(b) Following the rules and procedures of the affected Party

(c) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 4

Preparation of the environmental impact assessment documentation

I.17. How do you ensure sufficient quality of the EIA documentation as Party of origin? Please specify:

(a) The competent authority checks the information provided and ensures it includes all information required under appendix II as a minimum before making it available for comments

(b) By using quality checklists

(c) There are no specific procedures or mechanisms

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

¹³ List available from http://www.unece.org/env/eia/points_of_contact.htm.

I.18. How do you determine the relevant information to be included in the EIA documentation in accordance with article 4, paragraph 1? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) By using appendix II
- (b) By using the comments received from the authorities concerned during the scoping phase, if applicable
- (c) By using the comments from members of the public during the scoping phase, if applicable
- (d) As determined by the proponent based on its own expertise
- (e) By using other means (please specify):

Your comments:

I.19. How do you determine “reasonable alternatives” in accordance with appendix II, paragraph (b)?

- (a) On a case-by-case basis
- (b) As defined in the national legislation (please specify):
- (c) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 5

Consultations on the basis of the environmental impact assessment documentation

(a) Public participation

I.20. How can the public concerned express its opinion on the EIA documentation of the proposed project (art. 5)? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

As Party of origin

- (a) By sending comments to the competent authority/focal point
- (b) By taking part in a public hearing
- (c) Other (please specify):

As affected Party

- (d) By sending comments to the competent authority/focal point
- (e) By taking part in a public hearing
- (f) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.21. Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of a public hearing on the territory of the affected Party in cases where your country is the country of origin:

- (a) Yes
 (b) No

Your comments:

I.22. Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of public hearings in cases where your country is the affected Party:

- (a) Yes
 (b) No

Your comments:

(b) Consultations

I.23. Does your national EIA legislation have any provision on the organization of transboundary consultations (expert, joint bodies, etc.) between the authorities of the concerned Parties? Please specify:

- (a) Yes, it is obligatory
 (b) No, it does not have any provision on that
 (c) It is optional (please specify):

Your comments:

**Article 6
 Final decision**

I.24. Please indicate all points below that are covered in a final decision related to the implementation of the planned activity (art. 6, para. 1):

- (a) Conclusions of the EIA documentation
 (b) Comments received in accordance with article 3, paragraph 8, and article 4, paragraph 2
 (c) Outcome of the consultations as referred to in article 5
 (d) Outcomes of the transboundary consultations
 (e) Comments received from the affected Party
 (f) Mitigation measures
 (g) Other (please specify):

I.25. Are the comments of the authorities and the public of the affected Party and the outcome of the consultations taken into consideration in the same way as the comments from the authorities and the public in your country (art. 6, para. 1):

- (a) Yes
 (b) No

Your comments:

I.26. Is there any regulation in the national legislation of your country that ensures the implementation of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3?:

- (a) No
(b) Yes (please specify):

Your comments:

I.27. Do all activities listed in appendix I (items 1-22) require a final decision to authorize or undertake such an activity?:

- (a) Yes
(b) No (please specify those that do not):

Your comments:

I.28. For each type of activity listed in appendix I that does require a final decision, please indicate the legal requirements in your country that identify what is regarded as the “final decision” to authorize or undertake such an activity (art. 6 in conjunction with art. 2, para. 3), and the term used in the national legislation to indicate the final decision in the original language:

Your comments:

Article 7

Post-project analysis

I.29. Is there any provision regarding post-project analysis in your national EIA legislation (art. 7, para. 1)?:

- (a) No
(b) Yes (please specify the main steps to be taken and how the results of it are communicated):

Your comments:

Article 8

Bilateral and multilateral cooperation

(a) Agreements

I.30. Does your country have any bilateral or multilateral agreements based on the Convention (art. 8, appendix VI)?:

- (a) No
(b) Yes Please specify with which countries:

If publicly available, please also attach the texts of such bilateral and multilateral agreements, preferably in English, French or Russian.

I.31. What issues do these bilateral agreements cover (appendix VI)? (more than one option may apply):

- (a) Specific conditions of the subregion concerned
(b) Institutional, administrative and other arrangements
(c) Harmonization of the Parties’ policies and measures

(d) Developing, improving, and/or harmonizing methods for the identification, measurement, prediction and assessment of impacts, and for post-project analysis

(e) Developing and/or improving methods and programmes for the collection, analysis, storage and timely dissemination of comparable data regarding environmental quality in order to provide input into the EIA

(f) Establishment of threshold levels and more specified criteria for defining the significance of transboundary impacts related to the location, nature or size of proposed activities

(g) Undertaking joint EIA, development of joint monitoring programmes, intercalibration of monitoring devices and harmonization of methodologies

(h) Other, please specify:

Your comments:

(b) Procedural steps required by the national legislation

I.32. Please describe the steps required in your national legislation for a transboundary EIA procedure:

(a) When EIA in a transboundary context is part of a domestic EIA procedure:

(b) When EIA in a transboundary context is a separate procedure (please provide of how this procedure links to the domestic procedure and whether the steps are different):

Alternatively, this question can be answered or supported by providing a schematic flowchart showing these steps.

Your comments:

I.33. Does your country have special provisions or informal arrangements concerning transboundary EIA procedures for joint cross-border projects (e.g., roads, pipelines)?:

(a) No

(b) Yes (please specify):

(i) Special provisions:

(ii) Informal arrangements:

Your comments:

I.34. Does your country have special provisions or informal arrangements concerning transboundary EIA procedures for nuclear power plants (NPPs)?:

(a) No

(b) Yes (please specify):

(i) Special provisions:

(ii) Informal arrangements:

Your comments:

Part two Practical application during the period 2013–2015

Please report on your country’s practical experiences in applying the Convention (not your country’s procedures described in part one), whether as Party of origin or affected Party. The focus here is on identifying good practices as well as difficulties Parties have encountered in applying the Convention in practice. The goal is to enable Parties to share solutions. Parties should therefore provide appropriate examples highlighting application of the Convention and innovative approaches to improve its application.

II.1. Does your country object to the information on transboundary EIA procedures that you provide in this section being compiled and made available on the website of the Convention? Please specify (indicate “yes” if you object):

(a) Yes

(b) No

Your comments:

1. Experience in the transboundary environmental impact assessment procedure during the period 2013–2015

Cases during the period 2013–2015

II.2. If your country’s national administration has a record of transboundary EIA procedures that were under way during the reporting period, in which your country was Party of origin or affected Party, please list them in the tables II.2 (a) and II.2 (b) below (adding additional rows as needed).

Table II.2 (a)

Transboundary EIA procedures: As Party of origin

Name of case	Starting date (date notification sent)	Length of the main steps in months			Final decision (date of issuing, if information is available)
		Submission of the environmental report	Transboundary consultations (expert), if any	Public participation, including public hearing, if any	
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
...					

Your comments:

Table II.2 (a)
Transboundary EIA procedures: As affected Party

Name of case	Starting date (date notification sent)	Length of the main steps in months			Final decision (date of issuing, if information is available)
		Submission of the environmental report	Transboundary consultations (expert), if any	Public participation, including public hearing, if any	
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
...					

Your comments:

Please share with other Parties your country's experience of using the Convention in practice. In response to each of the questions below, either provide one or two practical examples or describe your country's general experience. You might also include examples of lessons learned in order to help others.

II.3. Translation is not addressed in the Convention. How has your country addressed the question of translation? What difficulties has your country as Party of origin and affected Party experienced relating to translation and interpretation, and what solutions has your country applied? (Please specify, among others, the parts and type of the documentation translated, language, costs, etc.):

- (a) As Party of origin:
- (b) As affected Party:

II.4. Describe any difficulties that your country has encountered during transboundary public participation (expert consultation, public hearing, etc.), including on issues of timing, language and the need for additional information:

II.5. Does your country have successful examples of organizing transboundary EIA procedures for joint cross-border projects or that of an NPP?:

- (a) Yes
- (b) No

II.6. If you answered yes to question II.5, please provide information on your country's experiences describing, for example, means of cooperation (e.g., contact points, joint bodies, bilateral agreements, special and common provisions, etc.), institutional arrangements, and how practical matters are dealt with (e.g., translation, interpretation, transmission of documents, etc.):

- (a) For joint cross-border projects:
- (b) For NPPs:

II.7. Name examples of good practice cases, whether complete cases or good practice elements (e.g., notification, consultation or public participation) within cases:

II.8. Would your country like to introduce a case in the form of a Convention “case study fact sheet”?

- (a) No
- (b) Yes (please indicate which cases):

II.9. Has your country carried out post-project analyses in the period 2013–2015:

- (a) No
- (b) Yes (please indicate which projects, along with the challenges in implementation and any lessons learned):

2. Experience in using the guidance in 2013–2015

II.10. Has your country used in practice the following guidance, adopted by the Meeting of the Parties and available online?:

(a) Guidance on Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (ECE/MP.EIA/7):

- No
- Yes (please provide details):
Your experience with using this guidance:

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance:

(b) Guidance on subregional cooperation (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex V, appendix):

- No
- Yes (please provide details):
Your experience with using this guidance:

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance:

(c) Guidance on the Practical Application of the Espoo Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/8):

- No
- Yes (please provide details):
Your experience with using this guidance:

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance:

3. Clarity of the Convention

II.11. Has your country had difficulties implementing the procedures defined in the Convention, either as Party of origin or as affected Party, because of a lack of clarity of the provisions?:

- No
- Yes (please indicate which provisions and how they are unclear):

4. Suggested improvements to the report

II.12 Please provide suggestions for how this report may be improved.

Annex II

Protocol questionnaire

Questionnaire for the report of [NAME OF COUNTRY] on the implementation of the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment in the period 2013–2015

Information on the focal point for the Protocol

1. Name and contact information:

Information on the point of contact for the Protocol

2. Name and contact information (if different from above):

Information on the person responsible for preparing the report

3. Country:
4. Surname:
5. Forename:
6. Institution:
7. Postal address:
8. E-mail address:
9. Telephone number:
10. Fax number:
11. Date on which report was completed:

Part one

Current legal and administrative framework for the implementation of the Protocol

In this part, please describe the legal, administrative and other measures taken in your country to implement the provisions of the Protocol. This part should describe the framework for your country's implementation, and not experience in the application of the Protocol.

Article 3

General provisions

I.1. Please provide the main legislative, regulatory and other measures you have adopted in your country to implement the Protocol (art. 3, para. 1) (more than one option may apply):

- (a) Law on SEA (please indicate number/year/name):
- (b) SEA provisions are transposed into another law(s) (please specify):
- (c) Regulation (please indicate number/year/name):
- (d) Administrative rule (please indicate number/year/name):
- (e) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 4

Field of application concerning plans and programmes

I.2. List the types of plans and programmes that require SEA in your legislation:

I.3. Explain how you define whether a plan or programme "set the framework for future development consent" (art. 4, para. 2):

I.4. Explain how the terms "plans and programmes ... which determine the use of small areas at local level" (art. 4, para. 4) are interpreted in your legislation:

I.5. Explain how you identify in your legislation a "minor modification" to a plan or programme (art. 4, para. 4):

Article 5

Screening

I.6. How do you determine which other plans and programmes should be subject to a SEA as set out in article 4, paragraphs 3 and 4, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1? Please specify:

- (a) On a case-by-case basis
- (b) By specifying types of plans and programmes
- (c) By using a combination of (a) and (b)

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.7. Do you provide opportunities for the public concerned to participate in screening and/or scoping of plans and programmes in your legislation (art. 5, para. 3, and art. 6, para. 3)?:

No

Yes (please specify (more than one option may apply)):

(a) By sending written comments to the competent authority

(b) By sending written comments to the local municipality

(c) By providing answers to a questionnaire

(d) By taking part in a public hearing

(e) By sending written comments to the consultants/SEA experts or persons preparing the plans and programmes

(f) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 6 Scoping

I.8. How do you determine what is the relevant information to be included in the environmental report, in accordance with article 7, paragraph 2 (art. 6, para. 1)?:

Article 7 Environmental report

I.9. How do you determine “reasonable alternatives” in the context of the environmental report (art. 7, para. 2)? Please specify:

(a) On a case-by-case basis

(b) As defined in the national legislation (please specify):

(c) By using a combination of (a) and (b)

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.10. How do you ensure sufficient quality of the reports? Please specify:

(a) The competent authority checks the information provided and ensures it includes all information required under annex IV as a minimum before making it available for comments

(b) By using quality checklists

(c) There are no specific procedures or mechanisms

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 8

Public participation

I.11. How do you ensure the “timely public availability” of draft plans and programmes and the environmental report (art. 8, para. 2)? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) Through public notices
- (b) Through electronic media
- (c) Through other means (please specify):

Your comments:

I.12. How do you identify the public concerned (art. 8, para. 3)? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) Based on the geographical location of the plans and programmes
- (b) Based on the environmental effects (significance, extent, accumulation, etc.) of the plans and programmes
- (c) By making the information available to all members of the public and letting them identify themselves as the public concerned
- (d) By other means (please specify):

Your comments:

I.13. How can the public concerned express its opinion on the draft plans and programmes and the environmental report (art. 8, para. 4)? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) By sending comments to the relevant authority/focal point
- (b) By providing answers to a questionnaire
- (c) Orally
- (d) By taking part in a public hearing
- (e) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.14. Do you have a definition in your legislation of the term “within a reasonable time frame” (art. 8, para. 4)? Please specify:

- (a) No, the time frame is determined by the number of days fixed for each commenting period
- (b) No, it is defined case by case
- (c) Yes (please provide the definition):
- (d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 9

Consultation with environmental and health authorities

I.15. How are the environmental and health authorities identified (art. 9, para. 1):

- (a) On a case-by-case basis:
- (b) As defined in the national legislation:
- (c) Other (please specify)

Your comments:

I.16. How are the arrangements for informing and consulting the environmental and health authorities determined (art. 9, para. 4):

- (a) On a case-by-case basis:
- (b) As defined in the national legislation:
- (c) Other (please specify)

Your comments:

I.17. How can the environmental and health authorities express their opinion (art. 5, para. 2, art. 6, para. 2, and art. 9, para. 3):

- (a) By sending comments
- (b) By providing answers to a questionnaire
- (c) In a meeting
- (d) By other means (please specify)

Your comments:

Article 10

Transboundary consultations

I.18. As a Party of origin, when do you notify the affected Party (art. 10, para. 1)? Please specify:

- (a) During scoping
- (b) When the draft plan or programme and the environmental report have been prepared
- (c) At other times (please specify):

Your comments:

I.19. As a Party of origin, what information do you include in the notification (art. 10, para. 2)? Please specify:

- (a) The information required by article 10, paragraph 2
- (b) The information required by article 10, paragraph 2, plus additional information (please specify):

Your comments:

I.20. As a Party of origin, does your legislation indicate a reasonable time frame for the transmission of comments from the affected Party (art. 10, para. 2)? Please specify:

- (a) No
(b) Yes (please indicate how long):

Your comments:

I.21. If the affected Party has indicated that it wishes to enter into consultations, how are the detailed arrangements, including the time frame for consultations, agreed (art. 10, paras. 3 and 4)? Please specify:

- (a) Following those of the Party of origin
(b) Following those of the affected Party
(c) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 11 Decision

I.22. When a plan or programme is adopted, explain how your country ensures, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 1, that due account is taken of:

- (a) The conclusions of the environmental report
(b) Mitigation measures
(c) Comments received in accordance with articles 8 to 10

Your comments:

I.23. How and when do you inform your own public and authorities (art. 11, para. 2)?:

I.24. How do you inform the public and authorities of the affected Party (art. 11, para. 2)? Please specify:

- (a) By informing the point of contact
(b) By informing the contact person of the ministry responsible for SEA, who then follows the national procedure and informs his/her own authorities and public
(c) By informing all the authorities involved in the assessment and letting them inform their own public
(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 12 Monitoring

I.25. Describe the legal requirements for monitoring the significant environmental, including health, effects of the implementation of the plans and programmes adopted under article 11 (art. 12, paras. 1 and 2):

Part two

Practical application during the period 2013–2015

In this part, please report on your country's practical experiences in applying the Protocol (and not your country's procedures, which were described in part one). The focus of this section should be on identifying good practices as well as difficulties encountered in applying the Protocol in practice. The goal is to enable Parties to share solutions. Please therefore provide appropriate examples highlighting application of the Protocol in your country and innovative approaches to improve its application.

II.1. Does your country object to the information on SEA procedures provided in this section being compiled and made available on the website of the Protocol? Please specify (indicate "yes" if you object):

(a) Yes

(b) No

Your comments:

1. Consideration of health effects

II.2. Does your SEA documentation always include specific information on health effects? Please specify:

(a) Yes

(b) No, only when potential health effects are identified

2. Domestic and transboundary implementation in the period 2013–2015

II.3. Does your SEA documentation always include specific information on potential transboundary environmental, including health, effects? Please specify:

(a) Yes

(b) No, only when potential transboundary effects are identified

3. Cases during the period 2013–2015

II.4. Please provide the (approximate) number of transboundary SEA procedures initiated during the period 2013–2015 and list them, grouped by the sectors listed in article 4, paragraph 2:

4. Experience with the strategic impact assessment procedure in 2013–2015

II.5. Has your country experienced substantial difficulties in interpreting particular terms (or particular articles) in the Protocol?:

(a) No

(b) Yes (please indicate which ones):

II.6. How does your country overcome the(se) problem(s), if any, for example by working with other Parties to find solutions? Please provide examples:

II.7. With regard your country's experience with domestic procedures, in response to each of the questions below, either provide one or two practical examples or describe your country's general experience. You might also include examples of lessons learned in order to help others. Please detail:

(a) Has your country carried out monitoring according to article 12 and, if so, for what kinds of plans or programmes (cite good practice cases or good practice elements (e.g., consultation or public participation), if available)?:

(b) Would your country like to present a case to be published on the website of the Convention and its Protocol as a "case study fact sheet"?:

(i) No

(ii) Yes (please indicate which ones):

II.8. With regard your country's experience with transboundary procedures, in response to each of the questions below, either provide one or two practical examples or describe your country's general experience. You might also include examples of lessons learned in order to help others. Please detail:

(a) What difficulties has your country experienced in relation to translation and interpretation, and what solutions has your country applied?:

(b) What does your country usually translate as a Party of origin?:

(c) Has your country carried out transboundary public participation according to article 10, paragraph 4?:

(i) No

(ii) Yes (please indicate how):

(d) What has been your country's experience of the effectiveness of public participation?:

(e) Does your country have examples of organizing transboundary SEA procedures for joint cross-border plans and programmes?:

(i) No

(ii) Yes (please describe):

5. Experience regarding guidance in 2013–2015

II.9. Are you aware of any use in your country of the online *Resource Manual to Support Application of the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment* (ECE/MP.EIA/17)?¹⁴:

- (a) No:
- (b) Part of it (Please specify):
- (c) Yes (please describe your experience):

Your comments on how the Guidance might be improved or supplemented:

6. Awareness of the protocol

II.10. Does your country see a need to improve the application of the Protocol in your country?:

- (a) No:
- (b) Yes Please describe how your country intends to improve application of the Protocol:

7. Suggested improvements to the report

II.11. Please provide suggestions for how this report may be improved:

¹⁴ Available from http://www.unece.org/env/eia/pubs/sea_manual.html.