To: Mr. Ján KUBIŠ  
Executive Secretary of the UN Economic Commission for Europe  
Fax: 0041 (0) 22 917 05 05

In response to your letter of 09 May 2011 (ref. N ECE/EHLM/254/2011/L)

Dear Mr. KUBIŠ,

I am pleased to remind you that the Republic of Armenia pursuing the goals of fulfilling its obligations and following the provisions of the Espoo convention, in particular those of Art. 3, point 1, within the time frame of informing its own public on the proposed activity on construction of the new nuclear unit in Armenia, has applied to the Secretariat of Espoo Convention with the request to familiarize the neighboring countries, irrespective of their membership in the Convention with the planned activity. In its actions Armenia was lead by the principle of the good-neighborly relations.

In conformity with Art. 3, point 2 of the Convention, the documentation on notifications contained the information on the planned activity, technical information, tables with calculated data and preliminary EIA, submitted by developer. Text of the notification contained the deadline for submitting the response from neighboring Parties. Within the mentioned timeframe Armenia did not get any substantial official response from the interested Party (in our region there are two Parties to the Convention – Armenia and Azerbaijan) on its intention to participate in the Trans-boundary EIA.

After the expiration of the mentioned deadline Armenia, by its letter of 18 October 2010, in accordance with the provision of Art. 3, point 4 of the Convention informed Secretariat of the Convention on its intention to implement EIA for construction of the new nuclear unit in Armenia, according to its national legislation and practice.
Only after this letter, and after expiration of the indicated deadline, the Secretariat of the Convention submitted to Armenia on October 21, the letter of the Permanent Mission of Azerbaijan in Geneva. By this letter the Mission stated the willingness of Azerbaijan to participate in the trans-boundary EIA. It also mentioned that the Government of Azerbaijan is still examining the issue and the official position of the country would be submitted later to the UNECE Secretariat. This formulation meant that the response of the Permanent Mission did not reflect the final official position of Azerbaijan. It is noteworthy that the promised official position of the Azerbaijan has never been submitted.

On the basis of the above-mentioned information and in accordance with the Art. 3 point 4 of the Espoo Convention, Armenia has no obligations towards Azerbaijan and has no intention to suspend the national EIA procedure.

Sincerely,

Aram Harutyunyan