

1. Regarding the Kok Zhailau ski resort: (a) Has a final decision to permit the ski resort yet been issued? If so, on what date was it issued? (b) Did you challenge the final permitting decision in court? If so, what was the outcome of your challenge?

Answer. a) Yes, a final decision has been issued. Unfortunately I haven't found exact date, it was 2014 year.

b) No, I didn't challenge the final permitting decision in court.

2. Regarding the road to the Kok Zhailau ski resort: (a) Has a final decision to permit the road to the ski resort yet been issued? If so, on what date was it issued? (b) Did you challenge the final permitting decision in court? If so, what was the outcome of your challenge?

Answer. a) Yes, a final decision has been issued. Unfortunately I haven't found exact date, it was 2015 year.

b) No, I didn't challenge the final permitting decision in court.

3. Please confirm that your communication specifically concerns the alleged failure by the Kazakh authorities to take due account of the comments you personally submitted during the EIA procedures on the ski resort and the road to the ski resort (rather than a failure by the authorities to take due account of comments submitted by members of the public in general).

Answer. You are almost right. According my opinion it was few failure by the authorities to take due account of comments submitted by members of the public in general too. The *possible* comment of members of the public was hadn't taken into account by Kazakh authorities because authorities broke procedure of hearing. This possible comment could be real if authorities include my comments it first version of minutes of hearing.

4. In your communication, you allege that the Party concerned has failed to comply with article 4(1) and (7), article 6(6) and article 9(1) of the Convention. Please clarify which of the following statements most accurately summarizes your claim concerning article 4(1) and (7) and article 6(6) of the Convention: (a) You consider that the Party concerned failed to adequately respond to one or more requests that you made to the Kazakh authorities for access to environmental information; or (b) You consider that the Party concerned provided incorrect or insufficient environmental information in its minutes of the hearings on the Kok Zhailau resort and the road to the ski resort.

Answer. I think the Party concerned failed two of this point.

5. It appears from your statements of claims to the first instance courts in which you challenged the minutes of the meetings for the hearings on the Kok Zhailau ski resort and the road to the ski resort that: (a) You sent written comments after both hearings; (b) Your written comments were included in the final versions of the minutes and were replied to; (c) However, you consider that the competent authorities did not properly consider your comments and in particular the authorities did not change their view as a result of your comments. Please confirm whether the summary in (a)-(c) above is correct

Answer. The primary idea is correct. But I decide that the competent authorities allowed other violations. I had added this points to my statements. For example I tried to ask first instance court about non-enough possibility to declared my comments in time of second hearing (road to ski resort).