



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
15 July 2014
Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

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

Sixth session

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

Second session

Geneva, 2–5 June 2014

Report of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on its sixth session and of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on its second session

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–9	3
A. Attendance.....	3–4	3
B. Organizational matters.....	5–9	3
II. Outstanding issues	10–33	4
A. Issues relevant to the Convention.....	11–19	4
B. Issues relevant to the Protocol.....	20–23	6
C. Issues relevant to the Convention and the Protocol.....	24–33	6

GE.14-08484 (E)



* 1 4 0 8 4 8 4 *

Please recycle 



III.	Seminar on wind and hydro energy	34–37	8
IV.	Review of the workplan	38–39	9
V.	Seminar on globalization of the Convention and the Protocol and the role of international financial institutions	40–43	9
VI.	Opening ceremony of the high-level segment.....	44–46	10
VII.	Panel discussion on energy-related issues.....	47–50	11
VIII.	Statements by ministers and high-level representatives.....	51	11
IX.	Adoption of decisions and the Declaration	52–63	12
	A. Decisions and the Declaration adopted by consensus.....	52–56	12
	B. Decision adopted by a vote.....	57–63	12
X.	Election of officers for the next intersessional period.....	64–69	13
XI.	Date and venue of next meetings	70	14
XII.	Conclusion of the session.....	71–73	14
Annex			
	Pledges to the budget for the next intersessional period		15

For practical reasons, the decisions and the declaration adopted by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on its sixth session and of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol on its second session are being issued in addenda to the present report:

- Decisions by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/20/Add.1–EIA/SEA/4/Add.1)
- Decisions by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (ECE/MP.EIA/20/Add.2–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/4/Add.2)
- Decisions taken jointly by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention and the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (ECE/MP.EIA/20/Add.3–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/4/Add.3)

I. Introduction

1. The sixth session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention) was held from 2 to 5 June 2014 in Geneva. It was held in conjunction with the second session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention's Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (Protocol on SEA).

2. The Meeting of the Parties to the Convention (MOP) and the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (MOP/MOP) convened in joint and individual meetings throughout the sessional period. The present report details the work of both sessions. The Meetings of the Parties (MOPs) refers to both bodies meeting in a joint session.

A. Attendance

3. The meeting was attended by delegations from the following Parties to the Convention and the Protocol, as well as other member States of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE): Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan. 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 Greece, which held the Presidency of the Council of the EU in the first half of 2014. Mongolia, Morocco, the Republic of Korea, Tunisia and Viet Nam, as States Members of the United Nations, were also represented.

4. Representatives of the Convention secretariat attended the meeting. Representatives of three United Nations bodies also attended the meeting: the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Health Organization (WHO). The following international financial institutions were represented: the African Development Bank (AfDB), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the European Investment Bank (EIB) and the World Bank. The following non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were represented: Bureau of Environmental Investigation; Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) Bankwatch Network; Caucasus Environmental NGO Network; Ecoclub (Ukraine); Ecoglobe (Armenia); Ecohome (Belarus); Ecoline Environmental Assessment Centre Non-Profitable Partnership (Russian Federation); Green Network (Belarus); Greenpeace (Poland); European ECO Forum; International Association for Impact Assessment; International Council of Environmental Law; Justice and Environment; World Wildlife Fund (WWF) International; and WWF Russia. In addition, academics from the following universities attended the meeting: Central European University (Hungary), Hokkaido University (Japan), University of Limoges (France) and Opole University (Poland).

B. Organizational matters

5. The Chair of the Bureau, Mr. D. Mormul (Ukraine), opened the meeting and informed the delegations that the Convention's Bureau had recommended that Mr. P. Otawski (Poland) be elected as Chair of the general segment of the joint sessions. The MOPs elected Mr. Otawski accordingly.

6. The Director of the Environment Division of ECE welcomed delegates.
7. The MOPs adopted their agenda (ECE/MP.EIA/19–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/3),¹ which had been prepared by the secretariat in agreement with the Bureau.
8. The MOPs noted the informal report on the credentials of the representatives of Parties attending the sessions.
9. The secretariat informed the MOPs of the status of ratification of the Convention and its two amendments and of the Protocol. Further to the recent ratifications by Finland, Slovenia and Malta, the first amendment on the opening of the Convention to all United Nations Member States would enter into force on 26 August 2014; however, 15 further ratifications were still needed for it to have effect. Italy was expected to ratify both amendments, and Belgium and France the first amendment, soon. In addition, the delegations of France, Italy and the Republic of Moldova reported on their plans to ratify the Protocol in 2014. The MOPs supported the Bureau in urging all Parties that had adopted the amendments or the Protocol but not yet ratified them to proceed promptly with their ratification.

II. Outstanding issues

10. The MOP, the MOP/MOP or the MOPs, as appropriate, discussed the following outstanding issues prior to the high-level segment.

A. Issues relevant to the Convention

1. Review of compliance with the Convention

11. The Chair of the Implementation Committee, Ms. V. Kolar-Planinšič (Slovenia), introduced draft decision VI/2 on the review of compliance with the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.3) prepared by the Committee. She highlighted the additional recommendations in paragraphs 64 to 67 in subsection III.C regarding Belarus, which the Committee had prepared in February 2014, further to the efforts undertaken by Belarus and Lithuania to implement the Committee's original recommendations adopted in March 2013. She also drew attention to the report on the Committee's activities in the period since the fifth session of the MOP and the first session of the MOP/MOP (ECE/MP.EIA/2014/4–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/4).

12. The Chair of the general segment reported that, at its meeting on 2 June, the Bureau had considered proposals by the delegations of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania and Ukraine to revise relevant parts of the draft decision concerning their countries. He then presented alternative wording suggested by the Bureau in sections III and IV of the draft decision, taking into account the proposals submitted to it. Parties were not in agreement and the Chair invited interested Parties to meet in the margins of the plenary session to develop a revised version of the text of the draft decision that would be acceptable to all.

13. The Parties concerned met repeatedly throughout the sessional period until the MOP was able to agree on a revised version of the draft decision for consideration at its high-level segment with respect to subsections III.A and III.B regarding Armenia and Azerbaijan, respectively, and to section IV.B regarding Ukraine. Further to the proposal of

¹ All meeting documentation for the four-day session, as well as other information such as presentations that were provided to the secretariat and a list of participants, is available from http://www.unece.org/env/eia/meetings/mop_6.html.

the EU, the MOP also agreed not to consider two opinions of the Implementation Committee regarding the extension of the lifetime of a nuclear power plant (section I, paras. 5 (f) and (g)). In contrast, the MOP was not able to develop a revised version of subsection III.C regarding Belarus that was acceptable to all.

14. The MOP also drew attention to errors in the Russian translation of draft decision VI/2, and requested the secretariat to ensure that they were rectified in the final version of the decision.

2. Reporting and review of implementation of the Convention

15. The secretariat presented draft decision VI/1 on reporting and review of implementation of the Convention (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.1). The MOP agreed on a revised version of the draft decision, having introduced an amendment in the preamble regarding Greece.

3. Aligning the authentic language versions of the Convention

16. The Chair introduced draft decision VI/6 on aligning the authentic language versions of the Convention (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.1), including, in its annex, a list of proposed corrections to the text of the Convention, which had been agreed by the Bureau at its meeting in January 2014. In addition, the secretariat presented informal document ECE/MP.EIA/2014/INF.11 containing a number of suggested revisions by the United Nations language services to the proposed corrections regarding the Russian text of the Convention. The delegation of Belarus also indicated two further revisions to be made to the Russian text. The MOP agreed on a revised version of the draft decision that would be forwarded for its consideration at the high-level segment.

17. The MOP also decided that the secretariat should publish the revised text of the Convention after incorporation of the corrections and following the entry into force of the amendments to the Convention adopted by decision II/4.

4. Good practice on communication, cooperation and conflict resolution

18. The Chair introduced draft decision VI/9 on good practice on communication, cooperation and conflict resolution (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.1), as agreed by the Bureau in its meeting in January 2014. Following discussions during and in the margins of the plenary session over several days, the MOP agreed with the delegations of Armenia and Azerbaijan not to forward the draft decision for consideration at the high-level segment. Instead, the MOP took note of the report of the seminar on communication, cooperation and conflict resolution held during the third meeting of the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment in November 2013 (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2013/7, annex I).

5. Other draft decisions

19. The MOP agreed to forward without amendment the following draft decisions for its consideration at the high-level segment: draft decision VI/7 on application of the Convention to nuclear energy-related activities; and draft decision VI/8 on general guidance on enhancing consistency between the Convention and environmental impact assessment within State ecological expertise in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.1). The MOP noted errors in the Russian translation of draft decision VI/8, and requested the secretariat to ensure that they were rectified in the final version of the decision.

B. Issues relevant to the Protocol

1. Reporting and the review of implementation of the Protocol

20. The MOP/MOP agreed on a revised version of draft decision II/1 on reporting and the review of implementation of the Protocol (see ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.1), after having taken into account that Montenegro had in the meantime reported and, therefore, no longer needed to be urged to do so.

2. Review of compliance with the Protocol

21. The Chair of the Implementation Committee introduced draft decision II/2 on the review of compliance with the Protocol (ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.3), which incorporated by reference annexes I and II of draft decision VI/2. The MOP/MOP agreed to forward without amendment the draft decision for its consideration at the high-level segment.

3. Format for notification under the Protocol

22. The MOP/MOP agreed to replace the word “should” by “could” in the annex to draft decision II/7 on the format for notification under the Protocol (see ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.1), to indicate that a Party of origin “could” consider notifying an affected Party already during the scoping procedure specified in article 6 of the Protocol.

4. Other draft decisions

23. The MOP/MOP agreed to forward without amendment the following draft decisions for its consideration at the high-level segment: draft decision II/6 on aligning the authentic language versions of the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment; and draft decision II/8 on good practice recommendations on public participation in strategic environmental assessment (see ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.1)

C. Issues relevant to the Convention and the Protocol

1. Adoption of the workplan

24. The secretariat presented draft decision VI/3–II/3 (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.2–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.2) on the adoption of the workplan, informing the MOPs of a few amendments to the workplan table included in the draft decision concerning activities funded by the Greening Economies in the European Union’s Eastern Partnership (EaP-GREEN) programme (an EU-funded regional multi-stakeholder project), further to requests by the concerned countries. The Chair then facilitated the development of the workplan table, based on information provided by the delegations. The MOPs also revised the draft decision by supplementing it with a paragraph on meetings of the treaty bodies in the intersessional period moved from draft decision VI/4–II/4 on budget, financial arrangements and financial assistance (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.2–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.2.), and by adding text to mandate the secretariat to issue documents relevant to global outreach in the six official United Nations languages. The MOPs agreed on a revised version of the draft decision that would be forwarded for their consideration at the high-level segment.

2. Budget, financial arrangements and financial support

25. The secretariat presented the report on the budget and financial arrangements in the period since the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/2014/1–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/1), and noted a more recent contribution of

US\$ 3,000 from Slovenia for 2014. Furthermore, Switzerland had provided an additional in-kind contribution to cover hospitality expenses for the present sessions of the MOP and the MOP/MOP with a value of CHF 8,000. The secretariat reported a surplus of approximately US\$ 123,000 that would be added to the Convention's operating reserve. The MOPs expressed their satisfaction with the use of the Convention's trust fund.

26. The MOPs then agreed on a revised version of draft decision VI/4–II/4 and the financial strategy included in its annex II that would be forwarded for consideration at the high-level segment, including having opted to maintain the current system of voluntary financial contributions to the budget. The MOPs also decided to delete annex III to the draft decision containing a calculation of indicative contributions by the Parties for the proposed Convention budget based on the United Nations scale of assessments. No amendments were suggested to the budget table in annex I to the draft decision.

27. The delegations pledged contributions to the budget of the Convention and its Protocol (see annex). The secretariat noted that the total value of the pledges made represented less than a half of the budget agreed by the MOPs and that, therefore, further contributions would be necessary to cover the budgeted activities.

3. Accession by Member States of the United Nations not members of the Economic Commission for Europe

28. The MOPs agreed to forward without amendment draft decision VI/5–II/5 on accession by Member States of the United Nations not members of ECE (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.2–ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2014/L.2) for consideration at the high-level segment.

4. Declaration

29. The MOPs agreed on a revised version of the draft declaration that would be forwarded for consideration at the high-level segment. The amendments concerned part A of the declaration on the application of the Convention and the Protocol to nuclear energy issues.

5. Nominations of officers and tentative calendar of meetings

30. The Chair of the general segment presented an informal list of nominations for members of the Bureau, officers of the Working Group and members of the Implementation Committee (ECE/MP.EIA/2014/INF.5). Germany withdrew its nomination to the Implementation Committee and Albania and Estonia agreed to serve as alternates for Protocol matters on that body. In the absence of nominations by other Parties, Poland indicated that it would agree to continue to serve as alternate for Protocol matters as well. The MOPs noted that traditionally the host country for the next sessions of the MOPs provided the Chair of the Bureau, but that in absence of offers by Parties to host the next sessions it welcomed the candidature of Mr. P. Otawski (Poland) as the Chair of the Bureau.

31. The MOPs recalled that: (a) the Chair and two Vice-Chairs of the Implementation Committee would be elected from among that body's members when the Committee first met in its new composition (Geneva, 2–4 September 2014); (b) the Chair and the first Vice-Chair of the Implementation Committee should be from a Party to both the Convention and the Protocol; and (c) the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Working Group and the Chair and the first Vice-Chair of the Implementation Committee should serve also as members of the Bureau.

32. The MOPs also noted that, in accordance with the proposed amendments to the Committee's operating rules (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.3, draft decision VI/2, annex II),

each elected Party should not only nominate a permanent member, but should also appoint an alternate member for the same term of office. Each elected Party was invited to inform the secretariat of the name of the alternate member in advance of the Committee's upcoming session.

33. The MOPs noted the informal schedule of planned events for the next intersessional period contained in document ECE/MP.EIA/2014/INF.6.

III. Seminar on wind and hydro energy

34. Insights into the application of the Convention and the Protocol to wind and hydro energy-related activities were provided by experts invited to a seminar organized by Poland, as follows:

(a) On hydro energy:

(i) Ms. A. Hunke of the Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency of Germany spoke on the role of maritime spatial planning and strategic environmental assessment (SEA) for the effective development of offshore wind farms and grid connections;

(ii) Mr. L. Rejt of the General Directorate for Environmental Protection of Poland gave a presentation on the impacts of offshore wind farms on biodiversity;

(iii) Ms. P. Filipiak, also of the General Directorate for Environmental Protection of Poland, gave a talk on landscape analysis for wind energy to inform transboundary environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures;

(iv) Ms. H. Dzikowska of the Regional Directorate for Environmental Protection in Gdańsk, Poland, reflected on the practical experiences of that Polish regional authority in EIA of offshore wind farms, including in a transboundary context;

(b) On wind energy:

(i) Ms. Kolar-Planinšič, speaking on behalf of the Ministry of the Environment of Slovenia, provided good practice examples of applying the transboundary provisions of the Protocol to two Slovenian National Plans for Hydropower Use on the Lower Sava in Brezice and Mokrice, with Croatia as the affected Party;

(ii) Mr. I. Markelov of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine presented environmental problems of hydro energy in Ukraine.

35. Mr. J. Jendroska, representing Opole University, Poland, moderated the seminar.

36. The practical examples presented revealed that more research was needed to address the specificities of activities in the field of wind and hydro energy, for instance in relation to landscape impact assessment or to the adoption of an all-inclusive approach to planning, so as to foresee all possible uses of land, air and sea. Mutual trust, good faith and knowledge about the legal systems of the Parties involved were considered important for the successful implementation of transboundary procedures. The network of national focal points under the Convention and the Protocol and the available guidance documents had proved to be helpful in facilitating the transboundary EIA and SEA procedures. Moreover, speakers suggested that Parties could in the future also consider developing specific guidance on the application of the Convention and the Protocol to renewable energy-related activities.

37. The MOPs expressed their gratitude to the speakers and asked that the presentations be made available on the website of the Convention.²

IV. Review of the workplan

38. The secretariat presented an informal assessment of the implementation of the previous workplan (ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2, decision I/9–V/9), as contained in informal document ECE/MP.EIA/2014/INF.3. Approximately 68 per cent of the workplan activities had been completed, excluding activities cancelled by the countries that had originally requested them. Specifically, 100 per cent of priority 1 activities and 94 per cent of priority 2 activities had been completed. The implementation of over 90 per cent of the remaining workplan activities were ongoing or planned and would be completed in the next intersessional period, mostly owing to the identification of funding from the EU EaP-GREEN programme. The MOPs agreed that a planned workshop for the Mediterranean Sea area would again be carried forward into the next intersessional period, together with its budget, and welcomed the offer from Morocco to host the event in early 2015.

39. The MOPs expressed their satisfaction with the implementation of the previous workplan.

V. Seminar on globalization of the Convention and the Protocol and the role of international financial institutions

40. A seminar on the globalization of the Convention and the Protocol and the role of international financial institutions (IFIs) was organized by EIB and the secretariat. The following experts provided insights into the practices, needs and expectations of a number of countries in East Asia and North Africa and the policies and procedures followed by IFIs in terms of environmental assessment:

- (a) Representatives of non-ECE countries and experts:
 - (i) Mr. Y.-J. Lee of the Korea Environment Institute of the Republic of Korea, who spoke on strategies to promote transboundary EIA systems in North-east Asia;
 - (ii) Mr. T. Purev of the Ministry of Environment and Green Development of Mongolia, who gave a presentation on EIA in a transboundary context in Mongolia;
 - (iii) Mr. L. Hoai Nam of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Viet Nam, who talked on transboundary SEA and EIA in Viet Nam;
 - (iv) Mr. J. Dusik of Integra Consulting, who gave a presentation entitled “issues to consider when promoting the Protocol on SEA at a global level: lessons from South East Asia” (i.e., China, Indonesia, the Lao People’s Democratic Republic and Viet Nam);
 - (v) Ms. D. Hanane of the Ministry of Energy, Mining, Water and the Environment of Morocco, who spoke on EIA in Morocco;
 - (vi) Ms. D. Gharbi of the Ministry of Environment and Quality of Life of Tunisia, who talked about EIA and SEA in Tunisia;
- (b) Representatives of IFIs and NGOs:

² See: http://www.unece.org/env/eia/meetings/mop_6.html, under presentations and statements.

- (i) Ms. A. Relicovschi of EIB, who gave a talk on addressing transboundary environmental impacts in EIB operations;
- (ii) Ms. A. Filipas of the Joint Assistance to Support Projects in European Regions programme of the European Commission, EIB and EBRD (JASPERS)), who spoke on capacity-building on transboundary EIA;
- (iii) Mr. A. Nyong of AfDB, who gave a presentation on promoting environmental and social sustainability in AfDB investments;
- (iv) Ms. A. Kiss of the World Bank, who detailed World Bank policy and practice relating to EIA and SEA;
- (v) Ms. E. Smith of EBRD, who gave a talk entitled “EBRD and the Espoo Convention: an IFI perspective”;
- (vi) Ms. I. Holovko, a Ukrainian national campaigner for CEE Bankwatch Network, who talked on public financing in promoting the application of the Espoo Convention in non-EU countries, with examples from Ukraine’s experience;
- (vii) Mr. T. Geer of WWF International, who spoke on NGO-IFI engagement on EIA/SEA for large infrastructure projects, including in the energy sector.

41. Mr. M. Arndt of EIB moderated the discussion.

42. The discussions demonstrated that countries of other regions shared similar challenges in assessing and mitigating the environmental impacts of economic activities, in particular when they extended beyond national boundaries. The presentations also showcased the experience of IFIs in applying environmental assessments within and beyond the ECE region. Participants found the exchange between the regions to be a mutually enriching experience, paving the way for the future globalization of the Convention and the Protocol. They also appreciated the discussion on the role that the IFIs could play in promoting the application of the treaties beyond the ECE region through capacity-building activities.

43. The MOPs expressed their gratitude to the panellists and asked that the presentations be made available on the website of the Convention.

VI. Opening ceremony of the high-level segment

44. The Chair of the general segment informed the MOPs that the Bureau had recommended that Mr. A. Mokhnyk, Minister for Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine, and Mr. R. Paulauskas, Permanent representative of Lithuania to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva, be elected as co-Chairs of the joint high-level segment. The MOPs elected Mr. Mokhnyk and Mr. Paulauskas accordingly.

45. The co-Chair of the high-level segment made some initial opening remarks before giving the floor to Mr. M. Møller, Acting Executive Secretary of ECE, who also made an opening statement.

46. The co-Chair then invited the two moderators of the seminars on wind and hydro energy and on the globalization of the Convention and the Protocol and the role of IFIs to report back to the high-level segment on the outcomes of those discussions.

VII. Panel discussion on energy-related issues

47. A panel discussion was held in which the following panellists provided insights into the application of the Convention and the Protocol to the energy sector:

(a) Mr. T. Bunge (Germany) spoke about the application of the Convention to the Nord Stream gas pipeline project;

(b) Mr. G. Kremlis of the Directorate-General for Environment of the European Commission presented the application of transboundary EIA procedures to large-scale projects;

(c) Mr. M. Făcă (Romania) presented the application of the Convention to the Cernavodă nuclear power plant;

(d) Mr. M. Kuske of the Directorate-General for Energy of the European Commission spoke about the role of Euratom and the European Commission in the field of nuclear safety;

(e) Mr. J. Dusik of Integra Consulting presented the application of the Protocol on SEA to energy-related plans and programmes, policies;

(f) Mr. J. Jendroška, representing Opole University in Poland, spoke about the application of the Convention and the Protocol to energy-related issues in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia;

(g) Mr. A. Andrushevych, speaking on behalf of both the European ECO Forum and the Resource and Analysis Center “Society and Environment”, spoke on the application of the Convention to nuclear energy-related issues and the critical need for SEA in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia in the energy sector.

48. The Director of the ECE Sustainable Energy Division moderated the discussion.

49. Panellists identified the main achievements and lessons learned in the application of the Convention and the Protocol in the energy sector. The discussions confirmed that the Convention and the Protocol had effectively protected the environment and provided a sound basis for sustainable development, international cooperation and good neighbourly relationships. Procedures under the two treaties were now well-established, and authorities, civil society, industry and other stakeholders were familiar with the procedures and their respective roles. The benefits of the environmental assessment procedures outweighed the associated time and cost implications. Speakers underlined that no sector could be excluded from the application of the treaties, and recognized that there was still room to further expand and mainstream their use in improved permitting and planning procedures in the energy sector.

50. The MOPs expressed their gratitude to the panellists and asked that the presentations be made available on the website of the Convention.

VIII. Statements by ministers and high-level representatives

51. At the high-level segment the following country delegations made statements: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, France, Morocco, Norway, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Switzerland and Ukraine. Statements were also made by high-level representatives of the European Commission, the EU and WHO. In addition, the European ECO Forum spoke on behalf of the NGO community. The MOPs asked that the statements be made available on the website of the Convention.

IX. Adoption of decisions and the Declaration

A. Decisions and the Declaration adopted by consensus

52. Having reviewed the changes agreed earlier in the sessions, the MOP, MOP/MOP and the MOPs, as appropriate, proceeded with the adoption of the decisions and the declaration.

53. The MOP adopted the following decisions:

- (a) Decision VI/1 on reporting and review of implementation of the Convention;
- (b) Decision VI/6 on the aligning of the authentic language versions of the Convention;
- (c) Decision VI/7 on the application of the Convention to nuclear energy-related activities;
- (d) Decision VI/8 on general guidance on enhancing consistency between the Convention and environmental impact assessment within State ecological expertise in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia.

54. The MOP/MOP adopted the following decisions:

- (a) Decision II/1 on reporting and review of implementation of the Protocol;
- (b) Decision II/2 on the review of compliance with the Protocol;
- (c) Decision II/6 on the aligning of the authentic language versions of the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment;
- (d) Decision II/7 on the format for notification;
- (e) Decision II/8 on good practice recommendations on public participation in strategic environmental assessment.

55. The MOPs jointly adopted a Declaration as well as the following decisions:

- (a) Decision VI/3–II/3 on adoption of the workplan;
- (b) Decision VI/4–II/4 on the budget, financial arrangements and financial assistance;
- (c) Decision VI/5–II/5 on accession by Member States of the United Nations not members of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

56. The delegation of Armenia requested that its reservation regarding paragraph 6 of the Declaration, in part A on the application of the Convention and the Protocol to nuclear energy issues, be recorded in the report.

B. Decision adopted by a vote

57. In spite of its efforts during the general segment, the MOP had not reached an agreement on the wording regarding Belarus in section III.C of draft decision VI/2 on review of compliance with the Convention. Belarus supported the original wording in section III.C as proposed by the Implementation Committee (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.3) to which the EU could not agree. The EU had put forward alternative wording for that section, proposing, *inter alia*, to encourage Belarus to further develop confidence-building measures, including to invite the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to undertake a Site and External Events Design (SEED) mission to the country. Belarus had not agreed.

58. As all efforts at consensus had been exhausted and no agreement had been reached, Parties proceeded with voting according to rules of procedure 36 to 45 (See ECE/MP.EIA/2, annex I). The EU stated that, according to rule 36, paragraph 2, it would exercise its right to vote with the number of votes equal to the number of its member States which were Parties. At the request of Belarus, the method of voting was by secret ballot. The MOPs decided to appoint delegates of the Russian Federation, Switzerland and WHO as polling officers and invited the secretariat to provide administrative assistance.

59. As suggested by Belarus, Parties agreed to first vote on the initial wording of the draft decision as proposed by the Implementation Committee and reflected in document ECE/MP.EIA/2014/L.3. The results of the voting were as follows: 5 votes in favour, 30 votes against and 2 abstentions. Parties then voted on the alternative wording proposed by the EU. As a result of the second vote, the MOP adopted decision VI/2, as amended by the EU, by 31 votes to 4, with 1 abstention.

60. In its statement, the delegation of Belarus reiterated its support for section III.C of decision VI/2 as initially proposed by the Committee, which it believed would have contributed to more constructive bilateral discussions with Lithuania. It asserted that the position of Lithuania lacked legal grounds and undermined trust in the Committee and in its mandate. It stated that the amendments to the draft decision did not reflect its opinion and requested that its reservation regarding paragraph 64 (previously numbered para. 67 bis) of decision VI/2 be recorded in the report. The delegation reconfirmed the commitment of Belarus to continue its cooperation with the Committee and that it would invite the IAEA for a SEED mission to its country.

61. The delegation of Azerbaijan explained its position on decision VI/2, section III.A, expressing its concerns over the planned nuclear activity in Armenia and the non-compliance by Armenia with its obligation under article 3, paragraph 1, of the Convention, as well as its views that the absence of diplomatic relations did not release a Party from its obligations under the Convention. It noted with satisfaction the reference in the decision to the possibility for Armenia to implement the subsequent steps in the transboundary EIA procedure, and reiterated that its interest in participating in the EIA procedure remained intact. It also looked forward to the follow-up activities of the Implementation Committee, particularly in the light of the recent decision of Armenia to commence construction works on the new nuclear power plant unit in 2018. It hoped that the Convention secretariat would retain its ownership and management of the issue and continue supporting the implementation of the Convention.

62. The delegation of Armenia responded by declaring that its position had already been stated many times on the issue, and that Armenia had acted in full compliance with the IAEA safeguards and procedures. It asked the MOP to disregard the statement of Azerbaijan which did not comply with the rule 45 of the rules of procedure of the Convention.

63. The three delegations asked that their statements be recorded in the report. In line with past practice, the original statements are also available in full on the Convention website.

X. Election of officers for the next intersessional period

64. The MOPs elected officers for the next intersessional period.

65. The MOPs elected Ms. Masaityte as Chair of the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment and a representative of

Azerbaijan (to be named later), Ms. T. Plesco (Republic of Moldova) and Mr. I. Markelov (Ukraine) as Vice-Chairs.

66. The MOPs elected Mr. P. Otawski (Poland) as the Chair of the Bureau, with the understanding that his election did not indicate Poland's agreement to host the next sessions of the MOPs. The MOPs also elected Ms. C. Bourigault (Switzerland), Mr. A. Danelyan (Armenia) and Mr. G. Kremlis (EU) and, as Vice-Chairs of the Bureau, together with the Chair and the Vice-Chairs of the Working Group and the Chair and first Vice-Chair of the Implementation Committee. The first Vice-Chair of the Committee would serve as alternate to Ms. Bourigault for Protocol matters as Switzerland was not a Party to the Protocol.

67. The MOP elected four new members of the Implementation Committee for Convention matters: Mr. V. Buchko (Ukraine); Ms. A. Kliut (Belarus); Ms. Z. Pocsai (Hungary); and Mr. R. Švedas (Lithuania). They were to join the four continuing members of the Committee: Ms. E. Grigoryan (Armenia); Ms. L. A. Hernando (Spain), previously second Vice-Chair; Mr. M. Prieur (France); and Mr. F. Zaharia (Romania), previously first Vice-Chair.

68. The MOP/MOP also elected five new members of the Implementation Committee for Protocol matters: Mr. K. Heinma (Estonia) (as alternate to Ukraine); Mr. J. Jendroska (Poland) (as alternate to Belarus); Ms. Z. Pocsai (Hungary); Ms. O. Soshi (Albania) (as alternate to France); and Mr. R. Švedas (Lithuania). They were to join the three continuing members of the Committee for Protocol matters: Ms. Grigoryan (Armenia); Ms. Hernando (Spain), previously second Vice-Chair; and Mr. Zaharia (Romania), previously first Vice-Chair. The Committee was to elect its own chair from among its members

69. The MOPs noted that Mr. Jendroska had already completed two consecutive terms as a member to the Committee for Convention matters and one additional term as a member, alternate to the Republic of Moldova, to the Committee for Protocol matters. The MOPs agreed that Mr. Jendroska would be re-elected on an exceptional basis.

XI. Date and venue of next meetings

70. The MOPs decided that the seventh session of the MOP would be held in conjunction with the third session of the MOP/MOP in May or June 2017. It invited Parties to the Convention and the Protocol to come forward with offers to host the sessions.

XII. Conclusion of the session

71. The MOPs agreed on the main decisions taken in the sessional period, as presented by the secretariat. The MOPs authorized the secretariat to complete the report after the sessions under the guidance of the outgoing Bureau.

72. In closing the joint session, the co-Chairs thanked delegations for their work and endurance in finding solutions to several outstanding issues. The MOPs expressed their thanks to the delegation of Switzerland for hosting a reception and providing catering during the sessional period.

73. The Chair closed the joint session on Thursday, 5 June 2014.

Annex

Pledges to the budget for the next intersessional period

<i>Party to the Convention</i>	<i>Party to Protocol?^a</i>	<i>Present at MOP-6?</i>	<i>Pledge (1 share = US\$ 1,000)</i>
Albania	Yes	Yes	— ^b
Armenia	Yes	Yes	—
Austria	Yes	Yes	US\$ 6,000 (six shares) per year for three years, for both instruments and US\$ 5,000 for the guidance on nuclear-related activities.
Azerbaijan	No	Yes	US\$ 4,000 (4 shares) in 2014 and further contributions to be specified in 2015 and 2016.
Belarus	No	Yes	—
Belgium	No	Yes	—
Bosnia and Herzegovina	No	Yes	—
Bulgaria	Yes	Yes	US\$ 5,000 (5 shares) for the Convention and US\$ 3,000 (3 shares) for the Protocol in 2014.
Canada	No	No	—
Croatia	Yes	Yes	US\$ 3,000 (3 shares) per year in 2014, 2015 and 2016.
Cyprus	No	Yes	—
Czech Republic	Yes	Yes	US\$ 5,000 (5 shares) per year for the intersessional period.
Denmark	Yes	No	—
Estonia	Yes	Yes	€1,000 per year in 2014, 2015 and 2016
European Union	Yes	Yes	€50,000 per year ^c US\$ 10,000 for the guidance on nuclear-related activities from EaP-GREEN project funding, subject to approval by the EaP-GREEN Steering Committee.
Finland	Yes	Yes	US\$ 5,000 (5 shares) per year for the intersessional period (in 2015, 2016 and 2017), depending upon the availability of funds in the national budget.
France	No	Yes	€10,000 per year (in 2014, 2015 and 2016), subject to the availability of funds in the national budget.

<i>Party to the Convention</i>	<i>Party to Protocol?^a</i>	<i>Present at MOP-6?</i>	<i>Pledge (1 share = US\$ 1,000)</i>
Germany	Yes	Yes	A minimum of 30 shares for the intersessional period. This sum will be divided into at least two payments and will be earmarked. Any payment depends on the availability of funds in the national budget that will have to be adopted by the parliament for each year.
Greece	No	Yes	—
Hungary	Yes	Yes	—
Ireland	No	Yes	—
Italy	No	Yes	—
Kazakhstan	No	Yes	—
Kyrgyzstan	No	Yes	—
Latvia	No	Yes	—
Liechtenstein	No	No	—
Lithuania	Yes	Yes	—
Luxembourg	Yes	Yes	—
Malta	No	No	—
Montenegro	Yes	No	—
Netherlands	Yes	Yes	€48,000 for the intersessional period.
Norway	Yes	Yes	US\$ 10,000–US\$ 15,000 (10–15 shares) per year for the intersessional period. Any payment depends on the availability of funds in the national budget that will have to be adopted by the parliament for each year.
Poland	Yes	Yes	US\$ 5,000 (five shares) per year for the intersessional period (in 2015, 2016 and 2017).
Portugal	Yes	No	—
Republic of Moldova	No	Yes	—
Romania	Yes	Yes	US\$ 5,000 (5 shares) per year for three years.
Serbia	Yes	Yes	—

<i>Party to the Convention</i>	<i>Party to Protocol?^a</i>	<i>Present at MOP-6?</i>	<i>Pledge (1 share = US\$ 1,000)</i>
Slovakia	Yes	Yes	—
Slovenia	Yes	Yes	US\$ 3,000 (three shares) per year for the intersessional period (in 2014, 2015 and 2016) for both the Convention and the Protocol.
Spain	Yes	Yes	—
Sweden	Yes	Yes	—
Switzerland	No	Yes	US\$ 20,000 (20 shares) per year for the intersessional period (in 2014, 2015 and 2016). In addition, 25,000 for technical advice on EIA to Kyrgyzstan and approximately CHF 35,000 for guidelines on transboundary EIA for Central Asian Countries (i.e., US\$ 66,700)
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Yes	Yes	—
Ukraine	No	Yes	US\$ 6,000 (6 shares) for the intersessional period.
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	No	No	—

^a This column reflects the status of ratification of the Protocol as of the sixth session of the MOP.

^b An em-dash (—) indicates that no financial resources were pledged.

^c But see paragraph 4 of decision VI/4/II/4 on the budget, financial arrangements and financial assistance.