

Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment

Third meeting

Geneva, 11–15 November 2013

Item 4 of the provisional agenda

Exchange of good practices

Workshop on nuclear related activities 13 November 2013

Note by Austria, Finland and Sweden

QUESTIONS FOR GROUP DISCUSSIONS I

Please discuss problems in the application of the Espoo Convention and the Protocol on SEA to nuclear energy-related activities and how to solve these problems.

Highlight good examples and good application.

The sub-questions are only for orientations, groups are free to find their own approach to the issues.

Discuss application both for Party of Origin and Affected Party!

SCREENING

EIA/SEA

How to decide whether to apply the Convention or not?

- Is Annex I (or thresholds) clear enough to make the decision?
 - Should license renewal or extension of operating period be subject to the application of the Convention?
- Can it be problematic to decide if the project is a new activity or a major change?
 - According to which criteria is a change of a project considered a major change?
- Which screening criteria could be important for nuclear related activities?
 - Should risks of severe accidents beyond design base and long range impacts be screening criteria (risk not mentioned in Annex III but in other ECE Espoo documents) and if so, how?
 - Should transportation of fuel or spent fuel and waste be screening criteria?
- Which plans/programmes could be relevant to screen according to Article 4.3 and 4.4 in the SEA Protocol (other plan/programme than for energy + small areas at local level and minor modification)?

NOTIFICATION

EIA/SEA

How should it be decided which Parties to notify?

(Neighbouring Parties, more far away Parties, European or ECE wide Parties)

- What role should risk of accidents and long-range impacts have?
- Some Parties notify on a European/ECE-wide scale. Is this an approach to follow? What implications would that have for Parties of Origin and Affected Parties?
- How should requests for notification from non-neighbouring Parties be treated?
- Does it matter in which phase of project planning (or phase of program/plan) the notification is done?
- How should the language question be dealt with? What is most essential to translate?
- Should the Affected Party/Parties be approached beforehand for information on timeframes for notification and agreement on needed translation?

EIA DOCUMENTATION

EIA/SEA

What should be included in the EIA documentation and how?

- How could risk of accidents and long-range impacts best be described and assessed?
- Are there problems in making EIA documentation understandable for public (not too technical)?
- What kind of alternatives is important or relevant to describe (location, type of nuclear power plant, other means for energy supply etc.)?
- How could the no action alternative best be described?
- Which parts of the EIA documentation should be translated and into which languages?
- Should the Affected Party/Parties be approached beforehand for information on timeframes for public hearing and consultations and agreement on needed translation?