

Statement of the European ECO Forum on general issues of compliance (19.06.2018)

The compliance mechanism is what keeps this convention alive for many parties. It is clear, that some proposals by the EU resonate bitterly within NGO community:

Our over-arching concern is possible reopening I/7.

On the issue of proposed new deadlines our view is that they are likely to delay already prolonged case procedure. It was MOP follow up draft decisions timeline that in fact caused problems last time (MOP in Budva), at least for us (NGOs). A more important issue how to implement these proposals. Would an invitation (proposal) to Bureau be enough?

On the issue of splitting MOP decisions by cases upon request from a party. May be helpful, may be not; it depends on rationale and the way it will be done. We would like to hear and discuss the rationale for this first.

On the issue of nomination procedure [for Compliance Committee members]. We cannot accept any discussion on any possible additional criteria. Decision I/7 has criteria - geographical balance, competence, diversity of experience - which are sufficiently clear. Additional criteria will not add to transparency. Any discussion on specific additional criteria breaks our hard agreement at Budva. Some technical issues can be improved by just requesting Secretariat, e.g. CVs format.

All of these issues should have been raised at the open dialogue session with the Compliance Committee at Budva MOP. This was the right time to start discussions. Starting these discussions now is different. Having these issues on the agenda of WGP in fact prevents any discussion, at least the one which we had in Budva, because of EU closed coordination.