



Ref. No. KMF-167/2/2009
Budapest, 29 June, 2009

Mr. Matthias Sauer

Chair, Implementation Committee

Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment
in a Transboundary Context

Dear Mr. Sauer,

Referring to your letter written on 7 April, 2009, I noticed with regret that our previous answer, sent on 6 February 2009, could not still fully satisfy the Implementation Committee on the issue how the description of reasonable alternatives became implemented into the Hungarian regulation.

I would like to emphasize here for the Implementation Committee that Hungary, being one of the Parties to the *Convention of the Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context* (Espoo Convention), intends to fully adopt and enforce the regulations of the Convention. Having answered the question raised in the Implementation Committee's letter sent on 24 November, 2008, the relevant part of the *Report of Hungary for 2003-2005 on the Implementation of the Espoo Convention* was extended with further details to explain that the Hungarian regulation do cover the description of alternatives in a way the Convention requires. Our interpretation is that the transposition of the requirements of Appendix II to the Espoo Convention is necessary and it has happened accordingly, with respect that in the practice, in the certain individual case it can be identified what kind of reasonable alternatives exist.

In order that the Hungarian regulation should clarify better this prescription of the Convention, it will be overviewed how to make it even more obvious in the national EIA regulation and during its recent amendment process it will be extended with the modification.

I hope this further clarification will satisfy the Implementation Committee.

Sincerely yours,

Anna Radnai
Hungarian contact point
to the Espoo Convention