

## Decision VII/1

### Reporting and review of implementation of the Convention

*The Meeting of the Parties to the Convention,*

*Recalling* its decisions III/1, IV/1 and V/3 on the review of implementation, and decisions V/7–I/7 and VI/1 on reporting and the review of implementation,

*Recalling also* article 14 bis of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, as adopted by its decision III/7, which places a legal obligation on Parties to report on their implementation of the Convention,

*Recognizing once again* that regular reporting by each Party provides important information that facilitates the review of compliance under the Convention and thereby contributes to the work of the Implementation Committee,

*Acknowledging* that, for this reason, pending the entry into force of the second amendment to the Convention through decision III/7, Parties have shown their commitment to report regularly,

*Having analysed* the reports provided by Parties in response to the questionnaire on the implementation of the Convention,

*Expressing serious concern* that the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which was a Party to the Convention during the period under review, has not responded to the questionnaire,

*Strongly emphasizing* the importance of the timely submission of reports,

*Expressing concern* that Portugal and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reported on their implementation of the Convention during the period 2010–2012 with a delay of several years,

*Also expressing concern* that the following States Parties that were Parties to the Convention during the period under review responded to the questionnaire late (i.e., after the extended deadline of 30 April 2016): Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Greece, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Republic of Moldova, Serbia, Slovakia and the United Kingdom,

1. *Welcomes* the reports by Parties on their implementation of the Convention during the period 2013–2015, which have been made available on the Convention website;

2. *Adopts* the fifth review of implementation of the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/2017/9) and requests the secretariat to arrange for its publication in an electronic format in all three official languages of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (ECE);

3. *Notes* the findings of the fifth review of implementation, including the following possible weaknesses or shortcomings in the Convention's implementation by Parties:

(a) There are differences in Parties' definitions of and approach to key terms in the Convention, such as "impact", "transboundary impact", "major change" and "final decision", which has the potential to cause problems, particularly if the consequence is a lack of clarity about which proposed activities fall within the scope of the Convention (articles 1 and 6);

(b) The national reports show that there is no standardized practice on the organization of transboundary consultations in accordance with article 5 — i.e.,

Parties' approach to such consultations differs, with four Parties even treating them as optional. The procedure for and participants in such consultations differ from Party to Party;

(c) Only a minority of Parties have an express provision in their legislation on how to ensure application of article 6, paragraph 3, which requires concerned Parties to be updated on new information that may trigger consultations and a new decision before work on an activity commences;

(d) While the majority of Parties report they have an express provision regarding post-project analysis (article 7) in their national legislation, very few of the bilateral agreements and arrangements that were reported by Parties have provisions regarding post-project analysis and very few Parties reported that they had carried out such analyses in the period 2013–2015, even though this was identified as an issue in the fourth review of implementation (see ECE/MP.EIA/2014/3);

(e) There are several sets of guidance under the Convention, three of which were expressly mentioned in the questionnaire sent to Parties — namely, the sets of guidance on public participation, practical application and subregional cooperation.<sup>1</sup> The first two are not widely used, and the third is scarcely used at all;

(f) There is a continuing need for bilateral and multilateral agreements or other arrangements (article 8) and best practice to address differences between Parties' practice with respect to types of projects raising particular issues, such as joint cross-border projects or nuclear power plants;

(g) There is a lack of clarity about translation requirements. In the absence of an express provision in the Convention, a number of difficulties were reported concerning translation and interpretation, leading, in some cases, to serious problems particularly concerning delays and public participation;

(h) A number of Parties continue to report late;

4. *Requests* the secretariat to bring to the attention of the Implementation Committee general and specific compliance issues identified in the fifth review of implementation of the Convention, and requests the Implementation Committee to take these into account in its work;

5. *Urges* the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to provide the overdue responses to the questionnaire for the period under review, and requests the secretariat to make them available on the Convention website;

6. *Decides* that the current questionnaire will also be used for the preparation of the review of the implementation of the Convention during the period 2016–2018, except for minor modifications that the Implementation Committee and the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment may decide, taking into account the suggestions provided by Parties for improving the report;

7. *Also decides* that Parties shall complete the questionnaire as a report on their implementation of the Convention during the period 2016–2018, noting the obligation to report arising from article 14 bis of the Convention, as adopted by its decision III/7, and that a failure to report on implementation might be a compliance matter to be considered by the Implementation Committee;

8. *Urges* Parties to report by the deadline to be agreed by the Working Group;

---

<sup>1</sup> Guidance on Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (ECE/MP.EIA/7), Guidance on the Practical Application of the Espoo Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/8) and Guidance on Subregional Cooperation (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex V, appendix).

9. *Requests* the secretariat to post national reports on the Convention website in the languages in which they are available;
10. *Also requests* the secretariat to put the project lists included in the answers to the questionnaire on the Convention website, unless the countries object to this;
11. *Decides* that a draft sixth review of implementation of the Convention during the period 2016–2018 based on the reports by Parties will be presented at the eighth session of Meeting of the Parties to the Convention, and that the workplan shall reflect the elements required to prepare the draft review;
12. *Requests* the secretariat to foresee the subsequent publishing of the sixth review of implementation, once adopted, in an electronic format in all three official languages of ECE.