

# **Outcomes of the work of the Task Force on Access to Information and experience of the Republic of Moldova**

# **Aarhus Convention Task Force on Access to Information: mandate 2015-2017 (Decision V/1)**

- Exchange of experiences (see e.g. reports, background documents and presentations at the Task Force meetings) with regard to:
  - Scope of environmental information
  - Provision of environmental information by the different public authorities
  - Associated costs
  - Quality of environmental information
  - Comparability of the environmental information
  - Application of restrictions on access to environmental information in accordance with the Convention's provisions
- Monitoring and supporting the implementation of the recommendations in decision II/3 and the development of the Shared Environmental Information System across the region (see e.g. documents ECE/MP.PP/WG.1/2017/4 and AC/WGP-21/Inf.2)
- Monitoring technical developments and contribute to other initiatives relevant to access to environmental information (see e.g. documents ECE/MP.PP/WG.1/2017/4 and AC/WGP-21/Inf.2, see also [http://www.unece.org/env/pp/aarhus/tfai/case\\_studies.html](http://www.unece.org/env/pp/aarhus/tfai/case_studies.html))
- Contributing to further development of the Aarhus Clearinghouse for Environmental Democracy and PRTR.net

# Current trends

- Increased number of cases were found with regard to
- Scope of environmental information
- Access to digital databases
- Provision of environmental information by various public and private bodies
- Application of exemptions in access to environmental information
- Public authorities play increasingly the mediating role when dealing with public requests to provide sensitive commercial and business information.

# Potential interlinkages with the work of the Task Force on Access to Justice

- Population and use of the jurisprudence database regarding issues relevant to the mandate of the Task Force on Access to Information (e.g. see documents ECE/MP.PP/WG.1/2015/3 (para. 26) and AC/TF.AI-4/Inf.2)
- Population and use of the compendium of case studies on the use of electronic information tools relevant to e-justice initiatives (see [http://www.unece.org/env/pp/aarhus/tfai/case\\_studies.html](http://www.unece.org/env/pp/aarhus/tfai/case_studies.html))
- Promote and use of the Aarhus Clearinghouse as a tool to promote exchange of information and good practices and strengthen national nodes with information on access to judicial and administrative review procedures and other remedies as appropriate
- Exchange of experience with regard to the public accessibility of information about the violations to environmental law and information on inspections and law enforcement (see e.g. document ECE/MP.PP/WG.1/2017/4)
- Exchange of experience with regard to the public accessibility of information regarding judicial and review procedures and decisions of courts and other review bodies (see e.g. documents ECE/MP.PP/WG.1/2017/4 and AC/WGP-21/Inf.2)

# Cases Summary

## NGO "Eco-TIRAS" versus the Silviculture Agency "Moldsilva"

NGO Eco-TIRAS submitted a request to the State Forestry Agency ‘Moldsilva’ (a government agency) for the disclosure of a number of contracts for the rent of lands administered by the State Forestry Fund. Moldsilva refused this request on the grounds of the large volume of the requested information, and also asked the NGO to justify its interest in that information. The request for information was repeated, as was the refusal.

Eco-TIRAS then brought an action in the Court of Appeal Chisinau challenging this decision and claiming that Moldsilva was obligated to provide the copies of all contracts as requested.

The Court has fully admitted the action NGO Eco-TIRAS