Questions to guide the discussion of ACCC/C/2011/58 (Bulgaria) 
at the thirty-fifth meeting of the Aarhus Convention Compliance Committee 
Tuesday, 13 December 2011

1. Please describe in more detail the relation between (i) SEA decisions and EIA statements under the Environmental Protection Act (EPA) and (ii) plans and decisions (permits) under the Spatial Planning Act (SPA).

2. Following from question 1, please specify whether the environmental aspects of individual plans and projects are definitively decided upon in the SEA statements/EIA decisions, or, if not, which aspects, and to what extent, may be further discussed and decided upon when approving the plan or issuing the permit under the SPA.

3. Please outline which persons are entitled to challenge an EIA decision issued under the EPA through the national courts and the conditions they must fulfill to do so.

4. If a specific EIA decision is challenged in the court, please explain the legal consequences, if any, on the issuing of subsequent construction/exploitation permits for the project.

5. Please explain what legal options are available to challenge a Spatial Plan after its adoption on the ground that either (i) the SEA statement was not issued before the adoption of the General or Detail Spatial Plan, or (ii) the SEA procedure was not carried out properly. Which persons are entitled to bring such a challenge? Similarly, please explain what legal options are available to challenge a permit for a given project after its adoption on the basis that an EIA decision was not issued before the permit’s adoption. Which persons are entitled to bring such a challenge?

6. Please describe in greater detail the main differences between General Spatial Plans and Detail Spatial Plans adopted under the SPA (in particular, what each regulates and in which ways).

7. (Question mainly for the Party concerned):
Please describe in greater detail the “recent judicial practice associated with the appeal of acts of the environmental authorities”, which you refer to at page 2 of your written statement of 16 August 2011.