



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
12 January 2014

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Meeting of the Parties to the Convention
on Environmental Impact Assessment
in a Transboundary Context

Implementation Committee

Twenty-ninth session
Geneva, 10–12 December 2013

Report of the Implementation Committee on its twenty-ninth session

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–5	3
A. Attendance	2	3
B. Organizational matters	3–5	3
II. Submissions.....	6	3
III. Follow-up to decision V/4.....	7–23	3
A. Ukraine	8–16	4
B. Romania.....	17–18	5
C. Armenia	19–23	5
IV. Committee initiative.....	24–31	6
A. Azerbaijan	24–28	6
B. Ukraine	29–31	7
V. Specific compliance issues from the Third Review of Implementation.....	32–36	7
VI. Information gathering.....	37–55	8
A. Lithuania.....	37–41	8
B. Ukraine	42–47	8
C. Azerbaijan.....	48–51	10

GE.14-18377 (E)



* 1 4 1 8 3 7 7 *

Please recycle 



D.	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	52–53	10
E.	Ukraine	54–55	11
VII.	Structure, functions and operating rules	56–58	11
VIII.	Preparations for the next sessions of the Meetings of the Parties.....	59–61	11
IX.	Other business	62–64	12
X.	Presentation of the main decisions taken and closing of the session	65–66	12

I. Introduction

1. The twenty-ninth session of the Implementation Committee under the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention) and its Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment (Protocol on SEA) was held from 10 to 12 December 2013 in Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Attendance

2. The following members of the Implementation Committee for Convention and Protocol matters attended the session: Ms. A. Babayeva (Azerbaijan); Ms. E. Grigoryan (Armenia); Mr. J. Jendroška (Poland); Ms. V. Kolar-Planinšič (Slovenia); Ms. T. Plesco (Republic of Moldova); Mr. M. Prieur (France); and Mr. F. Zaharia (Romania). Mr. J. Brun (Norway) attended a part of the meeting. Ms. S. Dimitrova (Bulgaria) and Ms. L. Papajová Majeská (Slovakia) were absent. A representative of the Permanent Mission of Spain to the United Nations Office and other international organizations in Geneva replaced Ms. L. A. Hernando (Spain) for the present session in parts of the meeting. With the prior agreement of Ms. Hernando, the Chair of the Committee acted as the curator for the matters for which Ms. Hernando had been nominated curator. A representative of Azerbaijan was present for the adoption of the agenda.

B. Organizational matters

3. The Chair of the Committee, Ms. Kolar-Planinšič, opened the session. The Committee adopted its agenda (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2013/5).

4. The Committee regretted that the members nominated by Bulgaria and Slovakia had been absent at two consecutive sessions and that they had failed to provide a replacement. It stressed again the obligation of all members to participate in all of its sessions and that, if in exceptional cases a member were unable to participate, the respective Party should make every effort to provide a suitable replacement for that session, informing the Chair and the secretariat accordingly well in advance.

5. The Chair also regretted the late receipt of written contributions from the curators that had been requested in advance of the session, and invited curators in the future to provide the requested material at least one week in advance of the Committee's sessions to allow for its proper consideration.

II. Submissions

6. No submissions had been received since the Committee's previous session and there were no earlier submissions still under consideration.

III. Follow-up to decision V/4

7. Discussions concerning follow-up to decision V/4 of the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) to the Convention (see ECE/MP.EIA/15) were not open to observers, according to rule 17, paragraph 1, of the Committee's operating rules.

A. Ukraine

8. The Committee considered the progress report submitted by the Government of Ukraine on 5 December 2013 on the steps taken to bring about compliance with its obligations under the Convention as requested by the MOP at its fifth session (decision V/4, para. 24), as well as the additional information received on 25 November 2013 in relation to the application of paragraph 30 of decision V/4 (see para. 17 below). The Committee welcomed the timely submission of the information by Ukraine, which according to the decision was due by the end of the year, in advance of the Committee's session. However, the Committee observed that the information was not sufficient for the preparation of its draft report, including recommendations, to the MOP.

9. The Committee noted that while Ukraine had demonstrated efforts to reach compliance with the provisions of the Convention, the adoption of the draft law of Ukraine on "Amendments to some Laws of Ukraine on implementation of the Convention" by the parliament was still pending. According to Ukraine the adoption was expected by the end of 2013. The Committee reiterated its concern at the lack of progress in relation to the implementation of the strategy of the Government to implement the Convention (as requested in decision IV/2, para. 12 (see ECE/MP.EIA/2008/4); see also decision V/4, para. 21), in particular in relation to the adoption of the concrete legislative measures to that effect.

10. The Committee also regretted that Ukraine had not provided any information on how the specific measures recommended in the report of the European Union (EU)-funded project to support Ukraine in its implementation of the Convention (see decision V/4, para. 24, in conjunction with para. 19 and footnote 24) had been taken into account to bring the project for the Danube-Black Sea Deep Water Navigation Canal in the Ukrainian Sector of the Danube Delta (Bystroe Canal Project) into full compliance with the Convention.

11. The Committee further noted that the information provided with regard to post-project analysis showed that some progress had been achieved. The Committee welcomed the monitoring carried out and noted that it would constitute a good basis for meeting the requirements under article 7 of the Convention. The Committee underlined that post-project analysis presupposed cooperation between the Party of origin and the affected Party. According to the information available to the Committee, no information on the monitoring studies on the Bystroe Canal Project had been shared with Romania yet.

12. The Committee asked the Chair to write to the Government of Ukraine to communicate its views. Moreover, in its letter to Ukraine, the Committee decided:

(a) To encourage the Government to ensure that the new law met the requirements of the Convention and that it addressed both domestic and transboundary environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedures;

(b) To urge the Government to adopt the draft law as soon as possible, and provide the Committee with the Russian and English translation of the law upon its adoption;

(c) To request the Government to report on the concrete measures it had taken to bring the Bystroe Canal Project into compliance with the Convention, following the recommendations of the related EU-funded project;

(d) To encourage the Government to share the information on the post-project analysis with Romania, following article 7 of the Convention, and invite the Government to report on its action to the Committee.

13. Finally, the Committee stressed that the Government of Ukraine should be advised that the Committee's next session would be its last session before the sixth session of the

MOP (MOP-6) (Kyiv, 2–5 June 2014) and its consideration of the matter would then be conclusively completed. Unless the draft law were adopted by February 2014 and its provisions were in line with the Convention's requirements, and Ukraine was able to demonstrate that effective measures had been taken to follow the recommendations of the EU-funded project, the Committee would have to consider recommending new measures to be taken by the MOP in relation to Ukraine.

14. Ukraine would be requested to provide the additional information in English, in a brief and concise manner, by electronic means (e-mail) by no later than 14 February 2014.

15. The Committee agreed that, on the basis of the information received by Ukraine by the established deadline, the curator, with the assistance of interested Committee members, would finalize its report, including the recommendations for consideration by the Committee at its thirtieth session (Geneva, 25–27 February 2014).

16. In addition, the Committee invited its Chair to write to the Government of Romania inviting it to comment by 14 February 2014 on the progress in the implementation by Ukraine of decision V/4.

B. Romania

17. The Committee then turned to the consideration of the information made available to it by the Government of Ukraine and the Government of Romania on 25 November and 2 December 2013, respectively, on how they had implemented decision V/4, paragraph 30. The Committee welcomed the steps undertaken by the two Governments, but noted the slow progress with the negotiation of a bilateral agreement or other arrangement in order to support further the provisions of the Convention, as set out in article 8 of the Convention, because their negotiation depended on the adoption by Ukraine of the draft law on "Amendments to some Laws of Ukraine on implementation of the Convention" (see above).

18. The Committee agreed to encourage Romania and Ukraine to continue their efforts and to endeavour to strengthen their cooperation in preparing a bilateral agreement or other arrangement to support further the provisions of the Convention, as set out in article 8 of the Convention, further to paragraph 14 of decision IV/2 and paragraph 30 of decision V/4. The Committee decided to include its conclusions in its draft decision on review of compliance to the Convention and to reflect it in its report on its activities, which were to be considered by the MOP at its next session. It requested the Chair to communicate the Committee's decision to the Governments of Romania and Ukraine.

C. Armenia

19. The Committee took note of the report by the Committee member nominated by Armenia on the country's progress in adopting the draft legislation on EIA that had been prepared following the technical support recommendations by an international consultant to the secretariat, further to a Committee initiative on Armenia.

20. The Committee welcomed the information provided that the law had already been submitted to the parliament.

21. The Committee strongly encouraged Armenia to adopt the draft law without further delay, and, to the extent possible, before the next session of the MOP in June 2014.

22. The Committee invited Armenia to ensure that its new draft EIA legislation complied with the Convention. To that end, it was encouraged to also solicit the views of

the international consultant on the concordance of the draft EIA legislation with his recommendations, and to provide a copy of the consultant's opinion to the Committee before its next session.

23. Should the draft law not be adopted by MOP-6, the Committee agreed to recommend to the MOP to strongly urge Armenia to do so at its earliest convenience and to request it to regularly report to the Committee on the progress made. It then agreed to finalize its recommendations to the MOP at its next session.

IV. Committee initiative

A. Azerbaijan

24. In regard to Committee initiative EIA/IC/CI/2,¹ the Committee considered the progress report by the Committee member nominated by Azerbaijan regarding that country's progress in implementing recommendations by an international consultant to the secretariat to further strengthen Azerbaijan's capacity to comply fully with its obligations under the Convention. According to the information provided, the draft that had been made available to the Committee at its previous session had in the meantime been amended and was still being discussed at the Government level.

25. The Committee took note of the information provided that the draft law was still being processed at the ministerial level and was not yet in parliament. It noted the delays in the adoption of the law, since the amended draft, which was not publicly available, was still at the early stages of the law-making process. The Committee also expressed concerns about the quality of the new draft, because the regulation of several important elements under the Convention were to be subsequently detailed through implementing regulations after the adoption of the law and there was uncertainty as to whether the new draft was in line with the recommendations of the international consultant.

26. The Committee agreed to review progress on the matter at its next session. It requested the Committee member nominated by Azerbaijan to report on the steps taken for the adoption of the draft EIA law no later than 17 February 2014. In preparing the legislation, Azerbaijan was again advised to follow the international consultant's recommendations, as well as the draft general guidance on enhancing consistency between the Convention and environmental impact assessment within the framework of the State ecological expertise in countries of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia, which was expected to be adopted at MOP-6.²

27. The Committee agreed to finalize its recommendations to be considered by the MOP at the Committee's next session. Those should also include requesting Azerbaijan to regularly report on the adoption of the implementing regulations.

28. The Committee invited the secretariat to explore opportunities to provide technical assistance to Azerbaijan in that regard, as needed.

¹ Information on Committee initiatives is available from <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/environmental-impact-assessment/areas-of-work/review-of-compliance/committee-initiative.htm>.

² The draft general guidance (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.2/2013/INF.5) was last considered by the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment at its third meeting (Geneva, 11–15 November 2013) and is available from <http://www.unece.org/env/eia/mtgs/wg.2-3.html> (see unofficial documents).

B. Ukraine

29. The Committee drafted its findings and recommendations further to its initiative on Ukraine regarding the planned extension of the lifetime of two reactors at the Rivne nuclear power plant (NPP) in Ukraine, close to the border with Belarus and Poland (EIA/IC/CI/4). It decided to review the text in its final format by 22 December using its electronic decision-making procedure. In preparing its draft, the Committee took into account the information brought to its attention before, during and after its twenty-eighth session (Geneva, 10–12 September 2013).

30. The Committee agreed to send the draft findings and recommendations to Ukraine at the beginning of January 2014. In accordance with paragraph 9 of the structure and functions of the Committee, the Chair should invite the Government of Ukraine to submit to the secretariat, by 14 February 2014 at the latest, its comments or representations, which were to remain confidential at that stage.

31. The Committee agreed to consider any comments or representations at its thirtieth session before finalizing its findings and recommendations for consideration by the MOP at its next session.

V. Specific compliance issues from the Third Review of Implementation

32. Further to its twenty-eighth session, the Committee continued its examination of the pending specific compliance issue regarding Portugal that had emerged from the Third Review of Implementation (EIA/IC/SCI/3/2).³ The Committee considered a reply from the Government of Portugal of 31 October 2013 in response to its letter of 23 September 2013 to the minister responsible for environmental matters.

33. While noting the difficulties in receiving information from the Government of Portugal over the past two years, the Committee welcomed the response by Portugal. The Committee agreed that the clarification provided by Portugal that the provision at issue had a wider scope of application, including inland and offshore gas production activities, and that it was further complemented by other legislation to ensure implementation of the Convention and the relevant EU legislation, was satisfactory.

34. At the same time, the Committee observed that under Portugal's legislation the list of activities already included the numeric thresholds for hydrocarbon production as set out in the revised appendix I to the Convention contained in the second amendment to the Convention (see ECE/MP.EIA/6, decision III/7) — which was not yet in force — whereas the appendix I presently in force only referred to “offshore hydrocarbon production”. In that connection, the Committee noted that Parties to the Convention applied thresholds to offshore hydrocarbon production as set out in the revised appendix I even though the amendments had not yet entered into force. The Committee decided that it would not consider this to constitute non-compliance with the Convention.

35. The Committee decided to include in its report to the MOP a recommendation to urge Parties to ratify the second amendment to the Convention so as to streamline its application throughout the region, as soon as possible. It also took note of the measures decided by the Bureau and the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and

³ Information on specific compliance issues is available from http://www.unece.org/env/eia/implementation/implementation_committee_letters.html.

Strategic Environmental Assessment for speeding up the entry into force of the first and the second amendments to the Convention, including letters sent out in May 2013 to the ministers of foreign affairs and ministers of environment of the Parties concerned, inviting them to rapidly ratify or accede to the amendments.

36. The Committee then asked the Chair to write to the Government of Portugal to inform it accordingly. The Chair should also request agreement that the correspondence between the Committee and Portugal be placed on the Convention's website, as an illustration of the Committee's approach to specific compliance issues and of a proper and sufficient response from a Party to address the issue.

VI. Information gathering

A. Lithuania

37. Further to its twenty-eighth session, the Committee continued to consider the information it had gathered on the planned construction of the Visaginas NPP in Lithuania, close to the border with Belarus, in follow-up to the information provided by a Belarusian NGO (EIA/IC/INFO/9).⁴ The Committee considered replies from the Governments of Lithuania and Belarus on 20 and 21 November 2013, respectively, to the Committee's questions in its letters of 12 September 2013 to them.

38. The Committee agreed that it would continue its consideration of the matter at its next session. It asked the Chair to write to the Government of Lithuania inviting it to provide clarification on: (a) the current situation of the proposed activity in the light of the applicable procedures in Lithuania; (b) how the Lithuanian public had been informed about the public hearing; and (c) how it had taken into account the comments by Belarus within the transboundary procedure. The Chair should also request Lithuania's consent that its responses of 20 November 2013 to the Committee be shared with the Belarusian NGO.

39. The Committee also asked the Chair to write to the Government of Belarus requesting an original copy of the newspaper containing the public notice for the hearing that had taken place on 13 (or 14) October 2008, along with an English translation of the notice.

40. Finally, the Chair was asked to write to the NGO of Belarus, providing it with information on the public notice for the hearing, as described in Lithuania's response of 20 November 2013. The NGO should be invited to explain to the Committee by 31 January 2014 why it claimed that it had not been informed.

41. The Committee then invited the curator to provide an analysis of the information in advance of its next session.

B. Ukraine

42. Further to its twenty-eighth session, the Committee continued its consideration of the information it had gathered with regard to the information provided by a Belarusian NGO on the planned construction of nuclear reactors 3 and 4 at the Khmelnytskyi NPP in

⁴ Information on submissions concerning compliance by Parties from other sources (e.g., the public) can be found on the Committee website from <http://www.unece.org/environmental-policy/treaties/environmental-impact-assessment/areas-of-work/review-of-compliance/information-from-other-sources.html>.

Ukraine, close to the border with Belarus (EIA/IC/INFO/10). The Committee reviewed the clarifications received from the Governments of Austria, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia and Ukraine in response to the Committee's letters of 12 September 2013.

43. The Committee took note of the notification by Ukraine of potentially affected Parties and the initiation of transboundary procedures. It agreed that it would continue its consideration of the matter at its next session and asked the Chair to write to the Government of Ukraine to request the following further clarifications and information to be provided in English:

(a) Information on the progress of the transboundary EIA procedure in accordance with the Convention (public participation and consultations);

(b) An English translation of the legal provisions giving authority to the Cabinet of Ministers to take the final decision on the proposed activity (as opposed to article 2 of Law 2861, giving authority on the decision-making to the parliament). The Committee requested that clarification subsequent to Ukraine's reply to the Committee of 7 November 2013 stating that: "Once the parliament adopts the law on siting, designing and construction of the proposed activity, the EIA of construction of the nuclear installation or a radioactive waste management facility completed within the feasibility study is adjusted to a comprehensive expert review. Subject to positive conclusions, the project is then approved by the Cabinet";

(c) A copy of the English translation of Law No. 5217-VI on the location, design and construction of Khmelnytskyi NPP reactors 3 and 4, adopted by the Ukrainian parliament on 6 September 2012.

(d) Whether the decision by the Cabinet of Ministers could change the parameters for the activity or its location, as defined in Law No. 5217-VI;

(e) A copy of the letter, including materials, of 6 April 2012 (No. 7123/10/10) sent by Ukraine to potentially affected Parties (Belarus, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania and Slovakia);

(f) Copies of the notifications, including supporting documentation, Ukraine had sent in 2010 to potentially affected Parties (Belarus, Hungary, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania and Slovakia) about the project;

(g) Information on how Ukraine fulfilled the requirements under article 2, paragraph 6, article 3, paragraph 8, and article 4, paragraph 2, of the Convention with respect to its obligation as a Party of origin to ensure public participation for the public likely to be affected in the affected Party;

(h) How Ukraine reasoned that the content of the EIA documentation was compliant with appendix II of the Convention, for instance, with respect to the description of the locational alternatives and the non-action alternative, if the local executive body within the jurisdiction of which the activity would take place had already taken a decision on the location of the activity and a contract with the project developer had been signed?;

(i) Information on how Ukraine informed its own public about the proposed activity and when;

(j) Information about the public participation in Ukraine in May 2011 and whether Ukraine had informed the potentially affected Parties about the public hearing;

(k) Further to the information provided by one source of information to the Committee, that the planned activity might not be implemented, whether the implementation of the activity would be pursued by Ukraine.

44. In addition, the Committee asked that the Chair to write again to the Governments of Austria, Hungary, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Slovakia to ask them to provide information on the progress of the transboundary consultations on the EIA documentation pursuant to article 5 of the Convention.

45. The Committee further asked that the Chair also write to the Government of Belarus to ask whether it considered that the legal, administrative and other measures taken by the Government of Ukraine in that particular transboundary EIA procedure had been sufficient for proper implementation of the Convention.

46. The Committee requested that the written replies to its questions be provided through the secretariat, in English, by no later than 14 February 2014.

47. The Committee invited the curator to provide an analysis of the information received in advance of its next session.

C. Azerbaijan

48. Further to its twenty-eighth session, the Committee continued to consider the information it had gathered on the likely significant adverse transboundary impacts of, and the transboundary EIA process for, two activities by Azerbaijan vis-à-vis the other Caspian Sea coastal States Parties to the Convention (EIA/IC/INFO/11). The member of the Committee representing Azerbaijan was not present. The Committee considered responses from the secretariat of the Framework Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the Caspian Sea (Teheran Convention) and the Government of Kazakhstan, of 7 October and 4 December 2013, respectively, in response to the Committee's letters of 12 September 2013.

49. The Committee agreed that the responses were sufficient at present. In the light of the response by the Government of Kazakhstan, which did not bring forward any concerns about the likely significant adverse transboundary impacts of the two projects undertaken by Azerbaijan in the south Caspian Sea, and the information provided by the Teheran Convention secretariat that it did not have any information on such impacts at its disposal, the Committee decided that there was no need to further pursue its information gathering regarding the issue.

50. The Committee member nominated by Armenia stated that she abstained from taking a position with respect to the Committee's decision.

51. The Committee asked the Chair to write to the Government of Azerbaijan to inform it accordingly.

D. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

52. Further to its twenty-eighth session and its subsequent deliberations via its electronic decision-making procedure, the Committee continued its consideration of the information it had gathered on the planned construction of the Hinkley Point C NPP by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (EIA/IC/INFO/12). The Committee reviewed the clarifications received from the Governments of Austria, Germany, Ireland and the United Kingdom in response to the Committee's letters of 15 October 2013. Additional information had also been submitted on 9 December 2013 by the member of the German parliament representing the Green Party who had originally submitted the information.

53. The Committee agreed that it would continue its consideration of the matter at its next session and asked the Chair to write to the Governments of other countries neighbouring the United Kingdom, — i.e., Belgium, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and Spain, — with a copy to the German member of parliament and the Irish NGO, to enquire whether they shared the opinion of the United Kingdom that the project would not have any significant transboundary negative impact. The information should be provided to the Committee by 31 January 2014. In addition, the Chair should write to the United Kingdom requesting a copy of the judgment of the High Court on the complaint concerning the Secretary of State's decision granting planning consent, if available before the Committee's next session. The Committee invited the curator to provide an analysis of the information in advance of its next session.

E. Ukraine

54. The Committee considered the information received on 3 October 2013 from a political party of Hungary with regard to the operation of the Muzhiyev goldmine and the use of cyanide technology in Ukraine (EIA/IC/INFO/13).

55. The Committee nominated Ms. Babayeva as the curator for the matter and invited her to provide an analysis of the information received in advance of its next session.

VII. Structure, functions and operating rules

56. Further to the initial discussions held by the Committee at its previous session at the request of the MOP on the review and development of the Committee's structure and functions and operating rules (decision V/4, para. 15), and the further elaboration of the initial draft proposal for amendments through its electronic decision-making procedure, the Committee's proposal had been submitted for information to the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment at its third session (Geneva, 11–15 November 2013). The Chair, who had been present at the meeting, reported on the outcome of the third meeting, including on the comments received on the matter. Additional comments had also been received from Ukraine in writing on 28 November 2013.

57. The Committee revised its proposals, including taking into account the comments by the Working Group. The secretariat also briefed the Committee about its informal consultations with the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs concerning the proposed new possible recommendations to bring about compliance with the Convention (rule 12, para. 2, of the Committee's operating rules), as had been requested by the Working Group.

58. The Chair invited the secretariat to circulate a revised draft for comments by the Committee members by 31 January 2014. It agreed to finalize its proposals for amending its structure, functions and operating rules at its next session.

VIII. Preparations for the next sessions of the Meetings of the Parties

59. The Committee agreed to finalize at its next session draft decisions VI/2 and II/2 on the review of compliance with the Convention and the Protocol to be forwarded to the MOP at its sixth session and the Meeting of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol (MOP/MOP) at its second session, including taking into account the comments received from the Working Group at its third session. The Committee invited the secretariat to circulate a revised draft for comments by the Committee members.

60. The Committee also agreed to finalize at its next session a draft report on the activities of the Committee, to be submitted to the MOP at its sixth session and the MOP/MOP at its second session, as foreseen in the workplan (see ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2, decision V/9–I/9). The Committee invited the secretariat to circulate a revised draft report for comments by the Committee members to be submitted by 31 January 2014.

61. The Committee underlined that, in line with its operating rules, each member was to ensure the confidentiality of information received during its review of compliance by Parties with their obligations under the Convention. The Committee members should clarify that to any Party that sought to receive information other than that publicly available.

IX. Other business

62. The Committee took note of the unsolicited information provided by Belarus and Lithuania, subsequent to the Committee's twenty-seventh session (Geneva, 12–14 March 2013), on activities undertaken for the implementation of the Committee recommendations further to the submission by Lithuania regarding Belarus (EIA/IC/S/4).⁵ The Committee noted that its recommendations to the concerned Parties had already been submitted to the MOP, for consideration at its sixth session, and had not yet endorsed by it. The Committee recalled that in its recommendations it had proposed that the two Parties be requested to report by the end of each year to the Committee on the implementation of the recommendations (see ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2013/2, annex, para. 74 (k)). It agreed to note the steps taken by the two Parties to reach compliance subsequent to its findings and recommendations in the report on its activities to the MOP at its sixth session.

63. Finally, the Committee took note of the information submitted by a Moldovan, a Romanian, a Polish and a Ukrainian NGO concerning the final decision authorizing the extension of the lifetime of reactors at the South Ukrainian NPP in Ukraine.

64. Further to the consideration of the follow-up by Armenia with decision V/4 of the Meeting of the Parties and its Committee initiative regarding Azerbaijan, the Committee recommended that the international consultants contracted by the secretariat in the future for legislative assistance would also be required to follow up on the development of draft legislation or regulations until their adoption. According to the Committee, such a step would ensure the compliance of the national legislation with the Convention and the effective use of resources.

X. Presentation of the main decisions taken and closing of the session

65. The Committee adopted the draft report of its session, prepared with the support of the secretariat.

66. The Committee decided that it would next meet from 25 to 27 February 2014. The Chair then closed the twenty-ninth session.

⁵ Information on submissions by Parties concerning the compliance of other Parties can be found on the Convention website from http://www.unece.org/env/eia/implementation/implementation_committee_matters.html.