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Introduction

• Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) in a Transboundary Context
• Negotiated in late 1980s under United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE)
• Adopted and signed in Espoo (Finland) in 1991
• Came into force in 1997, with 16 Parties
• Now has 45 Parties
Bilateral & multilateral agreements

• Examples from Baltic Sea area:
  • Estonia and Latvia (1997)
  • Estonia and Finland (2002)
  • Germany and Poland (2006; in force 2007)
  • Lithuania and Poland (2004)

• Elsewhere in region:
  • Multilateral agreement for SE Europe (2008; in force 2011)
  • Caspian Sea protocol on EIA in a transboundary context
  • Recommendations for Black Sea
  • EU Directive on EIA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land neighbours</th>
<th>Espoo</th>
<th>Caspian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Baltic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>not UNECE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People's Republic of Korea</td>
<td>not UNECE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>not UNECE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian Federation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Signatory</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>Party</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
<td>(Yes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Espoo Convention’s objectives (*implied*)

- To ensure environmentally sound and **sustainable development**
- To enhance **international co-operation** in assessing environmental impact in particular in a transboundary context
- To develop **anticipatory policies**
- To **prevent**, mitigate and monitor significant adverse environmental impact in general and more specifically in a transboundary context
- To give explicit **consideration** to environmental factors at an early stage in the decision-making process by applying environmental impact assessment, at all appropriate administrative levels
- To improve the **quality of information** presented to decision makers so that environmentally sound **decisions** can be made paying careful attention to minimizing significant adverse impact, particularly in a transboundary context
Implementing the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (1992)

• Principle 17: Environmental impact assessment, as a national instrument, shall be undertaken for proposed activities that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are subject to a decision of a competent national authority.

• Principle 19: States shall provide prior and timely notification and relevant information to potentially affected States on activities that may have a significant adverse transboundary environmental effect and shall consult with those States at an early stage and in good faith.
Requirements *(indicative)*

- Requires Party to notify & consult other Parties on planned activity likely to have significant environmental impact across borders
- Requires preparation and sharing of assessment of environmental impacts
- Allows affected Parties – authorities & public – to comment on planned activities and on assessment of environmental impacts
- Provides for bilateral consultations between concerned Parties
- Party of origin makes final decision, taking into due account:
  - comments received (incl. authorities & public of affected Party)
  - outcome of environmental impact assessment
  - outcome of bilateral consultations
- Final decision is sent to affected Party
Practical application

- Well over 700 cases to date
  - Growth from 10 cases per year a decade ago to almost 100 now
- Common examples
  - Power plants: nuclear, coal, hydropower, gas, wind
  - Cross-border infrastructure: road, rail, power lines, pipelines
  - Mining, major quarries & on-site processing
Practical application – pilot project
Neman hydroelectric power plant, Belarus

• Pilot project implemented by Ministry of Natural Resources & Environmental Protection of Belarus, with support of UNDP
• Planned hydroelectric power plant on Neman River, 11 km from border with Lithuania
  • Developer: Belarusian State enterprise Grodnoenergo
  • EIA report prepared by Central Research Institute for Complex Use of Water Resources
  • Originally planned to involve authorities and public of Lithuania and Russian Federation
Practical application – pilot project
Neman hydroelectric power plant, Belarus

- Informal consultations on 22-23 June 2009 in Minsk, involving Belarus, Lithuania and Russian Federation (plus secretariat)
- Notification letter sent by Ministry of Natural Resources & Environmental Protection of Belarus to Lithuania’s Ministry of Environment on 9 June 2009 and on 1 July 2009 (latter included deadline for submitting response), including first draft EIA report (in English & Russian)
- Notification also sent to Russian Federation on 1 July 2009
- Lithuania replied positively to notification
- Draft EIA report available on website of Ministry of Environment of Lithuania
Practical application – pilot project
Neman hydroelectric power plant, Belarus

- Lithuania comments on the draft EIA report sent on 7 August 2009 (in English)
- Lithuania comments sent to all interested institutions in Belarus on 17 August 2009
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of Belarus replied to Lithuania comments on 21 September 2009 and submitted also amended EIA report
- On 25 September 2009 public hearing was held in Lithuania
  - representatives of Lithuanian higher education institutions, NGOs, civil engineering companies, state and municipal authorities
  - representatives of Belarusian State enterprise Grodnoenergo, Central Research Institute for Complex Use of Water Resources of Belarus and Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection
Practical application – pilot project
Neman hydroelectric power plant, Belarus

• Public comments on draft EIA report collected until October 9 2009; report in Lithuanian available on website of Ministry of Environment of Lithuania
• On 24 February 2010 at Grodno (Belarus) bilateral (Governmental) consultations held with Lithuania on results of public hearing
  • Resolution signed, including consultation results
• National public hearing at Grodno (Belarus) on 10 March 2010
• Positive conclusion of State ecological expertise issued on 6 July 2010
• Final decision according to Convention presented to Lithuania on 5 November 2010
  • Decision on approval of justification of construction investment
Practical application – pilot project
Neman hydroelectric power plant, Belarus

- Led to better mutual understanding of legislation and procedures in Belarus and Lithuania, and a better understanding of the requirements of the Convention
- Possibly led to legislative amendments in Belarus
- Included development of guidelines in Belarus
- Included initiation of negotiation of bilateral agreements with several neighbouring Parties
Benefits: cooperation & sovereignty

- Provides framework for discussing with neighbouring States certain planned developments.
- Being a Party obliges other Parties to notify & consult you about planned developments on their territory that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on your country’s environment.
- Can enhance international cooperation, including awareness of importance of the environment, and so help to avoid conflict.
- Sovereignty is retained: decision-making power remains in country where the development is planned.
- Confidentiality is respected: protects information the supply of which would be prejudicial to industrial & commercial secrecy or national security.
Benefits: better development

- Better development: project design can be improved, including
  - higher environmental standards
  - mitigation & compensatory measures to reduce environmental impact
  - measures to adapt to climate change
  - risk of costly mistakes reduced
- Project alternatives can be identified
  - suggestions may come from public, assessment experts, developer, others
**Benefits:** better decision-making

- Better environmental protection
  - key environmental issues of a project can be identified
  - awareness of environmental consequences of project implementation raised
  - environmentally sensitive areas can be avoided by selecting new site
  - environmental impacts avoided or reduced by revising project design, so avoiding or reducing externalized environmental costs

- Better decision-making
  - decision-making can be better informed & more objective
  - assessment can provide a better framework for preparing conditions & legal agreements to govern future project operation
Costs

• Generally EIA costs less than 0.5 % of overall capital cost (with 60-90% for preparing EIA documentation)
• Costs over 1% unusual
  • for particularly controversial projects in sensitive environments
  • where good EIA practice not followed
• Actual costs of EIA tend to rise with capital cost of project, but percentage declines – projects subject to the Convention tend to be larger ones
• Timescales – typically one year. (For a large project that would take 2 years if subject to domestic procedures only, might take 3 years in a transboundary procedure.)
Espoo Convention

- Widespread and widely used – useful
- Sovereignty of decision-making
- International cooperation
- Better decisions
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