
Questionnaire for the report of Azerbaijan on the implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context in the period 2013–2015

Information on the focal point for the Convention

1. Name and contact information: **Ms. Aysel Babayeva**

Information on the point of contact for the Convention

2. Name and contact information (if different from above): Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Information on the person responsible for preparing the report

3. Country: **Azerbaijan**
4. Surname: **Aysel**
5. Forename: **Babayeva**
6. Institution: **Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources**
7. Postal address: **1154**
8. E-mail address: **ayselbabasoylu@yahoo.com**
9. Telephone number: **+994556001538**
10. Fax number: **+994125670828**
11. Date on which report was completed: **31.03.2016**

Part one

Current legal and administrative framework for the implementation of the Convention

In this part, please provide the information requested, or revise any information relative to the previous report. Describe the legal, administrative and other measures taken in your country to implement the provisions of the Convention. This part should describe the framework for your country's implementation, and not experience in the application of the Convention.

Please do not reproduce the text of the legislation itself but summarize and explicitly refer to the relevant provisions transposing the Convention text (e.g., EIA Law of the Republic of ..., art. 5, para. 3, of Government Resolution No. ..., para. ... item...)

Article 1

Definitions

I.1. Is the definition of impact for the purpose of the Convention the same in your legislation as in article 1?

- (a) **Yes X**
- (b) Yes, with some differences (please provide details):
- (c) No (please provide the definition):
- (d) There are no definitions of impact in the legislation

Your comments:

According to the Law on Environmental Protection of Azerbaijan Republic (1999), Article 1, it is given under the definition of "hazardous impact to the environment" and under this item it is explained the impacts to "ecosystem" which also defined in the same Article, which in whole purpose is compatible with the respective provision of Convention.

At the same time, according to the Constitution of Azerbaijan Article 148 (1995), the international treaties are considered the integral part of national legislation of Azerbaijan. Thus, referring to the Decree of the President of Azerbaijan Number 616, on 1st of February, 1999 on Approval of the Law of Azerbaijan Republic on Application of Espoo Convention and its Annexes, the respective provisions are required to be referred the same on this regard. It should be taken into account to all below mentioned questions on "national legislation".

I.2. Is the definition of transboundary impact for the purpose of the Convention the same in your legislation as in article 1? Please specify each below.

- (a) **Yes: X**
- (b) Yes, with some differences (please provide details):
- (c) No (please provide the definition):
- (d) There are no definitions of transboundary impact in the legislation

Your comments:

There is not specific national law that reflect this definition.

According to the Constitution of Azerbaijan Article 148 (1995) and the Decree of the President of Azerbaijan Number 616, on 1st of February, in 1999, the respective provisions of Espoo Convention and its Annexes, as an integral part of national legislation are required to be applied the same on this regard.

I.3. Please specify how major change is defined in your national legislation:

There is not a direct definition on “major changes” that explains it separately.

However, the law on Environmental Protection Law, Chapter VII on ecological requirements for industrial and other economic activities during the construction, reconstruction, commissioning, termination or restoring period, includes in general approach describing the changes that could have negative impact to the environment and for this purpose, to identify those impacts, state environmental expertise of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (MENR) is indicated the competent authority which stakeholders should consult with.

Description of the role and functions of relevant authority on State environmental Expertise are depicted in the Chapter VIII (Art.54-58) of EP Law.

I.4. How do you identify the public concerned? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

(a) **Based on the geographical location of the proposed project X**

(b) **By making the information available to all members of the public and letting them identify themselves as the public concerned X**

(c) By other means (please specify):

Your comments:

National legal acts such as Law on EP (1999, Article 6-7), Law on Access to Information of AR (18th of December, 2005), Law on Access to Information on Environment, Law on Public Participation (2014, 1st of June) give the rights for each citizen, legal and physical persons to obtain the information on environment and participate in any cases concerning their constitutional right of living in clean and health environment, at the same time to raise his/her opinion, propose and require the necessary steps towards (or cancellation) the harmful economic and industrial activities.

Guideline on “EIA process” (confirmed in 1996 by Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources) provides practical implementation steps on this regard too.

According to the Constitution of Azerbaijan Article 148 (1995) and the Decree of the President of Azerbaijan Number 616, on 1st of February, in 1999, the respective provisions of Espoo Convention and its Annexes, as an integral part of national legislation are required to be applied the same on this regard.

Article 2

General provisions

I.5. Provide legislative, regulatory, administrative and other measures taken in your country to implement the provisions of the Convention (art. 2, para. 2):

- (a) Law on EIA:
- (b) EIA provisions are transposed into another law(s) (please specify):
- (c) **Regulation (please indicate number/year/name): X**
- (d) Administrative (please indicate number/year/name):
- (e) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

As a regulatory basis, according to the Decree of The President of the Republic of Azerbaijan 29th of June, 2012, number 392-IVQ about “Approval, enforcement of the Code on Urban Planning and Construction and legal regulation on this regard”, Article 1.7.1, it is requires to prepare the Draft Law on Environmental Impact Assessment. The Draft (includes in State environmental expertise, environmental impact assessment and strategic environmental assessment) was prepared and submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers. The Decree required all legislations to be compatible with this Code.

Legal support was necessary during this term (2013-2015) in Azerbaijan due to the fact that new Draft Law on EIA was under preparation stage and it is required to ensure its compliance with the Espoo Convention. For this purpose, by the request of Azerbaijan legal assistance was supported by Espoo Convention Secretariat in 2014-2015 on EIA (on SEA as well). Legal support by international consultants was provided on giving the recommendations, then drafting the necessary parts of Draft. Based on this, it was improved by national consultants and was submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers. The Draft passed the ministerial review with positive confirmation that current stage it is expected to be submitted to the Parliament.

I.6. Please describe any differences between the list of activities in your national legislation and appendix I to the Convention, if any:

(a) There is no difference, all activities are transposed in the national legislation as is

(b) **It differs slightly: X (please specify):**

Your comments:

According to the Constitution of Azerbaijan Article 148 (1995) and the Decree of the President of Azerbaijan Number 616, on 1st of February, in 1999, the respective provisions of Espoo Convention and its Annexes are required to be applied the same as an integral part of national legislation. Therefore, if any differences the Espoo Convention list has prior force to be applied.

Currently, although all industrial and economic activities that should be issued by State Environmental Expertise Department (SEE) of MENR, while consultations with

developers in project level it is main requirement to apply EIA to the list of activities of Espoo Convention

It should be mentioned that prepared Draft Law on EIA ANNEX 1 includes in all activities based on Espoo Convention ANNEX 1 with minor changes or additions. Thus, some activities were considered necessary to be reflected in the Draft Law in accordance with its environmental concerns or modified with more precise way - like large-diameter oil and gas pipelines indicated with proper length and diameter referring to EU EIA Directive, or additions made - activities on national water fund resources like artificial island construction and etc.

I.7. Identify the competent authority/authorities responsible for carrying out the EIA procedure in your country (please specify):

- (a) There are different authorities at national, regional, local levels
- (b) They are different for domestic and transboundary procedures
- (c) Please name the responsible authority/authorities:
- (d) **There is no single authority responsible for the entire EIA procedure: X**

Your comments:

Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Azerbaijan is responsible competent authority which issue environmental conclusions (decisions) to the economic activities, thus it implements state environmental expertise process on EIA (Law EP, Article 54) documents and is the main authority on environment which developers consult during the EIA process and gets SEE conclusions for EIA Report.

EIA process itself are carried out by Developers that have an intention to initiate any economic and industrial activities, which in this case EIA process should be carried out by them or the institutions or consulting companies that are involved by them for the respective purposes and they start consultation with MENR when they begin EIA process.

Overall, it is responsibility of MENR to require of carrying out the EIA process on the activities that have significant environmental impacts.

I.8. Is there an authority in your country that collects information on all the transboundary EIA cases? If so, please name it:

- (a) No
- (b) **Yes X (please specify): Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources**

Your comments:

Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources and its relevant bodies (State Environmental Expertise Department, Environmental Protection Department) takes responsibilities and rights under the Law on EP Chapter 2, Art. 4.1.10, Art. 4.2.5 and 4.2.6 to disseminate, control and establish international cooperation over the environmental protection issues.

Competent authority identified as Points of Contact under the Convention also collects information on the transboundary EIA case and coordinates it.

I.9. How does your country, as Party of origin and as affected Party, ensure that the opportunity given to the public of the affected Party is equivalent to the one given to the Party of origin's public, as required in article 2, paragraph 6 (please explain):

There was not such a practice.

In case of both situations, public should be informed due to identified requirements under the Provisions of Espoo Convention, Aarhus Convention. Also, the requirements of the respective national laws on Public Participation, Access to Environmental Information and Access to Information should be followed too.

Article 3 Notification

I.10. As Party of origin, when do you notify the affected Party (art. 3, para. 1)? Please specify:

- (a) During scoping
- (b) When the EIA report has been prepared and the domestic procedure started
- (c) After finishing the domestic procedure
- (d) **At other times (please specify): X**

Your comments:

There was not such a practice.

According to the current requirements under the Guideline on EIA process (1996) Item 2.2, during the State Environmental Expertise process of proposed activity, application of EIA could be required by SEE (in this case based on Espoo Convention List or other the activities that raised significant environmental concerns due to the local conditions by SEE) and EIA process should start with the consultations on identification of the scope of the EIA with SEE and the public. After this process, in case of identification of transboundary impacts, Provision 3.1 of Espoo Convention should be applied.

I.11. Please define the format of notification:

- (a) **It is the format as decided by the first meeting of the Parties in its decision I/4 (ECE/MP.EIA/2, annex IV, appendix) X**
- (b) The country has its own format (please attach a copy)
- (c) No official format used

Your comments:

There is not such a practice

In case of application abovementioned format of Espoo Convention should be used.

I.12. As a Party of origin, what information do you include in the notification (art. 3, para. 2)? Please specify (more than one options may apply):

- (a) **The information required by article 3, paragraph 2 X**

(b) **The information required by article 3, paragraph 5 X**

(c) Additional information (please specify):

Your comments:

There is not such a practice

In case of application Espoo Convention provisions should be used.

I.13. As a Party of origin, does your national legislation contain any provision on receiving a response to the notification from the affected Party in a reasonable time frame (art. 3, para. 3, “within the time specified in the notification”)? Please specify:

(a) **National legislation does not cover the time frame X**

(b) Yes, it is indicated in the national legislation (please indicate the time frame):

(c) It is determined and agreed with each affected Party case by case in the beginning of the transboundary consultations (please indicate the average length in weeks):

Your comments:

There is not such a national law that define the timeframe.

In case of application Espoo Convention provisions should be used.

Please specify the consequence if a notified affected Party does not comply with the time frame, and the possibility of extending a deadline:

Identified timeframe in the notification or any conditions considered there should be followed. Indication of timeframe in the notification in compliance with Espoo Convention should be an asset case.

I.14. How do you inform the public and authorities of the affected Party (art. 3, para 8)? Please specify:

(a) **By informing the point of contact to the Convention listed on the Convention website¹ X**

(b) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.15. On what basis is the decision made to participate (or not) in the transboundary EIA procedure as affected Party (art. 3, para. 3)? Please specify:

(a) **Notified ministry/authority of the affected Party responsible for EIA decides on its own based on the documentation provided by Party of origin X**

(b) Based on the opinions of the competent authorities of the affected Party

(c) Based on the opinions of the competent authorities and that of public of the affected Party

¹ List available from http://www.unece.org/env/eia/points_of_contact.htm.

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

I.16. If the affected Party has indicated that it intends to participate in the EIA procedure, how are the details for such participation agreed, including the time frame for consultations and the deadline for commenting (art. 5)? Please specify:

- (a) **Following the rules and procedures of the Party of origin X**
- (b) Following the rules and procedures of the affected Party
- (c) Other (please specify):

There are not specific rules in national laws.

In case of application, Espoo Convention provisions (Art 5) and Guidelines on practical Application of it should be used.

Your comments:

Article 4

Preparation of the environmental impact assessment documentation

I.17. How do you ensure sufficient quality of the EIA documentation as Party of origin? Please specify:

- (a) **The competent authority checks the information provided and ensures it includes all information required under appendix II as a minimum before making it available for comments X**
- (b) By using quality checklists
- (c) There are no specific procedures or mechanisms
- (d) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

According to the Law on EP, Article 54 and Guideline on EIA Process Article 3.2.2 State Environmental Expertise Department issues the quality of the EIA documents

However, in case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention provisions and Guidelines on practical Application of it should be used.

I.18. How do you determine the relevant information to be included in the EIA documentation in accordance with article 4, paragraph 1? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) **By using appendix II : X**
- (b) **By using the comments received from the authorities concerned during the scoping phase, if applicable X**

(c) **By using the comments from members of the public during the scoping phase, if applicable X**

(d) As determined by the proponent based on its own expertise

(e) By using other means (please specify):

Your comments:

In general, according to the Guideline on EIA Process Article 3.2.2 State Environmental Expertise Department agrees on the scope of the EIA documents. SEE requires all issues raised by MENR and public to be taken into account in the EIA report.

In any case of transboundary EIA application, Espoo Convention provisions and Guidelines on practical Application of it should be used. It should be noted that New Draft Law on EIA describes the content and information to be included in the EIA documentation that is in compliance with Espoo Convention.

I.19. How do you determine “reasonable alternatives” in accordance with appendix II, paragraph (b)?

(a) On a case-by-case basis

(b) As defined in the national legislation (please specify):

(c) **Other (please specify):**

There is not such a definition in current national laws. In case of application, Espoo Convention Annex II (B) will be applied.

At the same time New Draft Law on EIA includes information on alternatives to be included in the EIA documentation in compliance with Espoo Convention.

Your comments:

Article 5 Consultations on the basis of the environmental impact assessment documentation

(a) Public participation

I.20. How can the public concerned express its opinion on the EIA documentation of the proposed project (art. 5)? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

As Party of origin

(a) **By sending comments to the competent authority/focal point X**

(b) **By taking part in a public hearing X**

(c) Other (please specify):

There was not such a practice.

In case of transboundary procedure, timeframe, the tools for consultation and getting the opinions should be formed by Party of Origin and agreed with Affected Party in advance. Therefore, both options can be used based on Guideline of Practical Application of Espoo Convention.

As affected Party

- (d) **By sending comments to the competent authority/focal point X**
- (e) **By taking part in a public hearing X**
- (f) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

There was not such a practice.

In case of transboundary procedure, timeframe, the tools for consultation and getting the opinions should be formed by Party of Origin and agreed with Affected Party in advance. Therefore, both options can be used based on Guideline of Practical Application of Espoo Convention.

I.21. Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of a public hearing on the territory of the affected Party in cases where your country is the country of origin:

- (a) Yes
- (b) **No X**

Your comments:

There is not such specific Law that identifies this procedure.

In case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention and Practical Guideline will be referred to.

I.22. Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of public hearings in cases where your country is the affected Party:

- (a) Yes
- (b) **No X**

Your comments:

There is not such specific Law that identifies this procedure.

In case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention and Practical Guideline will be referred to.

(b) Consultations

I.23. Does your national EIA legislation have any provision on the organization of transboundary consultations (expert, joint bodies, etc.) between the authorities of the concerned Parties? Please specify:

- (a) Yes, it is obligatory
- (b) **No, it does not have any provision on that X**
- (c) It is optional (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 6

Final decision

I.24. Please indicate all points below that are covered in a final decision related to the implementation of the planned activity (art. 6, para. 1):

- (a) Conclusions of the EIA documentation
- (b) Comments received in accordance with article 3, paragraph 8, and article 4, paragraph 2
- (c) Outcome of the consultations as referred to in article 5
- (d) Outcomes of the transboundary consultations
- (e) Comments received from the affected Party
- (f) Mitigation measures
- (g) **Other (please specify):**

There is not specific national law that defines this definition “final decision”.

It could be expressed that, currently, in the Law on EP, the conclusion of State ecological expertise (SEE) which permits to realize the project has obligatory character to proceed on implementation. Conclusion is given after the EIA procedures contain environmental protection measures and mitigation of impacts and reflects the opinion of public which compatible with the Article 6 of the Convention.

However, in case of transboundary application the Espoo Convention Provisions should be followed.

I.25. Are the comments of the authorities and the public of the affected Party and the outcome of the consultations taken into consideration in the same way as the comments from the authorities and the public in your country (art. 6, para. 1):

- (a) Yes
- (b) **No X**

Your comments:

There is not such a specific laws that reflect this occasion. There was not such a practice either.

In case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention and its Practical Guideline will be referred to.

I.26. Is there any regulation in the national legislation of your country that ensures the implementation of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3?:

- (a) **No: X**
- (b) Yes (please specify):

Your comments:

In case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention and Practical Guideline will be referred to. There are no such specific laws that reflect this occasion. There was not such a practice either.

I.27. Do all activities listed in appendix I (items 1-22) require a final decision to authorize or undertake such an activity?:

(a) Yes **X**

(b) No (please specify those that do not):

Your comments:

There is not such a specific laws that reflect this occasion. There was not such a practice either.

In case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention and its Practical Guideline and SEE process and conclusions on these activities will be referred to.

I.28. For each type of activity listed in appendix I that does require a final decision, please indicate the legal requirements in your country that identify what is regarded as the “final decision” to authorize or undertake such an activity (art. 6 in conjunction with art. 2, para. 3), and the term used in the national legislation to indicate the final decision in the original language:

Your comments:

There is not such a specific laws that reflect the definition of “final decision”. In this case, State Environmental Expertise conclusions which are very compatible with the Art 6 of Espoo Convention should be accepted as final decision of competent authority on environment (department of MENR).

Article 7

Post-project analysis

I.29. Is there any provision regarding post-project analysis in your national EIA legislation (art. 7, para. 1)?:

(a) No: **X**

(b) Yes (please specify the main steps to be taken and how the results of it are communicated):

Your comments:

Guideline on EIA process Art 6.4, SEE monitors the applied conditions given on the environmental conclusions and at the same time it is an obligation of Developer to hold the monitoring and give the results of Monitoring to the MENR regularly. It is also requirement of Law on EP Art 17-18.

In case of transboundary application, Espoo Convention and Practical Guideline will be referred to, as there are no such specific laws that reflect transboundary occasion. There was not such a practice either.

Article 8

Bilateral and multilateral cooperation

(a) Agreements

I.30. Does your country have any bilateral or multilateral agreements based on the Convention (art. 8, appendix VI)?:

(a) **No**

(b) Yes Please specify with which countries:

If publicly available, please also attach the texts of such bilateral and multilateral agreements, preferably in English, French or Russian.

I.31. What issues do these bilateral agreements cover (appendix VI)? (more than one option may apply):

(a) Specific conditions of the subregion concerned

(b) Institutional, administrative and other arrangements

(c) Harmonization of the Parties' policies and measures

(d) Developing, improving, and/or harmonizing methods for the identification, measurement, prediction and assessment of impacts, and for post-project analysis

(e) Developing and/or improving methods and programmes for the collection, analysis, storage and timely dissemination of comparable data regarding environmental quality in order to provide input into the EIA

(f) Establishment of threshold levels and more specified criteria for defining the significance of transboundary impacts related to the location, nature or size of proposed activities

(g) Undertaking joint EIA, development of joint monitoring programmes, intercalibration of monitoring devices and harmonization of methodologies

(h) **Other, please specify:** **have not such practice**

Your comments:

(b) Procedural steps required by the national legislation

I.32. Please describe the steps required in your national legislation for a transboundary EIA procedure:

(a) **When EIA in a transboundary context is part of a domestic EIA procedure:**

The Law on EP Art 1.10 includes the condition on international cooperation on the cases related to environmental protection. However, there is not specific national law that prescribe this procedure.

According to the Constitution of Azerbaijan Article 148 (1995) and the Decree of the President of Azerbaijan Number 616, on 1st of February, in 1999, the respective provisions of Espoo Convention and its Annexes, as an integral part of national legislation are required to be applied the same on this regard.

(b) When EIA in a transboundary context is a separate procedure (please provide of how this procedure links to the domestic procedure and whether the steps are different):

Alternatively, this question can be answered or supported by providing a schematic flowchart showing these steps.

Your comments:

I.33. Does your country have special provisions or informal arrangements concerning transboundary EIA procedures for joint cross-border projects (e.g., roads, pipelines)?:

(a) **No: X**

(b) Yes (please specify):

(i) Special provisions:

(ii) Informal arrangements:

Your comments:

I.34. Does your country have special provisions or informal arrangements concerning transboundary EIA procedures for nuclear power plants (NPPs)?:

(a) **No: X**

(b) Yes (please specify):

(i) Special provisions:

(ii) Informal arrangements:

Your comments:

Part two

Practical application during the period 2013–2015

Please report on your country's practical experiences in applying the Convention (not your country's procedures described in part one), whether as Party of origin or affected Party. The focus here is on identifying good practices as well as difficulties Parties have encountered in applying the Convention in practice. The goal is to enable Parties to share solutions. Parties should therefore provide appropriate examples highlighting application of the Convention and innovative approaches to improve its application.

II.1. Does your country object to the information on transboundary EIA procedures that you provide in this section being compiled and made available on the website of the Convention? Please specify (indicate "yes" if you object):

(a) Yes

(b) No **X**

Your comments:

1. Experience in the transboundary environmental impact assessment procedure during the period 2013–2015

Cases during the period 2013–2015

II.2. If your country's national administration has a record of transboundary EIA procedures that were under way during the reporting period, in which your country was Party of origin or affected Party, please list them in the tables II.2 (a) and II.2 (b) below (adding additional rows as needed).

Table II.2 (a)

Transboundary EIA procedures: As Party of origin

Name of case	Starting date (date notification sent)	Length of the main steps in months		Final decision (date of issuing, if information is available)
		Submission of the environmental report	Transboundary consultations (expert), if any Public participation, including public hearing, if any	
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
...				

Your comments:

there was not such an occasion

Table II.2 (a)

Transboundary EIA procedures: As affected Party

Name of case	Starting date (date notification sent)	Length of the main steps in months			Final decision (date of issuing, if information is available)
		Submission of the environmental report	Transboundary consultations (expert), if any	Public participation, including public hearing, if any	
1. <i>New Metsamor NPP</i>	<i>no action followed</i>	<i>no action followed</i>	<i>no action followed</i>	<i>no action followed</i>	<i>no action followed</i>
2.					
3.					
4.					
...					

Your comments:

In 2010 as an Affected Party Azerbaijan confirmed the intent of participation on Transboundary EIA process of new Metsamor NPP while the Party of Origin (in this case Armenia) refused to apply transboundary EIA process under Espoo Convention.

According to the Decision VI/2, p.45-46 of MOP6 on 2-5th of June, in 2014 Armenia was considered in non-compliance under the Article 3, paragraph 1 of the Espoo Convention referring to the submission of Azerbaijan on 5th of May, 2011. Due to the respective Decision the case is requested to be followed up and monitored by Implementation Committee of the Convention with a possibility for Armenia to continue the implementation of the subsequent steps in the transboundary EIA procedure under the Convention considering the fact that the final decision on the construction of the nuclear power plant had not yet been taken.

Please share with other Parties your country's experience of using the Convention in practice. In response to each of the questions below, either provide one or two practical examples or describe your country's general experience. You might also include examples of lessons learned in order to help others.

II.3. Translation is not addressed in the Convention. How has your country addressed the question of translation? What difficulties has your country as Party of origin and affected Party experienced relating to translation and interpretation, and what solutions has your country applied? (Please specify, among others, the parts and type of the documentation translated, language, costs, etc.):

- (a) As Party of origin:
- (b) As affected Party:

No comment

II.4. Describe any difficulties that your country has encountered during transboundary public participation (expert consultation, public hearing, etc.), including on issues of timing, language and the need for additional information:

No practice

II.5. Does your country have successful examples of organizing transboundary EIA procedures for joint cross-border projects or that of an NPP?:

(a) Yes

(b) No

II.6. If you answered yes to question II.5, please provide information on your country's experiences describing, for example, means of cooperation (e.g., contact points, joint bodies, bilateral agreements, special and common provisions, etc.), institutional arrangements, and how practical matters are dealt with (e.g., translation, interpretation, transmission of documents, etc.):

(a) For joint cross-border projects:

(b) For NPPs:

II.7. Name examples of good practice cases, whether complete cases or good practice elements (e.g., notification, consultation or public participation) within cases:

no practice

II.8. Would your country like to introduce a case in the form of a Convention "case study fact sheet"?:

(a) No

(b) Yes (please indicate which cases):

II.9. Has your country carried out post-project analyses in the period 2013–2015:

(a) No **there was not such a case on post project analysis under the Convention**

(b) Yes (please indicate which projects, along with the challenges in implementation and any lessons learned):

2. Experience in using the guidance in 2013–2015

II.10. Has your country used in practice the following guidance, adopted by the Meeting of the Parties and available online?:

(a) Guidance on Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (ECE/MP.EIA/7):

No

Yes (please provide details):

Your experience with using this guidance:

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance:

(b) Guidance on subregional cooperation (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex V, appendix):

No

Yes (please provide details):

Your experience with using this guidance:

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance:

(c) Guidance on the Practical Application of the Espoo Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/8):

No

Yes (please provide details):

Your experience with using this guidance: **Guidance was used for formulation Draft Law on EIA.**

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance:

3. Clarity of the Convention

II.11. Has your country had difficulties implementing the procedures defined in the Convention, either as Party of origin or as affected Party, because of a lack of clarity of the provisions?:

No

Yes (please indicate which provisions and how they are unclear):

4. Suggested improvements to the report

II.12 Please provide suggestions for how this report may be improved.

No comment