Compliance by Ukraine with its obligations under the Convention

I. Introduction - Decision IV/9h of the Meeting of the Parties

1. At its fourth session, the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention) adopted decision IV/9h on compliance by Ukraine with its obligations under the Convention (included in ECE/MP.PP/2001/2/Add.1).

2. Ukraine’s compliance with the Convention has been under the review of the Compliance Committee since 2004, beginning with communication ACCC/C/2004/3 and submission ACCC/S/2004/1 – the only submission made before the Committee by a Party concerning compliance by another Party – in relation to the construction of the Bystre deep-water navigation canal. In its findings adopted on 18 February 2005, the Committee found that the Party concerned had failed to comply with article 6, paragraph 1 (a), and in that connection with article 6, paragraphs 2 to 8, and article 6, paragraph 9, second sentence. The Committee also found non-compliance by the Party concerned with article 4, paragraph 1; and with article 3, paragraph 1, of the Convention (ECE/MP.PP/C.1/2005/2/Add.3) and made recommendations directly to the Meeting of the Parties.

3. Through decision II/5b (ECE/MP.PP/2005/2/Add.8), the Meeting of the Parties at its second session endorsed the Committee’s findings on the communication and the submission, namely:

(a) By failing to provide for public participation of the kind required by article 6 of the Convention, Ukraine was not in compliance with article 6, paragraph 1 (a), and, in connection with this, article 6, paragraphs 2 to 8, and article 6, paragraph 9 (second sentence);

(b) By failing to ensure that information was provided by the responsible public authorities upon request, Ukraine was not in compliance with article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention;

(c) The lack of clarity with regard to public participation requirements in environmental impact assessment (EIA) and environmental decision-making procedures for projects, such as time frames and modalities of a public consultation process, requirements to take its outcome into account and obligations with regard to making information available in the context of article 6, indicates the absence of a clear, transparent and consistent framework for the implementation of the Convention and constitutes non-compliance with article 3, paragraph 1, of the Convention;

4. Through decision II/5b, the Meeting of the Parties also requested the Party concerned to proceed with certain actions in identified areas of non-compliance, namely:

(a) to bring its legislation and practice into compliance with the provisions of the Convention and include information on the measures taken to that effect in its report to the next meeting of the Parties; and

(b) to submit to the Compliance Committee, not later than the end of 2005, a strategy, including a time schedule, for transposing the Convention’s provisions into national law and developing practical mechanisms and implementing legislation that sets out clear procedures for their implementation. The strategy might also include capacity-building activities, in particular for the judiciary and public officials involved in environmental decision-making.

5. During the intersessional period 2005-2008, the Committee reviewed the progress made by the Party concerned in the implementation of decision II/5b and submitted its report for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties at its third session (ECE/MP.PP/2008/5/Add.9). On the basis of the information before it, the Committee concluded that the Party remained in a situation of non-compliance with the Convention. The Committee also noted with regret the Party’s failure to engage sufficiently with the process of the review of compliance since 2004. It recommended to the Meeting of the Parties,
amongst other things, to consider whether to apply measures set out in paragraph 37 of the annex to decision I/7.

6. Through decision III/6f (ECE/MP.PP/2008/2/Add.14), the Meeting of the Parties at its third session, among other things, noted the continuing failure of the Party concerned to engage sufficiently with the compliance review process, took note of the action plan developed in May 2008, regretted however that the fulfilment of actions in the action plan would not fully address the recommendations of decision II/5b, and decided to issue a caution to the Party to become effective on 1 May 2009, unless the Party had fully satisfied the conditions set out in subparagraphs (a) to (d) below and had notified the Secretariat of that fact by 1 January 2009. The successful fulfilment of the conditions was to be established by the Committee:

a) The action plan incorporates clear activities to resolve the problems identified by the Committee in its findings and recommendations (ECE/MP.PP/C.1/2005/2/Add.3), and in particular in paragraphs 29 to 35 of the latter document (including with respect to issues of clear domestic regulation of time frames and procedures for public consultation, commenting and making available to the public the information on which decisions are based);

b) The action plan also incorporates capacity-building activities, in particular training of the judiciary and of public officials involved in environmental decision-making;

c) The action plan establishes a procedure which ensures its implementation in a transparent manner and in full consultation with civil society;

d) The action plan is transposed through a governmental normative act ensuring its implementation by all ministries and other relevant authorities.

5. The Meeting of the Parties also requested the Party concerned to regularly report to the Committee on its progress in implementing the plan.

6. During the intersessional period 2008-2011, the Committee reviewed the progress made by the Party in the implementation of decision III/6f. Further to the information submitted by the Party concerned, the Committee at its twenty-third meeting (31 March – 3 April 2009), found that Ukraine had fulfilled the conditions set out in paragraph 5(a) to (d) of decision III/6f of the Meeting of the Parties to the extent that the caution issued by the Meeting of the Parties through decision III/6f should not become effective. However, the Committee found that Ukraine was not yet fully in compliance with its obligations under the Convention and it therefore reserved the right to make further recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties, including to recommend to the newly issued a new caution if the Committee found that its concerns relating to the points highlighted had not been satisfactorily met.

7. At its thirty-first meeting (22-25 February 2011), on the basis of the information submitted through the intersessional period, the Committee prepared its report for consideration by the Meeting of the Parties at its fourth session (ECE/MP.PP/C.1/2011/2/Add.8).

8. On 29 June 2011, during the fourth session of the Meeting of the Parties (Chisinau, 29 June-1 July 2011), the Party concerned adopted new legislation on public participation in decision-making (Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 771).
report to the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties on whether the Party concerned had fulfilled decision II/5b, with a view to the Meeting of the Parties deciding whether to suspend the special rights and privileges accorded to Ukraine under the Convention.

II. Summary of follow-up action with decision IV/9h

10. On 1 May 2012 the Party concerned submitted its report along with a copy of the new draft law “On Environmental Impact Assessment” which had been prepared to address among other things the compliance issues under the Aarhus Convention.

11. On 30 May 2012, the NGO Environment-People-Law (formerly known as Ecopravo Lviv and communicant of ACCC/C/2004/3) provided its comments on the report submitted by the Party concerned, noting in particular that the law on public participation adopted by the Cabinet of Ministers in June 2011, was subsequently subjected to many substantive changes that significantly reduced its rights for public participation and was then on 25 April 2012 annulled. Environmental-People-Law submitted that the new draft law “On Environmental Impact Assessment” seemed to be solid document, but remained a draft.

12. On 5 June 2012, the Committee sent a letter to the Party through the secretariat, in which it noted with concern the late submission of the report, which had been due on 1 April 2012. The Committee, however, was even more concerned at the fact that the report had not provided evidence of full implementation by Ukraine of the measures requested by the Meeting of the Parties. Instead, it provided mainly information of draft legal acts under preparation. In the same letter, the Committee had also urged the Party concerned no later than 25 June 2012 to submit to the Committee any additional information evidencing that Ukraine had actually fulfilled the measures requested in a successful manner.

13. By letter of 26 June 2012, the Party concerned informed the Committee that the draft law “On amending certain laws of Ukraine in connection to implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context” had been registered with the Verkhovna Rada (Parliament) and was expected to be considered in July 2012.

14. At its thirty-seventh meeting (26-29 June 2012), the Committee took note of the information provided and entered into discussion with a representative of the Government of Ukraine, who participated in the session by videoconference, and with the observers. During the discussion, the Party underscored the efforts undertaken by Ukraine to bring it into compliance with the Convention, as well as with the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention). The draft law at issue was being processed simultaneously with the draft law on urban development. The Government of Ukraine commended the role of the Committee in assisting the Parties to reach compliance with the Convention and, considering the current positive dynamic in the country, asked for the consideration of the issue to be postponed to the Committee’s next meeting. A representative of the Government of Romania expressed Romania’s concerns, saying a number of the changes undertaken by Ukraine did not properly reflect the recommendations of the decision. Observers noted that even if the draft law in question were adopted, there would still be difficulties in implementing the Convention in practice.

15. The Committee took note of the statements made. It expressed its appreciation at the steps taken by Ukraine, but noted that the condition of decision IV/9h required that the Party concerned had “fully” implemented the conditions of decision II/5b by the set deadline. In the view of the Committee, the Party concerned had not fully satisfied those conditions and therefore the caution could not be lifted. The Committee expressed the expectation that Ukraine would continue its efforts, as described during the meeting. It reminded the Party of its obligation to submit its report no later than 30 November 2012. It asked the Party to provide detailed information on the progress achieved with the legislative process, including the translation in English of the draft law “On amending certain laws of Ukraine in connection to implementation of the Convention on environmental impact assessment in a
transboundary context”. The Committee instructed the secretariat to send a letter to the President of Ukraine informing him about the decision. The Committee agreed that it would evaluate the progress undertaken and consider further steps to be taken at its thirty-ninth meeting.

16. On 14 August 2012, a letter was sent by the ECE Executive Secretary to the President of Ukraine conveying the Committee’s decision that the caution would not be lifted and reminding Ukraine of its obligation set out in paragraph 10 of decision IV/9h to submit to the Committee no later than 30 November 2012 detailed information on further progress in implementing the measures referred to in decision II/5b.

17. On 30 November 2012, the Party concerned submitted its report along with the requested translation of the draft law “On introducing amendments into certain Laws of Ukraine on implementation of the provisions of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in the Transboundary Context”.

18. At its thirty-ninth meeting (11-14 December 2012), the Committee noted that the Party concerned had submitted the requested information by the deadline, but that there appeared to be no significant progress, since the law was not in force yet. It confirmed that it would evaluate the situation in greater detail and would consider further steps to be taken at its fortieth meeting.

19. On 27 February 2013, information was submitted by Environment-People-Law, inter alia, indicating that:

The Party concerned’s report of 30 November 2012 failed to mention that the draft law “On introducing amendments into certain Laws of Ukraine on implementation of the provisions of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in the Transboundary Context”, which had been registered in the Parliament in June 2012, had been automatically withdrawn pursuant to the parliamentary rules of procedure following the election of a new Parliament in October 2012, and thus was no longer before the Parliament;

The draft had in the meantime been revised by the Ministry of Ecology and renamed as draft law “On introducing amendments to certain laws of Ukraine on implementation of the provisions of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters”. The revised draft had been submitted to other ministries for approval in December 2012, but was subsequently declined by most of them. The draft had then been further revised by the Ministry of Ecology and re-submitted to other ministries for approval, which was then pending. The revised drafts were not released to the public;

The draft law “On introducing amendments on Regulation of Urban Development Activities (related to public discussions of the project documentation on construction)”, proposing amendments to article 21 of the Law on Regulation of Urban Development Activities in terms of mandatory public consultation, which had been submitted to the Parliament in September 2012, had also been automatically withdrawn in December 2012 following the election of a new Parliament (see under (a) above);

In June 2011, the Law on Urban Development Activities had abolished the previous state ecological expertise for projects adversely affecting the environment. Under the Law on Urban Development Activities, the Ministry of Ecology and Nature Resources no longer participated in the assessment of documentation to evaluate the environmental impact of proposed construction projects; new higher thresholds for when an EIA was required were introduced, meaning a smaller number of projects would be subjected to EIA, and thus public participation; and there was no requirement for public participation during the expertise or when the permit was issued and no requirement for the outcomes of the public participation during the environmental impact assessment (known as OVNS) to be taken into account by the developer.

There is lack of coordination between the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources (the Ministry responsible for EIA and Aarhus matters and the draft law “On introducing amendments to certain laws of Ukraine on implementation of the provisions of the Convention on Access to
Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters") and the Ministry of Regional Development and Construction, on the other hand (the Ministry responsible for the urban development and construction activities and the draft law “On Urban Development Activities).

20. At its fortieth meeting (25-28 March 2013), the Committee took note of the information submitted by the communicant of ACCC/C/2004/3 (Environment People Law). The Committee noted the continuous failure of the Party concerned to implement the public participation procedures of the Convention over the past eight years. It also noted that the report submitted by the Party concerned in November 2012 related primarily to changes introduced by a draft law, which according to recent information, had in the meantime been withdrawn from parliamentary proceedings.

21. The Committee then discussed the matter via teleconference with a representative of the Party concerned, who informed the Committee of the internal ongoing procedures for the approval of legislative amendments in order to reach compliance with the Convention, including the draft law subject to parliamentary proceedings and the amendment of the Law concerning Development Construction, which was also pending. The representative noted that, while the Party concerned had striven to properly include all elements of article 6 of the Convention in the new draft law, some elements remained weak, such as the obligations arising from article 6, paragraph 2 (regarding provision of information to the public concerning about environmental decision-making procedures). The representative of the Party concerned thanked the Committee for its assistance, and said that the statement made during the teleconference would subsequently be provided in writing.

22. An observer representing Environment-People-Law expressed its deep concern at the fact that the draft law had been withdrawn and that the current changes to the new draft were not open to public comment. It was also noted that there was currently no draft legislation before the parliament with respect to public participation and that public participation, especially in the context of the State ecological expertiza, had significantly deteriorated, while at the same time the scope of review by the competent authorities was much more limited.

23. The Committee requested the Party concerned to comment on the statement made by the observer. It also requested the Party to submit an advance copy of the new draft law, after its approval by all the relevant ministers, and before it was submitted for parliamentary approval, and agreed to review the situation at its next meetings.

24. At its forty-first meeting (25-28 June 2013), the Committee recalled that further to the discussions at its fortieth meeting, the Party concerned was expected to comment on the statement made by the observer and to submit an advance copy of the new draft law “On amending certain laws of Ukraine in connection to implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context”, after its approval by all the relevant ministers, and before it was submitted for parliamentary approval. The Committee agreed to review the situation at its next meeting, when the information expected by the Party concerned by 31 July 2013 has been provided. It requested the secretariat to remind the Party of its obligation to respond.

25. On 11 July 2013, the ECE Executive Secretary wrote to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine to remind the Party concerned of the Committee’s request and the deadline of 31 July 2013 to respond.

26. On 31 October 2013, the Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources informed the Committee that in May 2013, the draft law “On introduction of amendments of some laws of Ukraine in terms of implementation of the Convention on the Assessment of Environmental Impact in the Transboundary Context” had been registered by the Ukrainian Parliament, and had had its first reading on 17 September 2013. The Ministry for Ecology and Natural Resources was currently preparing the draft law for its second reading.

27. On 13 November 2013, at the request of the Committee a letter was sent by the ECE Executive Secretary to the President of Ukraine noting that pursuant to decision IV/9h the final deadline for the Party concerned to submit detailed information to the Committee on its progress in implementing the
measures referred to in decision II/5b was November 2013. The Executive Secretary encouraged Ukraine to provide the requested information as soon as possible and no later than 30 November 2013 in order that it may be taken into account in the preparation of the Committee’s recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties at its fifth session. The Executive Secretary also stressed that confirmation that the relevant legislation bringing Ukraine into compliance with the provisions of the Convention had been passed into law would be critical to the recommendations that the Committee would make in its report to the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties. The letter indicated that the Committee was scheduled to complete its draft recommendations to the Meeting of the Parties at its forty-third meeting (Geneva, 17-20 December 2013).

28. On 14 November 2013, during an informal meeting between representatives of the Party concerned and the secretariat organized at the latter’s invitation, the representatives of the Party concerned informed the secretariat that in a letter dated 1 August 2013 it had provided a full response to the requests made by the Committee at its fortieth meeting. The secretariat checked all incoming reception points for correspondence, and informed the Party concerned that the letter had not been previously received by the ECE.

29. In his letter dated 1 August 2013, but hand-delivered to the secretariat on 14 November 2013, the Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources stated that the draft law “On amendments of some laws of Ukraine on implementation of the Convention on the Assessment of Environmental Impact in the Transboundary Context” had been available on the official website of the Ukrainian Parliament from 21 June to 6 September 2013. In accordance with article 20.1 of the Law of Ukraine “On Citizens’ Application”, citizens were entitled to appeal and to submit comments to the public authorities and the public authorities were required to consider and solve the issues raised in the citizens’ application within a period of one month. Hence, the observer’s allegation that the draft law was not open for public comment was not valid. With respect to the observer’s allegation that there were currently no draft legal acts concerning public participation before the Parliament, the Party concerned stated that a pause in consideration of the draft law had been caused by the scheduled parliamentary election and by the forming of the Parliament’s committees but the draft law had been registered in the Parliament in May 2013 and by decree of 4 July 2013, inserted in the Parliament’s agenda. With respect to the observer’s comment that the public participation procedure had deteriorated while the scope of review by the competent authorities was much more limited, the Party concerned stated that “despite the fact that the order of the public participation doesn’t observe all Compliance Committee of Aarhus Convention recommendations, the order of the public participation, as at 25 of March 2013, was not deteriorated in comparison with the order, which existed under the Law of Ukraine “On Environmental Expertise” and before the Law of Ukraine “On Regulation of Urban Development” had been adopted.” The letter also enclosed the draft law “On amendments of some laws of Ukraine on implementation of the Convention on the Assessment of Environmental Impact in the Transboundary Context” as registered in the Ukrainian Parliament on 23 May 2013.

30. At its forty-third meeting, the Committee prepared its draft report to the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties, completing the draft report through its electronic decision-making procedure before sending it to the parties for their comments.

III. Considerations and evaluation by the Committee

31. Through paragraph 5 of decision IV/9h, the Meeting of the Parties urged Ukraine to implement the measures requested by the Meeting of the Parties in decision II/6 as soon as possible, namely to bring its legislation and practice into compliance with the provisions of the Convention. Decision II/5b had found the Party concerned to be in non-compliance with article 3, paragraph 1, article 4, paragraph and article 6, paragraph 1 (a), article 6, paragraphs 2 to 8, and article 6, paragraph 9,
32. In order to fulfil the requirements of decision IV/9h, the Party concerned would need to provide the Committee with evidence that:

(a) it had adopted legislative measures to bring its legislation and practice into compliance with the provisions of the Convention; and

(b) the legislative measures as adopted indeed fulfil the requirements of the Convention, and in particular, article 3, paragraph 1, article 4, paragraph 1, and article 6, paragraph 1 (a), article 6, paragraphs 2 to 8, and article 6, paragraph 9 (second sentence).

33. On the basis of the information before it, the Committee briefly summarizes the timeline regarding the development of the legislative measures requested through decision II/5b, as follows:

- In May 2008, the Party concerned provided its action plan requested through decision II/5b (through decision III/6f the Meeting of the Parties regretted that the fulfilment of actions in the action plan would not fully address the recommendations of decision II/5b).

- On 29 June 2011, during the third session of the Meeting of the Parties, the Party concerned adopted new legislation on public participation in decision-making (Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 771).

- On 25 April 2012, the Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 771 was annulled.

- On 1 May 2012, Party provided the Committee with a copy of the new draft law “On Environmental Impact Assessment”.

- On 26 June 2012, the Party concerned informed Committee that the draft law “On amending certain laws of Ukraine in connection to implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context” had been registered with the Verkhovna Rada (Parliament) and was expected to be considered in July 2012 (copy of draft law was not provided to Committee).

- On 30 November 2012, an English translation of the draft law “On amending certain laws of Ukraine in connection to implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context” was provided to Committee.

- Following the election of a new parliament in October 2012, the draft law “On introducing amendments into certain Laws of Ukraine on implementation of the provisions of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in the Transboundary Context”, which had been registered in the Parliament in June 2012, was automatically withdrawn in accordance with the parliamentary rules of procedure.

- Following the election of the new parliament, the draft law “On introducing amendments on Regulation of Urban Development Activities (related to public discussions of the project documentation on construction)”, proposing amendments to article 21 of the Law on Regulation of Urban Development Activities in terms of mandatory public consultation, which had been submitted to the Parliament in September 2012, was also automatically withdrawn.

- On 23 May 2013, the draft law “On introduction of amendments of some laws of Ukraine in terms of implementation of the Convention on the Assessment of Environmental Impact in the Transboundary Context” was registered by the Parliament and had its first reading on 17 September 2013. Following the first reading, the Ministry for Ecology and Natural Resources began preparing the draft law for its second reading.
On 14 November 2013, the text of the draft law “On introduction of amendments of some laws of Ukraine in terms of implementation of the Convention on the Assessment of Environmental Impact in the Transboundary Context” as at its first reading was provided to the Compliance Committee.

34. The above timeline shows that, beginning with the development of the action plan in May 2008, the Party concerned has, during the intervening years, taken a number of steps towards the preparation of legislative measures to address the requirements of decision II/5b. However, as at the present time, the legislation which the Party concerned has proposed to the Committee as addressing the requirements of decision II/5b, III/6f and IV/6 is still in draft form and is pending its second reading before the parliament.

35. The Committee appreciates the helpful information provided by the Party concerned in its various progress reports and correspondence and its engagement with the compliance review process throughout the intersessional period. The Committee regrets however that as of the present time, the legislation proposed by the Party to address the areas of non-compliance identified by the Committee in its 2005 findings on ACCC/C/2004/3 and ACCC/S/2004/1, endorsed by the Meeting of the Parties through paragraph 1 of decision II/5b, remains only in draft form. The Committee expresses its deep concern at the very slow progress by the Party to finally adopt the legislative measures necessary to address its findings and to fulfill the requirements of decision II/5b, III/6f and IV/9h.

IV. Conclusions and recommendations

A. Main findings with regard to non-compliance

36. The Committee notes the engagement of the Party concerned, demonstrated by its correspondence with the Committee and helpful progress reports during the intersessional period. The Committee regrets however that as of the present time, the legislation proposed by the Party to address the areas of non-compliance endorsed by the Meeting of the Parties through paragraph 1 of decision II/5b remains only in draft form. The Committee is deeply concerned about the very slow progress by the Party to adopt the legislative and practical measures necessary to address those areas of its legislation and practice found to be in non-compliance and thus to fulfill the requirements of decisions II/5b, III/6f and IV/9h.

37. Based on its considerations and evaluation, the Committee concludes that, as the legislative measures proposed by the Party concerned to fulfill the requirements of paragraph 2 of decision II/5b remain only in draft form, Ukraine has failed to meet the requirements of both decision II/5b and paragraph 5 of decision IV/9h of the Meeting of the Parties. This means the Party concerned remains in non-compliance with article 4, paragraph 1, of the Convention on access to information, numerous provisions of article 6 concerning public participation in decision-making and article 3, paragraph 1, requiring a clear, transparent and consistent framework to implement the Convention.

B. Recommendations

38. The Committee recommends to the Meeting of the Parties that it reiterate paragraph 5 of decision IV/9h and “urges therefore the Party concerned to implement the measures requested by the Meeting of the Parties in decision II/b as soon as possible”, namely for the Party to bring its legislation and practice into compliance with the provisions of the Convention, and in particular:
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(a) To provide for public participation of the kind required by article 6 of the Convention (article 6, paragraph 1 (a)), and, in connection with this, article 6, paragraphs 2 to 8, and article 6, paragraph 9 (second sentence);

(b) To ensure that information is provided by public authorities upon request (article 4, paragraph 1);

(c) To address the lack of clarity with regard to public participation requirements in environmental impact assessment (EIA) and environmental decision-making procedures for projects, such as time frames and modalities of a public consultation process, requirements to take its outcome into account and obligations with regard to making information available in the context of article 6, in order to ensure a clear, transparent and consistent framework for the implementation of the Convention (article 3, paragraph 1).

39. Recalling that a caution was issued to the Party concerned through paragraph 6 of decision IV/9h, and that the Meeting of the Parties requested the Committee, through paragraph 9 of that decision, to report to the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties on whether the Party concerned had fulfilled decision II/5b with a view to the Meeting of the Parties deciding whether to suspend the special rights and privileges accorded to Ukraine under the Convention, the Committee recommends that the Meeting of the Parties:

(a) Considers suspending, in accordance with the applicable rules of international law concerning the suspension of the operation of a treaty, the special rights and privileges accorded to the Party concerned under the Convention, as set out in paragraphs 37 (g) of the annex to decision I/7, taking into account that no real or effective steps have been taken by the Party concerned to implement the measures referred to in decision II/5b, decision III/6f, or decision IV/9h of the Meeting of the Parties, unless the Government of Ukraine has adopted the necessary measures to bring its legislation into full compliance with the provisions of the Convention, in particular fully satisfying the conditions set out in paragraph 32 (a) and (b) above and has notified the secretariat of this fact by 31 December 2014. The successful fulfilment of the conditions is to be established by the Committee.

(b) Considers providing for the suspension to be lifted, if the Party subsequently adopts the necessary measures to bring its legislation into full compliance with the provisions of the Convention. The successful fulfilment of the conditions is to be established by the Committee;

40. The Committee recommends to the Meeting of the Parties that, in addition to the report due by 31 December 2014, it request the Party concerned to provide detailed progress reports to the Committee by 31 October 2015 and 31 October 2016 on the measures taken and the results achieved in the further implementation of the above recommendations.