

**UNECE**

# **Implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (2013-2015)**

**Fifth review**



**UNITED NATIONS**

UNITED NATIONS ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

# Implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (2013-2015)

**Fifth review**



**UNITED NATIONS**

# Note

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers and boundaries.

Copyright © United Nations, 2017  
All rights reserved.

**ECE/MP.EIA/25**

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION
eISBN: 978-92-1-362915-4

# Preface

The Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention) was adopted in Espoo, Finland, on 25 February 1991 and entered into force on 10 September 1997. By November 2017 there were 45 Parties to the Espoo Convention, including the European Union, as identified on the Convention's website (<http://www.unece.org/env/eia>). In 2001, the Parties adopted an amendment to the Convention allowing non-UNECE member States to become Parties. That amendment entered into force on 26 August 2014, but eight further ratifications are still needed for it to have effect.<sup>1</sup> In 2004, the Parties adopted a second amendment revising, inter alia, the list of activities in Appendix I, allowing affected Parties, as appropriate, to participate in scoping, requiring review of compliance procedures and introducing regular reporting on the implementation of the Convention. The second amendment entered into force on 23 October 2017.

The Espoo Convention is intended to help make development sustainable by promoting international cooperation in assessing the likely impact of a proposed activity on the environment. It applies to activities that could damage the environment in other countries. Ultimately, the Espoo Convention is aimed at preventing, mitigating and monitoring such environmental damage.

The Espoo Convention ensures that explicit consideration is given to environmental factors well before the final decision is taken on activities with potential environmental impacts. It also ensures that the people living in areas likely to be affected by an adverse impact are informed of the proposed activity. It provides an opportunity for these people to make comments or raise objections to the proposed activity and to participate in relevant environmental impact assessment procedures. It also ensures that the comments and objections made are transmitted to the competent authority and are taken into account in the final decision. A Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment to the Espoo Convention was adopted on 21 May 2003 and entered into force on 11 July 2010; by November 2017 it had 32 Parties, including the European Union. It applies the principles of the Espoo Convention to plans, programmes, policies and legislation, but with a focus on the national impact assessment procedures.

Since the Meeting of the Parties first decided at its second session, in 2001, that a review of the implementation of the Convention should be undertaken (MPEIA/2001/11, annex) five reviews have been carried out and subsequently adopted by the Meeting of the Parties and published by the secretariat.<sup>2</sup> These reviews were undertaken on the basis of responses to a questionnaire by Parties (and by some non-Parties) to the Convention during the respective reporting rounds.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UN Member States that are not members of the ECE may only accede when the first amendment has entered into force for all the 31 States and organizations that were Parties to the Convention at the time the amendment was adopted on 27 February 2001 (new art. 17, para. 3). The following eight Parties still need to ratify the amendment to make it operational: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Canada, Greece, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

<sup>2</sup> Reviews of implementation are available following the link:  
[http://www.unece.org/env/eia/implementation/review\\_implementation.html](http://www.unece.org/env/eia/implementation/review_implementation.html)

<sup>3</sup> The first review of implementation (2003) was adopted by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention at its third session in 2004 (ECE/MPEIA/6); the second review of implementation (2003–2005) was adopted by the Meeting at its fourth session in 2008 (ECE/MPEIA/11); the third review of implementation (2006–2009) was adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its fifth session in 2011 (ECE/MPEIA/16); the fourth review of implementation (2010–2012) was adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its sixth session (2013) (ECE/MPEIA/23). All the reviews of implementation are available from [http://www.unece.org/env/eia/implementation/review\\_implementation.htm](http://www.unece.org/env/eia/implementation/review_implementation.htm)

This publication contains the Fifth review of implementation of the Espoo Convention, as adopted by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention at its seventh session (Minsk, 13–16 June 2017).<sup>4</sup> It examines responses to a questionnaire on countries' implementation of the Convention in the period 2013–2015. The Meeting of the Parties noted the findings presented in section I.B. of the present Review. The Parties also requested the Convention's Implementation Committee to take into account general and specific compliance issues identified in the Review in its review of compliance by Parties with their obligations under the Convention. Besides its importance to the Implementation Committee, this Review provides valuable information for Parties wishing to strengthen their implementation of the Convention, for States considering acceding to the Convention in their legal and administrative preparations, and for others wishing to understand better how the Convention is implemented in national legislation and applied in practice.

The sixth review of the implementation is expected to cover the period 2016–2018. Further to the entry into force of the second amendment to the Convention, Parties will have a legal obligation to report on their implementation of the Convention.

---

<sup>4</sup> ECE/MP.EIA/EIA/2017/9.

# Contents

<b>I. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>A.</b> Preparation of the review .....	1
<b>B.</b> Findings of the review .....	2
<b>II. Summary of responses to the questionnaire</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>A.</b> Article 1: Definitions .....	4
<b>B.</b> Article 2: General provisions .....	7
<b>C.</b> Article 3: Notification .....	10
<b>D.</b> Article 4: Preparation of the environmental impact assessment documentation.....	17
<b>E.</b> Public participation (article 3, para. 3, and article 4, para. 2) .....	20
<b>F.</b> Article 5: Consultations on the basis of the environmental impact assessment documentation ...	23
<b>G.</b> Article 6: Final decision .....	24
<b>H.</b> Article 7: Post-project analysis.....	28
<b>I.</b> Article 8: Bilateral and multilateral cooperation .....	29
<b>III. Practical application during the period 2013–2015</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>A.</b> Experience in the transboundary environmental impact assessment procedure during the period 2013–2015 .....	33
<b>B.</b> Experience in using the guidance in 2013–2015 .....	39
<b>C.</b> Clarity of the Convention .....	41

## Figures

<b>Figure 1.</b>	Is the definition of impact for the purpose of the Convention the same in your legislation as in article 1? .....	4
<b>Figure 2.</b>	Is the definition of transboundary impact for the purpose of the Convention the same in your legislation as in article 1? .....	5
<b>Figure 3.</b>	How do you identify the public concerned?.....	6
<b>Figure 4.</b>	Please describe any differences between the list of activities in your national legislation and appendix I to the Convention, if any. ....	7
<b>Figure 5.</b>	Identify the competent authority or authorities responsible for carrying out the EIA procedure in your country .....	8
<b>Figure 6.</b>	Is there an authority in your country that collects information on all the transboundary EIA cases? .....	9
<b>Figure 7.</b>	As Party of origin, when do you notify the affected Party (art. 3, para. 1)? .....	10
<b>Figure 8.</b>	Please define the format of notification. ....	11
<b>Figure 9.</b>	As a Party of origin, what information do you include in the notification (art. 3, para. 2)? .....	12
<b>Figure 10.</b>	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”)? .....	13
<b>Figure 11.</b>	How do you inform the public and authorities of the affected Party (art. 3, para 8)? .....	14
<b>Figure 12.</b>	On what basis is the decision made to participate (or not) in the transboundary EIA procedure as affected Party (art. 3, para. 3)? .....	15
<b>Figure 13.</b>	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)?.....	16
<b>Figure 14.</b>	How do you ensure sufficient quality of the EIA documentation as Party of origin? .....	17
<b>Figure 15.</b>	How do you determine the relevant information to be included in the EIA documentation in accordance with article 4, paragraph 1? .....	18
<b>Figure 16.</b>	How do you determine “reasonable alternatives” in accordance with appendix II, paragraph (b)? .....	19
<b>Figure 17.</b>	How can the public concerned express its opinion on the EIA documentation of the proposed project? .....	20
<b>Figure 18.</b>	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. ....	21
<b>Figure 19.</b>	Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of public hearings in cases where your country is affected. ....	22
<b>Figure 20.</b>	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? .....	23

<b>Figure 21.</b> Please indicate all points below that are covered in a final decision related to the implementation of the planned activity (art. 6, para. 1).....	24
<b>Figure 22.</b> 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)? .....	25
<b>Figure 23.</b> Is there any regulation in the national legislation of your country that ensures the implementation of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3? .....	26
<b>Figure 24.</b> Do all activities listed in appendix I (items 1-22) require a final decision to authorize or undertake such an activity? .....	27
<b>Figure 25.</b> Is there any provision regarding post-project analysis in your national EIA legislation (art. 7, para. 1)? .....	28
<b>Figure 26.</b> Does your country have any bilateral or multilateral agreements based on the Convention (art. 8, appendix VI)? .....	29
<b>Figure 27.</b> What issues do these bilateral agreements cover (appendix VI)? .....	30
<b>Figure 28.</b> Does your country have special provisions or informal arrangements concerning transboundary EIA procedures for joint cross-border projects (e.g., roads, pipelines)? ...	31
<b>Figure 29.</b> Does your country have special provisions or informal arrangements concerning transboundary EIA procedures for nuclear power plants? .....	32
<b>Figure 30.</b> 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?.....	33
<b>Figure 31.</b> Does your country have successful examples of organizing transboundary EIA procedures for joint cross-border projects or that of an NPP?.....	35
<b>Figure 32.</b> Would your country like to introduce a case in the form of a Convention “case study fact sheet”? .....	37

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

[https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\\_1373](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_1373)

