UNITED NATIONS **E**

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/4
22 October 2009

Original: ENGLISH

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION
ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
IN A TRANSBOUNDARY CONTEXT

Implementation Committee

Seventeenth session
Geneva, 14–18 September 2009

REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE ON ITS SEVENTEENTH SESSION

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	INTRODUCTION	1–7	3
	A. Attendance	2–6	3
	B. Organization of work	7	3
II.	FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION IV/2 REGARDING UKRAINE (PARAGRAPHS 7–14)	8–18	3
	A. Independent review and strategy	8–9	3
	B. Exchange of letters and report	10–18	4
III.	FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION IV/2 REGARDING ARMENIA (PARAGRAPHS 15–19)	19–25	5

CONTENTS (*continued*)

		Paragraphs	*Page*
IV.	SECOND REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION	26–42	7
	A. General compliance issues	26–29	7
	B. Specific compliance issues	30–37	8
V.	SUBMISSIONS	38–40	9
VI.	COMMITTEE INITIATIVE	41–47	10
VII.	REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE	48–49	12
VIII.	STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS AND OPERATING RULES	50	12
IX.	OTHER BUSINESS	51–55	12
X.	PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN DECISIONS TAKEN AND CLOSING OF THE MEETING	56–57	13

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The seventeenth session of the Implementation Committee was held from 14 to 18 September 2009 in Geneva.

A. Attendance

2. The following members of the Implementation Committee attended the session: Ms. Nina Stoyanova (Bulgaria); Mr. Nenad Mikulic (Croatia); Mr. Matthias Sauer (Germany); Ms. Rakia Kalygulova, replacing Mr. Kubanychbek Noruzbaev (Kyrgyzstan); Mr. Jerzy Jendroska (Poland); Ms. Diana Bragoi (Republic of Moldova); and Ms. Vesna Kolar-Planinsic (Slovenia). The member nominated by Azerbaijan did not attend.

3. The session was attended by delegations from Romania and Ukraine during the Committee's consideration of a submission by Ukraine (see chapter V below), at the invitation of the Committee.

4. No observers were present during the session.

5. The Committee recalled rule 4, paragraph 2, of the Committee's operating rules (ECE/MP.EIA/10, decision IV/2, annex IV), which specifies that members are expected to participate in every meeting of the Committee, and asked the Chair to write to each Party represented in the Committee, reminding them of their commitments.

6. The Committee also noted the absence of the member nominated by Azerbaijan and requested the Chair to write to the Minister of Environment of Azerbaijan to seek assurances that the member would be present at the next session.

B. Organization of work

7. The Chair opened the meeting. The Committee adopted the agenda as set out in ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/3.

II. FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION IV/2 REGARDING UKRAINE (PARAGRAPHS 7–14)

A. Independent review and strategy

8. The Committee welcomed the independent review of Ukraine's legal, administrative and other measures to implement the provisions of the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/5), further to the decision of the Meeting of the Parties (decision IV/2, para. 11). The finalized review should be used by the Government of Ukraine as the basis for its strategy to implement the Convention (decision IV/2, para. 12). The Committee reiterated its request that the Government of Ukraine include in its strategy a point-by-point response to the review's recommendations (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 8).

9. The secretariat reported on an advisory mission to Ukraine on 7 and 8 September 2009, including participation in a meeting of Ukraine's inter-ministerial council on the implementation of the Convention.

B. Exchange of letters and report

10. The Committee examined a letter to the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe from the Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine, received on 15 April 2009, in response to a letter sent by the Executive Secretary on behalf of the Committee on 20 March 2009. The Committee also examined a report sent by Ukraine to the secretariat on 31 August 2009 and a "non-paper" submitted to the secretariat on 11 September 2009 by the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations having their Headquarters in Geneva. The Committee decided to request Ukraine's agreement that the above documents be made available on the Convention's website. The Committee also considered other sources of information, including press releases by the Government of Ukraine.

11. Taking into account paragraphs 7, 9 and 10 of decision IV/2 and recalling its deliberations in its fifteenth and sixteenth sessions (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2008/2, paras. 22–32, and ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, paras. 9–18), the Committee reaffirmed that decision IV/2 requested Ukraine to stop all works related to Phases I and II of the Danube-Black Sea Deep-Water Navigation Canal in the Ukrainian Sector of the Danube Delta (the "Bystroe Canal Project", hereinafter the Project), including construction, operation and maintenance.

12. Therefore, the Committee considered that the documents submitted by Ukraine failed to confirm clearly and unambiguously that the conditions imposed in the decision of the Meeting of the Parties have been met, as requested in the Executive Secretary's letter. In particular, the documents submitted by Ukraine failed:

(a) To demonstrate that all works, including operation and maintenance, on Phase I have stopped;

(b) To show, separately for Phase I and for Phase II, that the Convention is being applied fully to the Project.

13. Further to its deliberations at its sixteenth session (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, paras. 9–18), and in the light of the above, **the Committee decided that**:

(a) **The continuation of works under Phase I of the Project was contrary to the requirements imposed by the Committee when deciding that the caution should not become effective (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2008/2, para. 31), and represented a continuing breach of the Convention, as explained in paragraphs 69 (b) and 73 of the Committee's findings and recommendations (ECE/MP.EIA/10, decision IV/2, annex I)**;

(b) **The carrying out of works under Phase II of the Project represented a further breach of Ukraine's obligations under the Convention, because the transboundary environmental impact assessment (EIA) procedure for the "full-scale development" of the**

Project (Phases I and II) is ongoing and because, as declared by the Government of Ukraine, no final decision on Phase II is in force.

14. Moreover, the Committee disagreed with the interpretation by the Government of Ukraine that the EIA only need address Project elements identified by the Inquiry Commission as likely to have significant adverse impact[1]. The environmental impact assessment procedure, including the preparation of the EIA documentation, must cover the environmental impact of the entire proposed activity, and not address only the likely significant adverse transboundary impacts identified by the Inquiry Commission. The Committee emphasized that the Inquiry Commission's role was to determine whether the whole Project required application of the Convention, and not to determine the scope of the assessment.

15. **The Committee thus found that Ukraine remains in non-compliance with its obligations under the Convention with respect to both phases of the Project and agreed that this should be communicated to the next session of the Meeting of the Parties**.

16. **The Committee concluded that its earlier decision that the caution should not become effective (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2008/2, para. 34) had been based on information that proved not to be comprehensive. Therefore the caution should have become effective on 31 October 2008. The Committee was uncertain of the legal consequences of such a conclusion after 31 October 2008 and of its mandate issued by the fourth session of the Meeting of Parties in this respect. Thus the Committee decided that this conclusion should be communicated to the next session of the Meeting of the Parties, with a recommendation that the Meeting of the Parties either bring into effect the caution issued in its fourth session or issue a new caution**.

17. The Committee requested the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Europe to write a letter to the Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine to convey the above. A copy of this letter should be sent to the Minister of Environment of Romania. The Committee also asked the secretariat to inform all focal points of the Convention accordingly.

18. **The Committee closed consideration of the submission pending a decision by the Meeting of the Parties and will no longer consider information provided by the concerned Parties regarding the Project**.

III. FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION IV/2 REGARDING ARMENIA (PARAGRAPHS 15–19)

19. The Committee welcomed the report by a consultant on technical advice in drafting the necessary legislation to support Armenia in ensuring its full implementation of the Convention (decision IV/2, para. 17), further to the Committee's agreement on a consultant at its fifteenth session (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2008/2, para. 37). The Committee requested its Chair to write to the Government of Armenia to welcome the work of the Government, supported by the consultant, to prepare new draft legislation in accordance with the Committee's findings (decision IV/2,

[1] The Inquiry Commission's opinion is set out in its report, available at: http://www.unece.org/env/eia/inquiry.htm.

annex II) to ensure full implementation of the Convention. **The Committee also welcomed the new draft legislation as providing a suitable framework for the implementation of the Convention in Armenia**.

20. The Committee endorsed the recommendations to Armenia set out in the consultant's report:

(a) To implement the draft of the amendment to the Law on Environmental Impact Expertise (EIE);

(b) To consider the following suggestions:

(i) Undertaking a pilot project together with another country (or countries) might help to test and improve the EIA system, to test institutional arrangements for transmitting information and communications with other Parties, and to strengthen the capacity to implement the Convention;

(ii) Organizing of training courses for officials of all the relevant public authorities and other stakeholders, as well as additional awareness-raising activities, might strengthen implementation of the legal changes;

(iii) Specific training courses and other capacity-building activities on screening the likelihood of significant adverse transboundary impacts, as well as on other transboundary EIA aspects, might need to be organized for the authorized body and experts from the State non-commercial organization "Environmental Expertise";

(iv) Although the timing of different stages in the proposed draft is more clear and consistent, some specific terms have been set at a minimum level, taking into account the recommendations of the Government to reduce the time of the EIE. Practical implementation may show the need to revise some of them;

(v) Discussing the proposed draft of amendments, including the issue of timing, with relevant stakeholders can be recommended;

(vi) Financing of EIE and related procedures might need to be improved and changed. If so, it could be recommended to differentiate the payment according to the categories in the list of activities, the complexity and scope of issues to be examined and other relevant procedural arrangements in the development of the financing. The procedural arrangements for transboundary EIA should also be taken into account.

21. In particular, the Committee encouraged the provision in the draft legislation of the time periods for public participation set out in the consultant's report. Further to paragraph 16 of decision IV/2, **the Committee requested the Government of Armenia to revise its legislation in accordance with the above-mentioned draft**.

22. Further to paragraph 19 of decision IV/2, **the Committee requested the Government of Armenia to report in writing, if possible by the end of 2009, on**:

(a) **The concrete steps taken and planned to be taken by the Government of Armenia to enact and implement the amended legislation;**

(b) **Other measures taken and planned to be taken by the Government of Armenia to apply the Convention, such as the carrying out of a pilot project or the elaboration of a bilateral agreement to support implementation of the Convention**.

23. The Committee asked that the Government of Armenia report in particular on specific steps taken to address each of the consultant's recommendations listed in paragraph 20 above. The Committee would appreciate receipt of this information in advance of its next session, in February 2010.

24. Finally, the Committee recalled the planned seminar on legislation and procedures for the implementation of the Convention in Armenia (ECE/MP.EIA/10, decision IV/7), expected to be held back-to-back with a meeting of the Working Group on EIA in 2010 and to be led by Armenia. The Committee reiterated its readiness to support Armenia in this regard. The Committee requested the Chair to inform the Government of Armenia of the above.

25. The Committee requested the secretariat to make the consultant's report available on the website of the Convention.

IV. SECOND REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

A. General compliance issues

26. Ms. Kalygulova presented her findings regarding an examination of the implementation of article 4 of the Convention (preparation of EIA documentation), as reported in the completed questionnaire for the period 2003–2005. She observed that the problems noted by the Committee previously (decision IV/2, annex III, para. 29) had continued, in particular regarding the adequacy of the content of the EIA documentation in terms of whether the information met the needs of the affected Party and whether it was in accordance with the Convention. **The Committee recommended that the Party of origin involve the affected Party in any case-by-case determination of the content of the EIA documentation ("scoping").**

27. Ms. Kolar-Planinsic presented her findings regarding cases reported in the completed questionnaire for the period 2003–2005. She noted that most Parties reported between one and four cases, and that almost twice as many cases were reported where the Party was Party of origin as where it was the affected Party. Transboundary EIA procedures generally lasted 12 months or more. She also observed that some difficulties had occurred with communications between Parties and because of poor quality documentation, a lack of post-project analysis and a lack of interest from the public in large transboundary projects. Language problems arose in some cases where documentation was sent in the language of the Party of origin with no translation into the language of affected Party; the affected Party then had to provide for a translation of the documentation, which was costly and time-consuming. On the basis of Ms.

Kolar-Planinsic's findings, **the Committee decided that the reportedly limited use of the guidance on public participation (ECE/MP.EIA/7) should be brought to the attention of the Working Group**.

28. Taking into account these findings, the Committee agreed that the questionnaire should distinguish between cases of notification only and cases where notification was followed by a full transboundary EIA procedure. The Committee agreed that the cover note for the questionnaire (see chapter VII below) would address this issue.

29. Mr. Mikulic (examining notification) and Ms. Bragoi (examining implementation of articles 7, 8 and 9) agreed to present the findings of their respective reviews at the Committee's next session (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2008/2, para. 11). Mr. Jendroska (examining public participation) would then present the findings of his review at the nineteenth session.

B. Specific compliance issues

30. The Committee continued from its previous session its examination of specific compliance issues identified in the second review of implementation (decision IV/1, annex), and in the completed questionnaires on which the review was based.

31. The Committee noted that Austria, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Liechtenstein and Slovenia had agreed that the secretariat publish on the Convention's website the exchange of communications between them and the Committee regarding specific compliance issues.

32. The Committee took note of the reply dated 13 May 2009 from the Government of Azerbaijan in response to the letter from the Chair dated 24 November 2008 (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 42). **The Committee requested its Chair to write to the Government of Azerbaijan to indicate that, in view of the assistance-oriented nature of the Convention's compliance procedures and referring to paragraph 6 ("Committee initiative") of the description of the Committee's structure and functions set out in the appendix to decision III/2 (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex II), the Committee had decided to explore possibilities to provide technical advice to review current and draft Azerbaijani legislation on EIA in detail**. With the observations resulting from the proposed advice, the Committee might make recommendations on measures to strengthen Azerbaijani legislation. The Committee decided that the Chair would make practical arrangements for the proposed advice, with the support of the secretariat. The Chair should keep the Government of Azerbaijan informed of progress in contracting a consultant, subject to the identification of funds. The Committee agreed that the same consultant who had provided a review of Armenian legislation for the Committee in 2007 might also advise Azerbaijan. The Committee decided, in the meantime, to invite the Government of Azerbaijan to provide any additional information of possible relevance by 31 December 2009. The Committee decided to review progress at its next session.

33. As the Government of Albania had not replied to a letter sent by the Chair on 7 April 2009, **the Committee requested the Chair to write again to the focal point for Albania, on behalf of the Committee, to seek clarification on, inter alia, the status of the legislation to implement the Convention, reportedly planned for 2008** (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 29).

The Committee decided that it might consider further steps if the Government of Albania failed to reply before the next Committee session.

34. The Committee reviewed the information received from the Government of Belgium on 10 July 2009, describing further the procedures applied in two transboundary EIA cases, in response to a letter from the Chair on 7 April 2009 (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 34). **The Committee asked the Chair to write to the Government of Belgium to express the Committee's thanks for its description and to inform it that the Committee was satisfied with the information provided**. Though, this was not made entirely clear in the description, the Committee inferred that the activities were made subject to the Convention through the application of article 2, paragraph 5, based on the close proximity of the planned activities to national borders. The Committee decided to ask whether the secretariat might publish the above exchange of communications on the Convention's website; if there was no reply by 31 October 2009, the Committee would understand that the Party agreed to publication.

35. The Committee reviewed the information received from the Government of Hungary on 29 June 2009, which explained that the national EIA regulation will be amended to make clear the requirement for a description, where appropriate, of reasonable alternatives. The information had been provided in response to a letter by the Chair on 7 April 2009 (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 39). **The Committee asked the Chair to write to the Government of Hungary to express the Committee's thanks for its letter and to inform it that the Committee was satisfied with the clarification provided**. The Committee looked forward to receiving confirmation of the regulatory amendment in the report of Hungary on its implementation of the Convention in the period 2006–2009. The Committee decided to ask whether the secretariat might publish the above exchange of communications on the Convention's website; if there was no reply by 31 October 2009, the Committee would understand that the Party agreed to publication.

36. The Committee examined the reply from the Government of Greece received on 9 September 2009. The Committee expressed its satisfaction with the reply. Nonetheless, the Committee repeated that Parties should report more precisely on their implementation of the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 32). More generally, **the Committee wished to remind Parties that**:

(a) **An extended time period between a final decision and works might bring into doubt the validity of the EIA and thus the final decision**;

(b) **Modernization of a motorway or express road might often constitute a major change to the motorway or express road**.

37. The Committee wished to include these remarks in the letter to Greece.

V. SUBMISSIONS

38. This agenda item was not open to observers according to rule 17, paragraph 1, of the Committee's operating rules.

39. The Committee considered the submission by Ukraine, received by the secretariat on 6 March 2009, expressing concerns about the compliance of Romania with its obligations under the Convention (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, paras. 45–47). The Committee also considered a reply by the Government of Romania to the submission, dated 4 June 2009, and clarifications provided by the Governments of Romania and of Ukraine, dated 29 and 26 June 2009, respectively. The Committee welcomed the delegations of Romania and Ukraine, and invited the delegation of Ukraine to present its submission and the delegation of Romania to respond. The Committee then questioned the two delegations.

40. The Committee then drafted its findings and recommendations and agreed to send the draft findings and recommendations to the two Parties, once finalized by electronic mail, by the end of October 2009. In accordance with paragraph 9 of the structure and functions of the Committee, as included in the appendix to decision III/2 (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex II), the Committee asked its Chair to invite the two Parties to submit to the secretariat by 31 January 2010 at the latest their comments or representations, which would remain confidential. **The Committee agreed to consider any comments or representations at its next session before finalizing its findings and recommendations for consideration by the next session of the Meeting of the Parties**.

VI. COMMITTEE INITIATIVE

41. This agenda item was not open to observers according to rule 17 of the Committee's operating rules.

42. The Committee noted that Romania had agreed that the secretariat would publish on the Convention's website the exchange of communications between the Government of Romania and the Committee regarding the application of the Convention to those activities within the National Territory Master Plan of Romania, adopted in 2006, relating to navigation on the Danube River, further to information provided by Ukrainian non-governmental organizations (NGOs) (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 49).

43. The Committee considered replies by the Governments of Belgium and the Netherlands, dated 25 and 22 June 2009, respectively, to the Chair's letter of 7 April 2009, further to information provided by a Dutch NGO regarding a proposed activity in Belgium (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2009/2, para. 50). The Committee considered that there were still aspects that remained unclear, particularly with regard to the allegations made by the NGO. **The Committee decided to ask the Chair to write to the two Parties to seek clarification as to whether the EIA documentation fulfilled the minimum content requirements, whether, what and how alternatives were considered, and on the time frame for the different opportunities for public participation**. The Committee agreed to discuss any reply, if appropriate, at its next session, and considered that it might then have further questions. The Committee requested the secretariat to inform the NGO accordingly.

44. The Committee reviewed information provided by a Ukrainian NGO regarding an activity in Belarus. **The Committee agreed that it would gather further information on whether there had been proper application of the Convention with regard to the proposed activity, and whether the Government of Belarus had taken the necessary legal,**

administrative and other measures to implement the provisions of the Convention. The Committee requested the Chair to write to the Government of Belarus seeking relevant information and asking for a reply by 31 December 2009. The Committee agreed to discuss any reply, if appropriate, at its next session, and considered that it might then have further questions. The Committee also decided to contact affected Parties identified by the NGO (Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Ukraine) to enquire into their experiences, if any, in the application of the Convention to the proposed activity. The Committee requested the secretariat to inform the NGO of the actions taken.

45. The Committee considered information provided by Ukraine on 8 September 2009, and earlier by the secretariat, regarding a proposed activity in Slovakia. **The Committee requested the Chair to write to the Government of Slovakia to ask whether Slovakia had notified other Parties to the Convention and, if so, which Parties and what had been the content of the notification**. The Committee also requested the Chair to write to the Government of Ukraine to ask whether Ukraine had indicated a wish to participate in the transboundary EIA procedure for the proposed activity.

46. The Committee considered the reply by the Government of Ukraine, received on 25 June 2009, to the Chair's letter of 7 April 2009, further to information provided by the secretariat regarding the Dniester hydro-accumulating power station in Ukraine, upstream of the Republic of Moldova. The secretariat reported to the Committee that, during an advisory mission to Ukraine (see para. 9 above), the Government of Ukraine had expressed willingness to share non-confidential information on the activity. The member of the Committee nominated by the Republic of Moldova (Ms. Bragoi) then left the room in accordance with rule 17 of the Committee's operating rules. On the basis of the above-mentioned information, and bearing in mind that the Convention does not have retroactive effect, **the Committee decided not to consider the information further and requested the Chair to write to Ukraine accordingly**. **The Committee nevertheless expressed its concern that the long time period between decision-making and construction raised questions about the validity of the EIA and of the subsequent decision**. Further, because of the importance of bilateral cooperation, and because of the power station's likely significant adverse transboundary impact and resulting widespread concern in the Republic of Moldova, the Committee would encourage the exchange of information and the carrying out of post-project analysis. Finally, the Committee wished to remind the Government of Ukraine of the Meeting of the Parties' decision to invite the Government of Ukraine to enter into negotiations with its neighbouring Parties to cooperate in the elaboration of bilateral agreements or other arrangements in order to support further the provisions of the Convention (decision IV/2, para. 14).

47. The Committee noted the replies of the Governments of the Republic of Moldova, Romania and Ukraine, received on 6 July, 29 June and 25 June 2009, respectively, to the Chair's letters of 7 April 2009, further to information provided by the secretariat regarding activities in the Republic of Moldova, close to the borders with Romania and Ukraine. Ms. Bragoi again left the room in accordance with rule 17 of the Committee's operating rules. The Committee then agreed to discuss the replies at its next session.

VII. REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE

48. The Committee took note of the secretariat's report that most pre-filled questionnaires had been prepared for issue by 30 September 2009, as requested by the Working Group on EIA. The French version of the questionnaire (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.1/2009/2, annex I) was not yet available, this being required by three Parties.

49. The Committee discussed the content of a cover note to accompany issue of the questionnaire. The Committee agreed that it should remind Parties of the need to be precise in their responses to questions. Ms. Bragoi, Ms. Kalygulova, Mr. Mikulic and Mr. Jendroska agreed to be available to assist Parties seeking clarification on how to complete the questionnaire.

VIII. STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONS AND OPERATING RULES

50. The Committee noted that it was expected to keep under review and, if necessary, develop its structure and functions as well as its operating rules, in the light of the experience it had gained (decision IV/2, para. 6). **The Committee agreed that the secretariat routinely ask sources of other information** (further to rule 15, para. 1 (b), of the Committee's operating rules) **whether the information supplied might be made available on the Convention's website**.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

51. The Committee thanked the secretariat for the preparation of a leaflet briefly introducing the Committee and its role and presenting the possibility for bodies and individuals to provide information to the Committee, further to rule 15, paragraph 1 (b), of the Committee's operating rules (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2008/2, para. 47).

52. **The Committee requested the secretariat to publish a compilation of guidance to assist Parties in the notification procedure under the Convention**.

53. The Chair informed the Committee of items on the outcomes of the twelfth meeting of the Working Group on EIA (Geneva, 11–13 May 2009) that related to the Committee (ECE/MP.EIA/WG.1/2009/2, chapter III). He reported that the delegations of Romania and Ukraine had made statements in that meeting regarding the Bystroe Canal Project (see chapter II above), and that the Working Group had taken note of this information without reacting. He had also reminded the Working Group of the findings of the second review of implementation (ECE/MP.EIA/10, decision IV/1); the Working Group had taken note. The Working Group had agreed to the questionnaire but had not established a small group to assist in the drafting of the third review of implementation.

54. The Committee took note without further action of information provided on 10 July 2009 by Ukraine regarding an incinerator in Romania and on 13 August 2009 regarding various industrial activities in Romania. **The Committee asked the Chair to inform the Government of Ukraine of the above and to ask that if the Government of Ukraine wishes to make a submission, then this needs to be made clear by reference to decision III/2 (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex II), by indicating which provisions of the Convention the Government of Ukraine considers may not be being complied with, and by identifying any specific activity subject**

to the Convention. The Committee also recalled article 2, paragraph 5, and article 3, paragraph 7, of the Convention as providing possible alternative mechanisms to resolve disagreements between Parties regarding application of the Convention to proposed activities.

55. The Chair indicated that Germany was likely to contribute additional earmarked funds to help meet the costs of additional Committee sessions in 2010, if these were required. **The Committee also decided to request that the Bureau take action to increase secretariat resources to deal with the growing workload in servicing the sessions of the Committee**.

X. PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN DECISIONS TAKEN AND CLOSING OF THE MEETING

56. **The Committee decided to hold its next meeting from 23 to 25 February 2010 in Geneva**. Subsequent sessions will be held from 31 August to 2 September 2010 and from 11 to 13 January 2011. If additional sessions are required, these might be held from 22 to 24 June 2010 and from 2 to 4 November 2010.

57. **The Committee adopted the draft report of its session prepared by the Chair and the secretariat**. The Chair then closed the meeting.

*****