



Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
4 October 2011

Original: English

Economic Commission for Europe

Meeting of the Parties to the Convention
on Environmental Impact Assessment
in a Transboundary Context

Implementation Committee

Twenty-second session
Geneva, 5–7 September 2011

Report of the Implementation Committee on its twenty-second session

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	1–6	3
A. Attendance	2–4	3
B. Organizational matters	5–6	3
II. Membership of the Implementation Committee.....	7	3
III. Review of decisions by the Meeting of the Parties	8–9	4
IV. Follow-up to decision V/4 regarding Ukraine	10–15	4
V. Submissions	16–25	6
A. Armenia	16–21	6
B. Belarus	22–23	7
C. Azerbaijan.....	24–25	7
VI. Committee initiative	26	7
VII. Information gathering.....	27–36	8
A. Belarus	27–31	8
B. Ukraine	33–34	8
C. Romania	34–36	9
VIII. Review of implementation	37–45	9
A. Examination of compliance issues from the Third Review	37–39	9

B.	Specific compliance issues from the Third Review	40–43	10
C.	Revision of the questionnaire	44–45	11
IX.	Structure, functions and operating rules.....	46–55	11
A.	Application of the Convention by the European Union member States	46–47	11
B.	Possible discrepancies between the different language versions of the Convention and the issue of no-action alternatives.....	48–52	11
C.	Participation at the Committee’s meetings	53–55	12
X.	Presentation of the main decisions taken and closing of the meeting	56–57	13

I. Introduction

1. The twenty-second session of the Implementation Committee under the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context (Espoo Convention) was held from 5 to 7 September 2011 in Geneva. For the first time, the Committee also reviewed compliance with the Convention's Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment, as a result of the adoption of decision I/6 of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention (decision V/6 by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol) on the application of the compliance procedure of the Convention to the Protocol (see ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2).

A. Attendance

2. The following members of the Implementation Committee for Convention and Protocol matters attended the session: Ms. E. Grigoryan (Armenia); Ms. T. Javanshir (Azerbaijan); Ms. N. Stoyanova (Bulgaria); Mr. M. Prieur (France); Ms. T. Plesco (Republic of Moldova); Mr. J. Brun (Norway); Mr. F. Zaharia (Romania); Ms. L. Papajová Majeská (Slovakia); Ms. V. Kolar-Planinšic (Slovenia); and Ms. L. A. Hernando (Spain).

3. The Committee members for the Protocol matters only (Mr. Brun and Ms. Papajová Majeská) did not attend those agenda items that concerned Convention matters only. The Committee session was attended by an observer from Azerbaijan during the discussions on the agenda items reported in sections I, II, III and X of the present document.

4. The Committee member nominated by Armenia and the representative of Azerbaijan expressed different understandings of the rules under which the Committee operates. Armenia expressed also its disappointment with how the representative of Azerbaijan participated. The representative of Azerbaijan could not understand why he was not able to participate as fully as he believed that he was entitled to according to the rules of procedure. This led the Committee to clarify the relevant rules concerning participation at the Committee's meetings (see section IX.C, below).

B. Organizational matters

5. The Director of the Environment Division of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe opened the session.

6. The Committee adopted its agenda (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2011/5), which had been prepared by the Convention secretariat in agreement with the Chair, Mr. M. Sauer (who acted in that role until the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention, 20–23 June 2011).

II. Membership of the Committee

7. The Committee elected Ms. Kolar-Planinšic as Chair, Ms. Stoyanova as the first Vice-Chair, Mr. Zaharia as the second Vice-Chair and Ms. Hernando as the third Vice-Chair, in accordance with paragraph 1 (a) of the appendix to decision III/2 (ECE/MP.EIA/6, annex II).

III. Review of decisions by the Meeting of the Parties

8. On the basis of an informal document prepared by the secretariat, the Committee reviewed decisions taken by the fifth session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention and by the first session of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, particularly on the review of implementation, the review of compliance and the adoption of the workplan, as included in the reports of the two sessions (ECE/MP.EIA/15 and ECE/MP.EIA/SEA/2, respectively).

9. For the main tasks delegated to it, the Committee assigned roles to its members, as follows:

<i>Task/Responsibility</i>	<i>Responsible Committee member(s)</i>
Acting as curator for the official submission: EIA/IC/S/3 (Armenia)	M. Prieur
Acting as curator for the official submission: EIA/IC/S/4 (Belarus)	N. Stoyanova
Acting as curator for the official submission: EIA/IC/S/5 (Azerbaijan)	F. Zaharia
Acting as curator for the follow-up to decision V/4 (and IV/2) regarding Ukraine (EIA/IC/S/1)	N. Stoyanova
Overseeing the revision of the questionnaire	T. Plesco and E. Grigoryan (Convention); L. Papajová Majeská and J. Brun (Protocol)
Overseeing work on operating rules	L.A. Hernando and F. Zaharia
Acting as curator for the information-gathering case on Belarus (EIA/IC/INFO/5)	L.A. Hernando
Acting as curator for the information gathering case on Ukraine (EIA/IC/INFO/7)	L.A. Hernando
Acting as curator for the information gathering case on Romania (EIA/IC/INFO/8)	T. Javanshir (Convention)

IV. Follow-up to decision V/4 regarding Ukraine

10. The discussion on follow-up to decision V/4 (review of compliance) by the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention regarding Ukraine was not open to observers, in accordance with rule 17 of the Committee's operating rules.

11. By decision V/4, the Government of Ukraine is required to report by the end of each year to the Implementation Committee on steps taken to bring into full compliance the Danube-Black Sea Deep Water Navigation Canal in the Ukrainian sector of the Danube Delta and on the post-project analysis of the project, as well as on the implementation of its strategy for implementing the Convention, in particular concrete legislative measures adopted to that effect (ECE/MP.EIA/15, para. 24).

12. The Committee considered information from the Government of Ukraine, received on 19 July 2011, in response to the Committee's letter of 1 February 2011 and a first letter of 23 June 2011 (addressed to the Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine) requesting clarifications on the recent changes in the Ukrainian legislative framework for development activities. The Committee found the information to be insufficient. It stressed that the Government of Ukraine had the responsibility to provide the Committee with the requested information fully and in a timely manner, independently of the internal coordination among the national authorities that that might involve.

13. The Committee also regretted the lack of any response from the Government to its second letter of 23 June 2011, which had been addressed to the national focal point, concerning the strategy for the implementation of the Convention. It emphasized that a change of a national focal point was not a valid reason for not replying to its questions and reminded Ukraine that it had an obligation to inform the secretariat without a delay of any such change.

14. The Committee requested the Government of Ukraine to ensure that its progress report, prepared as set out in paragraph 24 of decision V/4, would also address fully the Committee's earlier requirements and requests for information and clarifications, including:

(a) For the revised strategy:

(i) The Government of Ukraine should meet all the deadlines and present all draft laws, decrees etc. (including the Guidance on practical application) regarding the dates for the implementation of the strategy to the Committee for its comments before their approval;

(ii) Which activity, in the new circumstances created by the verdict of the Ukrainian Constitutional Court, would replace the originally scheduled activity which had been deleted;

(b) For the draft act on public participation, the Committee did not understand why the Council of Ministers had the competence to adopt a general act on public participation but not to adopt relevant details regarding environmental protection. In that regard, the Committee wished to receive further clarifications on:

(i) Whether article 20 of the Ukrainian Environmental Protection Law had been changed since the adoption of the strategy to implement the Convention;

(ii) Why the adoption of the decree on public participation had not been considered as an obstacle in the original strategy but was considered as one at the present time;

(iii) Whether article 20 of the Environmental Protection Law precluded adopting a procedure for "public participation in assessing the impact of [a] proposed activity on the environment" but not from approving the procedure for public participation in assessing the impact in a transboundary context;

(c) For the screening mechanism and application of the criteria listed in annex I, the Committee requested further clarifications on the current provisions in Ukraine, including the list of activities subject to an impact assessment, deemed insufficient, and on whether that list was to be extended (for example to include activities not requiring construction);

(d) Concerning the recent changes in the legislative framework for development control, namely the Law on Regulating Urban Development adopted on 17 February 2010, which had entered into force on 10 March 2010. That law, according to the information available to the Committee, appeared not to correspond to the strategy for implementation of the Convention, but in fact diminished rather than strengthening the capacity of the

legislative framework to ensure compliance with the Convention. The Government of Ukraine was requested to describe the key elements of the new system and an explanation of how it would ensure implementation of the Convention. In particular it should describe:

- (i) The types of activities that would require an environmental impact assessment (EIA);
- (ii) The responsibilities of environmental authorities for conducting the EIA procedure;
- (iii) The role of other authorities, including health authorities, in conducting EIA;
- (iv) Who would be responsible for ensuring public participation, including notifying the public, organizing public discussions and providing information;
- (v) Who would be responsible for preparation of the EIA documentation, and for verification of the EIA documentation;
- (vi) Who would be responsible for identification of potential significant transboundary effects on the environment, how the relevant procedure under the Convention would be triggered and who would run the procedure;
- (vii) Who would be responsible for taking into account the results of the EIA procedure, including comments from the public and from potentially affected countries;
- (viii) What would be the “final decision” and who would take it;
- (ix) Who would be responsible for informing the public and potentially affected countries of the final decision;
- (x) Any time limits applicable to the above procedural steps.

15. In the light of the above, the Committee asked the Chair to invite the Government of Ukraine to provide it with the report as requested by the Meeting of the Parties at its fifth session. The report should be provided in English by no later than 31 December 2011 and should cover all the above-mentioned questions from the Committee.

V. Submissions

A. Armenia

16. The Committee members nominated by Armenia and by Azerbaijan, as well as a representative of Azerbaijan, were present in the room during the consideration by the Committee of the submission by Azerbaijan expressing concerns about the planned building of a nuclear power station in Metsamor, Armenia, but they left the room during the preparation of findings of the Committee, in accordance with rule 17 of the Committee’s operating rules.

17. The Committee began its consideration of the submission. The submission had been received by the secretariat on 5 May 2011 and forwarded on the same day by the secretariat to the focal point of Armenia, in conformity with paragraph 5 (a) of the appendix to decision III/2. The Committee took note of the reply from Armenia that had been received on 2 August 2011.

18. The Committee noted the statement by Armenia and Azerbaijan that all the necessary documents and information had been made available for consideration by the Committee.

19. The Committee agreed that Mr. Prieur would act as curator for the submission.
20. The Committee agreed to invite the two Parties to its next session (5–7 December 2011), where it would continue its consideration of the submission. The Committee would start by considering the submission in a closed session on 5 December in the morning. In the afternoon, it would invite brief presentations by the concerned Parties (not exceeding 20 minutes each) and ask them questions. The Committee would then consider the submission again in a closed session on 6 December, in the morning. The Committee would request each delegation to be available on Tuesday, 6 December starting from noon, for one hour, in case it had additional questions. The two Parties should be invited to provide the secretariat with the names of their respective delegates as soon as possible, in order to facilitate the access to the Palais des Nations. Armenia should also be asked whether it would be willing to accept the presence of observers at the hearing. The Committee asked the Chair to send invitation letters to the two Parties to that effect.
21. In the invitation letters, the two Parties should also be reminded of rule 11, paragraphs 1 to 3, of the operating rules.

B. Belarus

22. The Committee noted the submission by Lithuania expressing concerns about the planned building of a nuclear power station in Belarus, which had been received by the secretariat on 16 June 2011. The Committee also took note of the message sent on the same day by the secretariat to the focal point of Belarus, forwarding the submission in conformity with paragraph 5 (a) of the appendix to decision III/2.
23. The Committee also recalled its earlier conclusion that the official submission by Lithuania would be considered by the Committee at its twenty-third session (5–7 December 2011), following the receipt of the reply requested from Belarus by 16 September 2011 (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2011/4, para. 15).

C. Azerbaijan

24. The Committee took note of the submission by Armenia expressing concerns regarding six named oil and gas projects developed in Azerbaijan, which had been received by the secretariat on 31 August 2011. It also took note of the message sent on 1 September 2011 by the secretariat to the focal point of Azerbaijan, forwarding the submission in conformity with paragraph 5 (a) of the appendix to decision III/2.
25. The Committee noted that the official submission by Armenia would be considered by the Implementation Committee at its twenty-third session, in December 2011, following the receipt of the reply requested from Azerbaijan by 30 November 2011.

VI. Committee initiative

26. The Committee took note of the information provided by the secretariat regarding the implementation of the project to provide technical assistance to Azerbaijan for the review of Azerbaijan's legislation on environmental impact assessment, and requested the secretariat to inform it about any further developments.

VII. Information gathering

A. Belarus

27. The Committee recalled its decision at its twenty-first session to close the information-gathering case on Belarus (EIA/IC/INFO/5), initiated further to information provided by the Ukrainian non-governmental organization (NGO), Ecoclub, following the official submission received on 16 June 2011 from Lithuania concerning the planned building of a nuclear power station in Belarus (EIA/IC/S/4), as well as to focus only on discussing the systemic issues related to the implementation of the Convention by Belarus (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2011/4, paras. 15–16). As requested, the secretariat had informed Ecoclub accordingly.

28. Furthermore, upon instructions by the Committee, the secretariat had asked Belarus for its permission to release the correspondence related to the information-gathering case. On 24 August 2011, the representative of Belarus had replied that it considered the Lithuanian statements regarding the Belarusian nuclear power plant and the transboundary environmental impact assessment procedure for the project conducted by Belarus as unfounded. It therefore estimated that the publishing of the relevant correspondence on the Convention's website was not timely and that the issue should be reconsidered upon the conclusion by the Committee on the submission by Lithuania.

29. The Committee continued its consideration of the possible systemic inconsistency between the Convention and environmental assessment within the framework of the State ecological expertise system of Belarus. The Committee welcomed the timely and comprehensive information from Belarus, received in Russian on 19 August 2011, and its English translation, received on 5 September 2011, in response to the Committee's letter of 23 June 2011.

30. The Committee also considered the analysis of the Belarussian reply prepared by Ms. Stoyanova, as well as the views expressed by a former Committee member, Mr. Jendroska, who had been requested by the Committee at its previous session to review the information.

31. As the Committee was meeting for the first time in a new composition and not all members had had the opportunity to study the response from Belarus in advance, the Committee decided to examine the information further at its next session. The Committee asked that the Chair write to Belarus to inform it of the above, copying also Ecoclub on that information.

B. Ukraine

32. The Committee took note of the letter from the Government of Ukraine received on 30 August 2011, in response to its letter of 23 June 2011 requesting information on the environmental impact assessment for a planned activity in Ukraine, close to the border with Belarus and Poland, as well as clarification on whether the Government of Ukraine had taken the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to implement the provisions of the Convention. The Committee had approached the Government of Ukraine further to information provided by a Ukrainian NGO.

33. The Committee decided to postpone the consideration of the case to its twenty-third session, if time was available, following the receipt of the requested information from Ukraine. The Committee invited the Chair to write again to the Government of Ukraine to

ask for a reply to its questions in Russian and in English by 15 November 2011. It requested the secretariat to inform the Ukrainian NGO accordingly (by e-mail).

C. Romania

34. The Committee continued its consideration of the information provided by a Romanian NGO regarding a planned activity in Romania, close to the border with Bulgaria. It welcomed the comprehensive and timely reply received on 16 August 2011 from the Government of Romania, in response to its letter of 23 June 2011 requesting information on the EIA for the proposed installation, as well as clarifications on whether the Government of Romania had taken the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to implement the provisions of the Convention.

35. Based on the reply from the Government of Romania indicating that the procedure for EIA regarding the planned activity had not yet been initiated, the Committee concluded that it had no grounds to continue its consideration and would therefore cease gathering information with respect to the Convention.

36. However, the Committee noted that the reply referred to a local urban plan and wished to receive information on the strategic environmental assessment for the proposed plan and clarifications on whether the Government of Romania has taken the necessary legal, administrative and other measures to implement the provisions of the Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment. It asked the Chair to write to the Government of Romania to inform it about the Committee's conclusions and to invite it to provide the above information by 15 November 2011 for consideration by the Committee at its twenty-third session. The Committee also requested the secretariat to inform the Romanian NGO accordingly (by e-mail).

VIII. Review of implementation

A. Examination of general compliance issues from the Third Review

37. The secretariat presented an informal document highlighting general and specific compliance issues identified in the Third Review of Implementation (ECE/MP.EIA/2011/2–3), and in the completed questionnaires on which it was based. The Committee agreed to take that document into account in its work (ECE/MP.EIA/15, decision V/3, para. 4).

38. The Committee agreed that the findings of the Third Review should also be taken into account in its work and reflected in the revised questionnaire. The revised questionnaire would ask what Parties were doing to address those issues, or to explain why no action was envisaged. The Committee noted that the Working Group on Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment, when reviewing the revised draft questionnaire, would therefore become aware that the Committee was following up on those findings.

39. The Committee agreed that each member would examine a part of the Third Review to identify additional possible general compliance issues, as set out in the table below. The outcomes of that work would be discussed at the twenty-fourth session of the Committee in March 2012.

<i>Subject</i>	<i>References (question numbers)</i>	<i>Reviewer(s)</i>
General provisions (article 2), including public participation	Q1–6 Q7, Q53 (e) (public participation) Q51–55 (experiences) Q56 (clarity of the Convention) Q57–58 (Awareness of the Convention) Q59 (improvements to the report)	M. Prieur
Notification (article 3)	Q8–18 Q53 (a)	N. Stoyanova
Preparation of the EIA documentation (article 4)	Q19–30 Q53 (b)	L. A. Hernando
Consultation (article 5)	Q31–33 Q50 (f)	L. A. Hernando
Final decision (article 6)	Q34–38 Q53 (g)	N. Stoyanova
Post-project analysis (article 7), bilateral agreements (article 8), research programmes (article 9)	Q39–40 Q41–42 Q43 Q53 (h)–(k)	F. Zaharia
Cases	Q47–50	F. Zaharia

B. Specific compliance issues from the Third Review

40. The Committee considered specific compliance issues from the Third Review of Implementation to which the secretariat had drawn its attention, as set out below.

41. The Committee noted Albania's failure to complete and return the questionnaire and to reply to the letter from the Committee of January 2011 urging it to do so. The Committee recalled that the Meeting of the Parties had decided that a failure to report on implementation might be a compliance matter to be considered by the Committee (ECE/MP.EIA/10, decision IV/1, para. 8). It requested the Chair to write again on its behalf to Albania to request it to complete and return the questionnaire for the Third Review of Implementation without delay and by no later than by 15 November 2011. In the meantime, the Committee decided to begin a Committee initiative (EIA/IC/CI/3), further to paragraph 6 of the appendix to decision III/2, and asked that the Chair inform Albania accordingly.

42. The Committee noted that Croatia had indicated that it had notified the affected Party's public only after the public hearing had been held in the Party of origin; that Portugal had excluded offshore hydrocarbon production from its lists of activities; and that the Republic of Moldova seemed to lack detailed provisions in its legislation for proper implementation of the Convention. The Committee requested the Chair to write on its behalf to the three countries to seek clarification of their implementation of the Convention regarding the above-mentioned issues.

43. The Committee noted the request of Montenegro for assistance from the secretariat for the implementation of the Convention. That request was not reflected in the workplan adopted by the Meeting of the Parties at its fifth session, at which Montenegro had not been represented. The Committee invited the secretariat to contact Montenegro to inquire

whether it wished to make a “self-referral” (as set out in decision III/2, appendix, para. 5 (b)), which would provide the basis for the Committee to give the requested assistance to Montenegro through conducting a country-specific performance review.

C. Revision of the questionnaire

44. The Committee approved the timetable proposed by the secretariat for the simplification of the questionnaire for the fourth review of implementation of the Convention and its extension for the first review of implementation of the Protocol. The modifications to the questionnaire were to be undertaken by the Committee, with the support of the secretariat and, where appropriate, that of the World Health Organization.

45. The Committee invited its members tasked with the revision of the questionnaire on the Convention and the preparation of the questionnaire on the implementation of the Protocol to present the outcomes of their work by 15 November 2011, for consideration by the Committee at its twenty-third session (5–7 December 2011). The Committee members responsible for reviewing the various parts of the Third Review of Implementation were encouraged to provide input to that work by e-mail copied to all the members of the Committee.

IX. Structure, functions and operating rules

A. Application of the Convention by the European Union member States

46. The Committee continued its consideration of the opinion from the Legal Service of the European Commission (ARES 2011 91651 of 27 January 2011) received on 7 February 2011, in response to the Committee’s letter of 19 January 2011 regarding submission by a European Union member State concerning the non-compliance of another member State under the Convention. At its twenty-first session, the Committee had not been satisfied with the explanations from the European Commission regarding the potential conflicts between the Convention’s procedures for the review of compliance and the EU legislation on dispute settlements (article 33 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). The Committee had therefore written to the Commission on 23 June 2011 inviting it to further clarify its views by 15 August 2011.

47. In the absence of a response from the European Commission to its letter of 23 June 2011, the Committee decided to postpone further consideration of the matter to its next session in December 2011. It requested the secretariat to inform the European Commission accordingly and to urge the Commission to reply at its earliest convenience.

B. Possible discrepancies between the different language versions of the Convention and the issue of no-action alternatives

48. The Committee considered the letter of 7 June 2011 from the European Commission seeking clarification on the appropriate interpretation of the provisions of the Convention, in particular with a view to establishing whether the description of the no-action alternative to a proposed action as set out in appendix II, item (b), was compulsory or whether the national authorities had any margin of discretion. The European Commission argued that there was a discrepancy between the English, French and Russian language versions of the Convention that might lead to different interpretations and inconsistencies in the application of the Convention by the Parties.

49. The Committee noted also the clarifications that the secretariat had communicated to the European Commission on 3 May 2011 in response to the informal inquiries of the Commission.

50. The Committee acknowledged, in general terms, that it was important to ensure the alignment of the three authentic texts of the Convention and of the Protocol in English, French and Russian. It noted that in particular the Russian translation of the Convention might contain several linguistic inaccuracies and inconsistencies potentially creating uncertainty for the Parties to the Convention as to the appropriate implementation of the Convention obligations, and possibly indicating the existence of more systematic problems with the different authentic language versions.

51. The Committee noted that it was not within its mandate to provide its opinion on the general issue regarding the linguistic discrepancies between the three language versions of the Convention and the most appropriate way to interpret any of them, as well as on the particular provision of appendix II, item (b) (i.e., whether the no-action alternative was compulsory and whether the national authorities had any margin of discretion). The Committee nevertheless referred to the opinion it had expressed in 2010 with respect to information gathering on Belgium: "It was important that the no-action alternative should be addressed fully so that the evolution of the environment in the absence of the project could be considered" (ECE/MP.EIA/IC/2010/2, para. 33).

52. In the light of the above, the Committee decided to bring the issue of potential inconsistencies between the three authentic language versions of the Convention to the attention of the Working Group of the Parties and the Bureau, and to recommend that those bodies consider establishing a task force with a view to bringing into line the three language versions. The Committee asked the Chair to write to the European Commission informing it of the above.

C. Participation at the Committee's meetings

53. The Chair, the other Committee members and the secretariat clarified at some length the Committee's structure and functions and the procedure for the review of compliance (decision III/2, appendix), its operating rules (decision IV/2, annex, as amended by decision V/4, annex) and the rules of procedure of the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention (decision I/1). Based on the above rules and in the light of prior practice, the Committee concluded that there were four possibilities for participation in a meeting of the Committee besides the regular participation of the Committee members. Those were the following:

(a) Observers, who had the right to participate in the meeting unless the Committee decided otherwise. Observers were not permitted to remain in the meeting during the Committee's consideration of submissions, unless the Committee and the Party whose compliance was in question agreed otherwise (decision III/2, appendix, para. 3 and decision IV/2, annex, rule 17, para. 1);

(b) Experts invited by the Committee to be present under specific agenda items or sub-items, who were invited to speak by the Chair in agreement with the Committee (decision III/2, appendix, para. 7 (d));

(c) Representatives of Parties in respect of which a submission was made or which made a submission, which were entitled to participate or to be present during the consideration by the Committee of that submission. Such representatives were not permitted to take part in the preparation and adoption of any report or recommendation of the Committee. Representatives of involved Parties might be invited to speak by the Chair in agreement with the Committee, in accordance with the relevant Committee procedures (decision III/2, appendix, para. 9 and decision IV/2, annex, rule 17, para. 2);

(d) A Committee member that represented an involved Party, who was entitled to participate in the consideration of the submission but was not permitted to participate in or be present during the preparation and adoption of any part of a report or recommendation of the Committee that related to the submission (decision III/2, appendix, para. 10 and decision IV/2, annex, rule 5, para. 2).

54. Items (a), (c) and (d) above applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the Committee initiative, information gathering and other specific compliance issues.

55. One member of the Committee pointed out that, unlike other compliance committees, which were composed of members serving in their personal capacity, the Implementation Committee of the Espoo Convention consisted of Parties to the Convention elected to serve in the Committee. Those Parties were represented in the meetings of the Committee by one member they had appointed. Any other representatives of the Parties should therefore be considered as observers.

X. Presentation of the main decisions taken and closing of the meeting

56. The Committee decided that it would next meet from 5 to 7 December 2011 and that the two first days of its twenty-third session would only address issues related to the Convention (namely, the submission from Azerbaijan regarding Armenia (ECE/IC/S/3) and the submission from Lithuania regarding Belarus (ECE/IC/S/4)). The Committee agreed that its twenty-fourth session would be held from 20 to 23 March 2012, subject to the availability of a meeting room.

57. The Committee adopted the draft report of its session, prepared with the support of the secretariat.
