

Questionnaire for the report of Denmark on the implementation of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context in the period 2016–2018

Information on the focal point for the Convention

1. Name and contact information:

Ms. Helle Ina Elmer
Special Advisor, Ph.D.
Ministry of Environment and Food of Denmark
The Department, Nature and Climate Adaptation
DK-Holmens Kanal 42, Copenhagen K
+45 93 58 79 94 | hinel(at)mfvm.dk

Information on the point of contact for the Convention

2. Name and contact information (if different from above):

Ms. Karin Anette Pedersen
Environmental Protection Agency
Ministry of the Environment and Food of Denmark
Haraldsgade 53
DK-2100 København Osterbro
Direct Phone: +45 72 54 47 42
Cell phone: +45 93 58 80 94
E-mail: kaape(at)mst.dk

Information on the person responsible for preparing the report

3. Country: Denmark
4. Surname: Elmer
5. Forename: Helle Ina
6. Institution: Ministry of Environment and Food
7. Postal address: DK-1216 Holmens Kanal 42

8. Email address: hinel@mfvm.dk
9. Telephone number: +45 9358 7994
10. Fax number:
11. Date on which report was completed: 12 April 2019

Part one

Current legal and administrative framework for the implementation of the Convention

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

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

Please note the following preconditions for the answers given below:

The EIA-Directive was brought in line with the Espoo-Convention with the adoption of Council Directive 97/11/EC of 3 March 1997, recital 12 and 13. There are not – to our knowledge – any misconceptions in the transposition of the Espoo-Convention in the EIA-Directives.

Given the fact that Denmark is a Member of the EU Denmark is obliged to transpose the EIA-Directives the transposition is adopted in the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA no. 1225 of 4 February 2018), which also transposes the SEA-Directive.

Article 1 Definitions

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

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

Your comments: **In accordance with the EIA- Directives the purpose of the EAA is to ensure that a procedure involving consultation of the public and authorities over an environmental assessment of a proposed project is carried out, when a project may have a possible significant impact on the environment, cf. art. 1.**

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

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

Your comments: **In accordance with the EIA- Directives the purpose of the EAA is to ensure that an environmental assessment of a project is carried out, when a project may**

have a possible significant impact on the environment, cf. art. 1. The same terminology is used when describing the legislative obligations for carrying out transboundary consultations, cf. EAA art. 38.

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

In the EIA- Directives a project precedes the possibility of a 'major change', cf. Annex I, point 24 and art. 4, paragraph 1. This is transposed into the EAA art. 15, paragraph 1, no. 1, and Annex 1, point 29.

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

- (a) Based on the geographical location of the proposed project **X**
- (b) By making the information available to all members of the public and letting them identify themselves as the public concerned
- (c) By other means (please specify):

Your comments: The concept of the public in the EIA-Directives art. 1, paragraph 2, litra e), and the definition is transposed in the EAA art. 5, no.1. However, the concept of the public concerned serves two purposes: 1) who to consult when the environmental assessment procedure is conducted and 2) who are eligible to bring action before the Environment and Food Appeal Board or the Court. In the first instance, location is one of several selection criteria in order to fulfill the Aarhus Convention. In the second instance the EAA art. 50, paragraph 1, require a 'legal interest' in the case, which is in line with the EIA-Directives art. 11.

Article 2

General provisions

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

- (a) Law on EIA: **Environmental Assessment Act (EAA no. 1225 of 4 February 2018)**
- (b) EIA provisions are transposed into another law(s) (please specify): **Intensive livestock installations (currently undergoing revision), cf. and projects covering motorways, certain highways, railways and commercial ports are transposed in the specific acts covering the various types of projects.**
- (c) Regulation (please indicate number/year/name): **no. 121 of 4 February 2019 pursuant to EAA**
- (d) Administrative (please indicate number/year/name):
- (e) Other (please specify): **Guidance documents under revision**

Your comments:

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

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

- (b) It differs slightly (please specify):

Your comments: The EAA Annex 1 transposes the Annex I in the EIA-Directive. This infers that windfarms and deforestation are projects comprised by Annex 2 as in Annex II of the EIA-Directive. Apart from the requirements in the Directive the Danish Parliament has adopted a few more projects comprised by Annex 1 in the EAA. This is mainly extraction of raw material from the sea bed and overhead high voltage power lines.

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

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

Your comments: The competent authority carrying out the EIA is also responsible for contacting and providing the necessary material for the transboundary consultation. It is the Environmental Protection Agency, which is the Point of Contact.

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

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

Your comments: The Environmental Protection Agency is the PoC for all EIA's with transboundary impact.

I.9. How does your country, As a Party of origin and as an affected Party, ensure that the opportunity given to the public of the affected Party is equivalent to the one given to the Party of origin's public, as required in article 2, paragraph 6 (please explain): The Danish EIA authorities are obliged to incorporate the Espoo procedures into the timetables for the specific plans and projects. The consultation material is sent to affected countries well in advance of the public consultation in Denmark. The consultation material is translated into relevant languages of countries concerned.

Article 3 Notification

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

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

Your comments: **Possible affected countries are consulted whether they want to participate and whether they have comments on the project / plan, including the content of the environmental assessment. The notification, including appendices, is sent to potential affected countries no later than one week before the Danish public and the authorities concerned are heard. All contact with possible affected countries is always via the Danish Environmental Protection Agency, which is the Danish Espoo authority.**

I.11. Please define the format of notification:

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

Your comments: **No comments**

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

- (a) The information required by article 3, paragraph 2 **X**
- (b) The information required by article 3, paragraph 5 **X**
- (c) Additional information (please specify):

Your comments: **No comments**

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

- (a) National legislation does not cover the time frame
- (b) Yes, it is indicated in the national legislation **X** (please indicate the time frame): **There is a deadline for public consultation and affected authorities for 14 days in the law. The deadline may be waived in specific circumstances e.g. that the Affected Party cannot fulfill the obligation to consult the authorities and the public.**
- (c) It is determined and agreed with each affected Party case by case in the beginning of the transboundary consultations (please indicate the average length in weeks):

Your comments:

Please specify the consequence if a notified affected Party does not comply with the time frame, and the possibility of extending a deadline: **Affected countries are informed about the specific consultation periods in Denmark, while it appears from the notification of the deadline for the affected country is one week after the end of the consultation.**

If an affected country asks for another deadline, this is agreed.

If an affected country does not respond to a notification, the Danish Environmental Protection Agency will contact the country to make sure it does not want to participate or have comments.

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

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

(b) Other (please specify):

Your comments: **No comments**

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

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

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

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

(d) Other (please specify):

Your comments: **The decision to participate as the Affected Party is mostly based on consultations involving the concerned authorities (as well as the Danish Environmental Protection Agency itself) NGO's and the public. The consultation is described in the EAA § 2, paragraph 1, no. 3.**

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

(a) Following the rules and procedures of the Party of origin

(b) Following the rules and procedures of the affected Party

(c) Other (please specify):

Your comments: **The notification describes an overall timetable for the environmental assessment process. Then the countries concerned are consulted when a draft environmental assessment is available. Deadlines for comments on the environmental assessment are stated in the consultation letter. Often, the process is agreed with POC in the affected country before the consultation letter is sent.**

Articles 3.8 and 4.2

Public participation

I.17. How can the public express its opinion on the EIA documentation of the proposed project (art. 5)? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

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

As a Party of origin

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

As an affected Party

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

Your comments: **Initially, it is only possible for the public to make comments during the periods when there is public consultation. However, according to the EIA-Directive (2014/52/EU) recital 29, 2nd paragraph it constitutes good administrative practice to take into account unsolicited comments that might have been received from other sources, such as members of the public or public authorities, even though no formal consultation is required at the screening stage.**

I.18. Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of a public hearing on the territory of the affected Party in cases where your country is the country of origin:

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

Your comments:

I.19. Please indicate whether your national EIA legislation requires the organization of public hearings in cases where your country is the affected Party:

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

Your comments: **Part of the scope of the EAA is to conduct public consultations, when Denmark is the affected Party, cf. art. 2, paragraph 1, no. 3.**

Article 4

Preparation of the environmental impact assessment documentation

I.20. How do you ensure sufficient quality of the EIA documentation As a Party of origin? Please specify:

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

Your comments: **In accordance with the EIA-Directive the developer is obliged to ensure that the information provided fulfills the requirements of the EAA art. 20 and that the information is correct and satisfactory. Furthermore, the developer is obliged to use consultants for drafting the EIA-report, cf. EAA art. 20, paragraph 6.**

I.21. How do you determine the relevant information to be included in the EIA documentation in accordance with article 4, paragraph 1? Please specify (more than one option may apply):

- (a) By using appendix II **X**
- (b) By using the comments received from the authorities concerned during the scoping phase, if applicable **X**
- (c) By using the comments from members of the public during the scoping phase, if applicable **X**
- (d) As determined by the proponent based on its own expertise
- (e) By using other means (please specify): **X**

Your comments: **The competent authority is also obliged to review the draft report and if they find misgivings and/or their expertise fall short of the one needed, they are obliged to request further information from the developer and/or seek expert assistance, cf. EAA art. 24, paragraph 1.**

I.22. How do you determine “reasonable alternatives” in accordance with appendix II, paragraph (b)?

- (a) On a case-by-case basis **X**
- (b) As defined in the national legislation (please specify):
- (c) Other (please specify):

Your comments:

Article 5

Consultations on the basis of the environmental impact assessment documentation

I.23. Does your national EIA legislation have any provision on the organization of transboundary consultations between the authorities of the concerned Parties? Please specify:

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

Your comments: **It follows from the obligation to conduct consultations as described in the EAA § 2, paragraph 1, no. 3.**

Article 6

Final decision

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

- (a) Conclusions of the EIA documentation **X**
- (b) Comments received in accordance with article 3, paragraph 8, and article 4, paragraph 2 **X**
- (c) Outcome of the consultations as referred to in article 5 **X**

- (d) Outcomes of the transboundary consultations **X**
- (e) Comments received from the affected Party **X**
- (f) Mitigation measures **X, if relevant**
- (g) Other (please specify):

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

- (a) Yes **X, if relevant and legally proportionate.**
- (b) No

Your comments:

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

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

Your comments: **If an EIA-permit is granted and it later proves to be legally invalid due to the lack of information etc., then it follows from the Administrative Act and case law that the permit may be revoked. This sanction is, however, not solely linked to the lack of certain information.**

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

- (a) Yes **X**
- (b) No (please specify those that do not):

Your comments: **Bear in mind that the Annex 1 in the EAA differs slightly from the Appendix I in the Espoo Convention.**

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

Your comments: **The concept of final EIA-permit is in the EIA-Directive an inter-legislative concept, which the ECJ regards as their prerogative to interpret the concept. The concept of final EIA-permit in EAA, cf. art. 5, no. 8, may in Danish legislation be linked to the final decision in EAA art. 25, or it may be a permit in another legislation eg. Environmental Protection Act (EPA), which for some types of projects substitute the permit in EAA with a permit in the EPA. The permit procedure may be divided into partial permits, but there will be one final permit. However, for projects in EAA Annex 1 (and Annex 2 – if the screening shows a possible significant impact on the environment) the procedure for the assessment must be conducted and the consultations carried out.**

Article 7

Post-project analysis

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

(a) No

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

Your comments: In accordance with the EIA-Directives the EAA art. 28 the competent authority must, if the project is expected to have significant adverse effects on the environment, precondition the EIA-permit with terms regarding the developer's measures envisaged to avoid, prevent or reduce and, if possible, offset significant adverse effects on the environment and procedures for monitoring of significant adverse effects on the environment. The type of parameters to be monitored and the duration of the monitoring shall be proportionate to the nature, location and size of the project and the significance of its effects on the environment. Existing monitoring arrangements may be used if appropriate, with a view to avoiding duplication of monitoring

Article 8 Bilateral and multilateral cooperation

(a) Agreements

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

(a) No

(b) Yes Please specify with which countries:

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

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

(a) Specific conditions of the subregion concerned

(b) Institutional, administrative and other arrangements

(c) Harmonization of the Parties' policies and measures

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

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

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

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

(h) Other, please specify:

Your comments:

(b) Procedural steps required by national legislation

I.32. Please describe how the steps required for a transboundary EIA procedure under your national legislation correlate to domestic EIA in the lead-up to the final decision. If there are differences in the procedures for screening/scoping or for preparation of the environmental impact assessment and consultation, please specify.

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

Your comments: **There is no difference in the EIA procedure for the two environmental assessment processes.**

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

- (a) No
- (b) Yes (please specify):
 - (i) Special provisions:
 - (ii) Informal arrangements:

Your comments: **The procedure for joint cross-border projects falls within the scope of the EIA-Directives and so it is conducted in accordance with the normal procedure in the EAA. The EIA-Directives offers the possibility to adopt a project by a specific act of national legislation and this possibility may be a way to secure complex procedures surrounding large projects.**

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

- (a) No
- (b) Yes (please specify):
 - (i) Special provisions:
 - (ii) Informal arrangements:

Your comments: **Denmark does not allow NPPs in the country.**

Part two

Practical application during the period 2016–2018

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

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

(a) Yes

(b) No

Your comments: **This questionnaire is quite comprehensive, so it most certainly depends on the context – especially the way the information is compiled and the future use of the information.**

1. Experience in the transboundary environmental impact assessment procedure during the period 2016–2018

Cases during the period 2016–2018

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

Table II.2 (a)

Transboundary EIA procedures: As a Party of origin

| Project name | Starting date (date notification sent) | Affected Party/ Parties | Timing of the notification (screening, scoping or preparation of the EIA documentation) | Length of the main steps in months | | | Final decision (date of issuing, if information is available) |
|--------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | Submission of the environmental report | Transboundary consultations (expert), if any | Public participation, including public hearing, if any | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | | | |

Your comments: There is no complete process overview for all Espoo cases in Denmark, so it is not possible to fill out the form. Instead, it can be stated that there are currently 12 ongoing EIA cases and 1 SEA case with Denmark as part of origin.

As an affected country, there are currently 33 ongoing EIA cases and 12 SEA cases in Denmark.

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

II.3. The Convention does not mention the translation of EIA documentation as an important prerequisite for the participation of potentially affected Parties in a transboundary EIA procedure. Please explain:

(a) How has your country addressed the issue of the translation of EIA documentation? When it comes to the Scandinavian countries, Danish and / or English are used, while environmental assessments for other affected countries are translated into their language and or English. It is the EIA authority and thus, in practice, the developer who has to arrange for translation of the environmental assessments.

(b) What difficulties has your country experienced with regard to translation and interpretation, both as a Party of origin and as an affected Party, and what solutions has it found? Immediately, there are no difficulties, but it is a financial burden for the developer, and the schedule is extended as it takes time to translate the environmental assessments

(c) Which Party covers the cost of translation of EIA documentation?

(i) As a Party of origin:

(ii) As an affected Party:

(iii) Other, please specify:

(d) What parts of the EIA documentation does your country usually translate?

(i) As a Party of origin:

(ii) As an affected Party:

(e) Please indicate whether and how the issue of translation is addressed in bilateral agreements between your country and other Parties.

In projects that run through several countries eg Nord Stream 2 and Baltic pipe, it has been agreed between POCs in the specific countries.

(f) As a Party of origin, in which language do you usually provide EIA documentation to the affected Party?

(i) English

(ii) The affected Party's language

(iii) Other (please, specify)

(g) As an affected Party, from which language do you usually translate?

(i) English

(ii) Language of the Party of origin

(iii) Other (please, specify) German

(h) Describe any difficulties that your country has encountered during public participation procedures and consultations under article 5, for example with regard to timing, language and the need for additional information.

(i) As a Party of origin:

Experience with public participation

When it comes to projects on land, it is often the local population and authorities participating and commenting on the cross-border environmental assessment project.

When it comes to projects at sea it is mostly authorities and interest organizations that participate and have comments on the cross-border environmental assessment of the project

Whatever participates, it is a great puzzle to get the Espoo process to be followed by the Danish EIA process, and the Espoo process generally means that the Danish process takes a little longer

Experience with consultations under article 5

If an Espoo process comes to a regular consultation meeting due to different perceptions of an influence, it can take quite a long time to achieve a common understanding because there can be a great difference in how cautiously one looks at, for example, the number of birds - is it sufficient bird counts 3 years in a row or it must be better documented.

Never the less it is the experience that both countries would very much like to reach agreement at consultation meetings, but it can be difficult because legislation, practice and process are not necessarily 100% identical in the countries, and it is difficult to make a party better or worse than others in the concrete country.

(ii) As an affected Party:

Experience with public participation

When it comes to a project on land very close to the border, eg wind turbines, it can give rise to great wonder, anger and a lot of newspaper articles if there are no similar limit values and calculation methods for eg noise across the border. There is also a big difference in how softer values such as the landscape are assessed - which the public can find difficult to understand

Experience with consultations under article 5

If an Espoo process comes to a regular consultation meeting due to different perceptions of an influence, it can take quite a long time to achieve a common understanding because there can be a great difference in how cautiously one looks at, for example, the number of birds - is it sufficient bird counts 3 years in a row or it must be better documented?

Never the less it is the experience that both countries would very much like to reach agreement at consultation meetings, but it can be difficult because legislation, practice and process are not necessarily 100% identical in the countries, and it is difficult to make a party better or worse than others in the concrete country.

- (i) Please describe how the costs of interpretation during the hearings are covered:
- (ii) By the Party of origin:
- (iii) By the affected Party:
- (iv) Shared by both Parties concerned:
- (v) Developer: **X**
- (vi) Other, please specify

II.4. Describe any difficulties that your country has encountered during transboundary public participation (expert consultation, public hearing, etc.), including on issues of timing, language and the need for additional information: **No comments**

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

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

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

(a) For joint cross-border projects: **Yes, it is successful because it is a very good collaboration and knowledge of each other. Processually, it can be very difficult to keep a common schedule, as each country can have other considerations that must also be taken into account.**

(b) For NPPs:

II.7. Please provide examples from your experience during the reporting period (either complete cases or elements such as notification, consultation and public participation) that, in your view, constitute good practice: **There is a good practice in informing about upcoming notification or consultation in cases, so that the affected country is aware of a coming process within a short time. It is also good practice to send consultation material to the affected country a week before the public period must be started. And finally good practice to give the country concerned a week after the end of the consultation period to gather and forward comments to the country of origin.**

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

- (a) No **X**

(b) Yes (please indicate which cases):

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

(a) No

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

2. Experience in using the guidance in 2016–2018

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

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

No

Yes (please provide details): **No comments**

Your experience with using this guidance: **The guide is a good support in the practical task solution**

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance: **No comments**

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

No

Yes (please provide details): **No comments**

Your experience with using this guidance: **The guide is a good support in the practical task solution**

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance: **No Comments**

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

No

Yes (please provide details): **No comments**

Your experience with using this guidance: **It is a good support in the practical solution**

Your suggestions for improving or supplementing the guidance: **No comments**

3. Clarity of the Convention

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

No

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

4. Suggested improvements to the report

II.12 Please provide further suggestions (preferably specific drafting proposals) for how this report could be improved. **No comments**