



To:
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Fw: Reaction on the response of the Communicant Ref. ACCC/C/2012/71

From: <brigitte-artmann@gmx.de>
To: "aarhus compliance" <aarhus.compliance@unece.org>, "Haverkamp Jan" <jan.haverkamp@ecn.cz>
Cc: "Artmann Brigitte Gruene" <brigitte.artmann@gruene-fichtelgebirge.de>
Date: 13/06/2013 23:45
Subject: Re: Reaction on the response of the Communicant Ref. ACCC/C/2012/71

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for submitting me the answer of the Party concerned .

I cannot see any reason why my submitted communication should not be taken into account in the process of the evaluation of the relevant case .

The Ministry says: "*... we are convinced that it is not based on truth*" . And refer to "*the reaction of the Communicant (in this case Mr. Jan Haverkamp)*" .

Please let me clarify first: I am sorry, but the Ministry misunderstood something. The communicant am I and nobody else.

Second: I have asked Mr. Haverkamp for his statement as my consultant. Mr. Haverkamp was accepted as my expert for the relevant case in the meeting in Geneva . Jan Haverkamp is - in the rest of the world, but as it seems not in the Ministry of the Czech Republic - a recognized, respected and requested expert in nuclear and energy issues . He has a absolutely reliable experience in the relevant legal issues . I am very glad to have him as a consultant in the relevant case. I reject the accusation of the Ministry expressly that Mr. Haverkamp`s statement "*is not based on truth*".

It is based on truth and Mgr. Martin Sip`s legal expertise about the legal situation concerning EIA Law in Czech Republic is backing up Mr. Haverkamp`s statement. Mr. Haverkamp explained accurately and truthfully in his statement the reasons why I cannot complain in Czech Republic because of the missing formal hearing in Germany and why I am therefore complaining in Geneva. Mr. Haverkamp explained further accurately and truthfully in his statement the situation why we could not clarify our questions and concerns on the formal hearing in Ceske Budejovice, why the black box procedure and why the way we were treated on the formal Temelin hearing in Ceske Budejovice is relevant for the relevant case.

I do not know whether all discrepancies between the answer of MZP to the secretariat and my reaction to it will be consulted with the MZP .

But if, the discrepancies should also be consulted with my consultant Mr . Haverkamp and with me, as communicant.

Kind regards,

Brigitte Artmann

Brigitte Artmann

Am Frauenholz 22

95615 Marktredwitz

Germany

Tel +49 923162821

Mobil +49 1785542868

brigitte.artmann@gruene-fichtelgebirge.de

www.gruene-fichtelgebirge.de