**Small Intersessional Working Group for the Update of the Technical Guidelines on Specially Engineered Landfill (D5) and Incineration on Land (D10)**

**February 4th, 2019 Teleconference**

**3:00pm to 5:00pm Geneva time
Co-leads summary**

For the list of attendees, please see Annex I of this document.

**Agenda & Introductory Remarks**

1. The meeting was co-chaired by Julie Croteau (Canada) and Alejandra Acosta (Argentina) and focused on the work on the D10 technical guidelines.
2. Participants agreed to organize the teleconference on the basis of the draft agenda proposed by the co-leads:
3. Introductory remarks
	1. Adoption of the agenda
4. Purpose and objectives of the meeting
5. Review current draft on the technical guidelines for D10
	1. Seek views from the SIWG on the draft, and on key items outlined
6. Discuss next steps
7. Co-chair Croteau noted that this was the first time the SIWG has reviewed the draft D10 guidelines, whereas for D5 members had two previous opportunities. The co-leads noted that there are a variety of technical issues to be resolved in these guidelines. The co-leads provided the group with a revised version of the document, and a tracking table showing comments and if/how they were incorporated, on January 31, 2019. The co-leads reminded the members that the D5 and D10 guidelines are not going for adoption at COP14.
8. One member thanked the co-leads for the work done to prepare the current draft and tracking table. He also mentioned that he will be coordinating with another working group member to provide further comments on the current draft, similar to D5.

**Purpose and objectives of the meeting**

1. Co-chair Croteau outlined that the objectives for this meeting are similar to the meeting for D5, which was to show the members the progress made on the D5 guidelines, how comments were integrated, seek guidance from the SIWG on some specific issues related to the guidelines, and to provide an additional opportunity for members to voice further comments and concerns.

 **Review of the current draft on the technical guidelines for D5**

1. Comments that were highlighted in the tracking table as needing input from the SIWG were addressed first, and then other comments were welcomed from the members for discussion.

**Issues on which the co-leads sought input**

1. **Cost in the guidelines, applicable to both D5 and D10**
2. The co-leads sought guidance on if costs should be included in the guidelines.One member said that economic feasibility is important for developing countries, and it is important to acknowledge that incineration is one of the most expensive treatment options.
3. The member suggested that costs do not need specific numbers, but instead use words such as “high” and “low”. Another member stated that the general technical guidelines on POPs had costs in an annex, but as they became quickly outdated the annex was deleted later on. The focus on the document is on ESM, not cost, and so they should not be included. Another member supported that costs should not be included in the guidelines.
4. Members had a conversation regarding the comparison of costs of different kinds of thermal treatment methods, perhaps in an annex. However, it was decided that this was ultimately outside the scope of the guidelines. Based on discussion with the members, the co-leads suggested adding a paragraph in the overview section on costs, and another in the operational section.
5. Members agreed, and this will be reflected in the D5 guidelines as well.
6. **Section I.A on scope**
7. The co-leads sought guidance on the current scope section, specifically the portion on co-incineration and if it should be included, removed, or modified.
8. Discussion occurred between the members on the inclusion of R1. In Europe, incineration plants can be R1 or D10, depending on the energy harnessed from the process. One member said that it is difficult to keep D10 and R1 separate, and that the mandate of the SIWG should be expanded to include R1 at the COP.
9. Many members stated that the text on co-incineration could be removed as it is outside the scope or needs to be explained more. One member said it is okay to leave as is, as it is simply factual but should include reference to the other technical guidelines.
10. Co-chair Croteau stated that the text for operations in Annex IV will be kept as they are now in the Convention.Suggestions were also made by one member on moving paragraphs within the scope, and that reference to Y47 should be removed. Co-chair Croteau asked for clarification on the possibility of incinerating ashes. Many members stated that this usually does not occur in practice.
11. Based on this discussion, the co-leads agreed that instead of referencing “other wastes”, the text will be changed to refer to household wastes.
12. The co-leads explained the need to have a clearly defined scope, and that while some changes can be made now, others will have to be discussed at or after the COP.
13. **Paragraph 12, disadvantages of incineration**
14. The co-leads sought guidance from the members on a comment that the disadvantages of incineration should be included. Members discussed the proposal, with some supporting or opposing it on different levels. A suggestion was made to bring text from the general technical guidelines on POPs, but the text should only be factual in nature.
15. However, upon further review, it was found that the information in the general technical guidelines on POPs was too short. Members suggested the co-leads communicate with the original commenter on what he would like to see included.
16. Co-chair Acosta suggested calling these “requirements” of incineration, rather than disadvantages.
17. Members discussed what considerations should be taken into account for disadvantages, such as the volume of waste, operation requirements, and BAT/BEP.
18. One member noted that a problematic issue with incinerators, stack bypass, is not included in the guidelines and should be included. Another member noted that stack bypass may not happen in all jurisdictions, such as the EU, due to legislation.
19. Co-chair Croteau said that the inclusion of some new paragraphs on cost may help to address some of these issues, and will explore incorporating BAT/BEP in them.
20. **Paragraph 13, relation to other conventions**
21. Co-leads sought guidance on adding new paragraphs to other MEAs. Co-chair Croteau stated that changes here will be reflected in the D5 technical guidelines.
22. Members agreed that the mention of other MEAs should be incorporated.
23. **Paragraph 17, carbon footprint**
24. The co-leads sought guidance on if this paragraph should be removed, as suggested in a comment.
25. Many members stated that a comparison of disposal methods, especially those outside the scope of the document, does not need to be added. One member said there should simply be a paragraph stating that there is an associated carbon footprint, which another member supported.
26. One member reiterated the fact that these technical guidelines should focus on ESM of incineration.
27. Co-chair Croteau acknowledged the comments made by the members, and stated that she understands that there is a desire to keep some sort of mention of carbon footprint, but not to compare disposal methods.
28. **Paragraph 26, incinerating medical waste**
29. The co-leads sought guidance on how to incorporate suggested text on incinerating entire barrels of hazardous waste. The suggested text stated that entire barrels of medical waste can be incinerated up to a maximum of 30L.
30. One member had received input from one expert and stated that barrels up to 120L of medical waste can be incinerated.
31. The member who made the former comment said that they try to avoid as much as possible feeding entire barrels into the incinerator. They only incinerate medical waste in entire barrels due to the possible presence of infectious disease, up to 30L, and occasionally up to 50L. Other waste in a barrel is shredded first.
32. Based on further discussion with members, co-chair Croteau invited all members to seek scientific literature to support their views.
33. **Section III, structure of document**
34. Co-leads sought guidance from members on changing the structure of the document to be similar to the cement kiln technical guidelines, as suggested in a comment.
35. Members agreed, as those guidelines follow a logical order. Co-chair Croteau mentioned that the changes would result in all of the paragraph numbers being changed.
36. The members acknowledged this and co-chair Croteau said the structure will be adjusted.

1. **Section IV.B, types of incinerators**
2. Co-leads sought guidance from members on moving the description on the types of incinerators earlier in the document.
3. Members agreed, but suggested keeping operational considerations where they currently are, in the operations section. Co-chair Croteau agreed.
4. **Section IV.D, energy recovery**
5. Co-leads sought guidance on if this section should be adjusted or removed, as it overlaps with R1.
6. Many members were fine with leaving this section intact, or putting it in square brackets for further discussion. One member proposed changing the title of the section to “Recovery of Energy”. Members identified areas that may need additional work, such as confirming electrical efficiencies, as 30% may be too optimistic, and elaborating the paragraph referring to quenches. Co-chair Croteau requested the members to provide written comments to help develop the text.
7. The co-leads will further discuss the feedback received and how to adjust the section. The section was put in square brackets.

**Comments from other members**

1. One member, referring to the text on entry laboratories in paragraph 30, said that “should” is not appropriate in this context, and that “could” or “may” can be better utilized as the current text reads that all incineration facilities should have an entry laboratory. In practice, only hazardous waste incineration facilities need an entry laboratory. Alternatively, text could be adjusted to specify the entry laboratory is for hazardous waste incinerators, not for incineration facilities for other waste. This was supported by another member. A third member brought to the group’s attention that other paragraphs in Section B “Reception Control” also mention the entry laboratory, and should be adjusted for consistency. Co-chair Croteau acknowledged these comments and the text will be adjusted accordingly. One member realized that some information in paragraph 140 is incorrect, and will provide proposed text and comments to the co-leads in the coming days.

**Next steps**

1. Co-chair Croteau stated that the next steps for the D10 technical guidelines are similar to the D5 technical guidelines, and the co-leads will finalize the document. Two members said they will communicate with each other and send in additional comments on the current draft.

**The meeting was closed at 17h.**
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