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

**January 29, 2019 Teleconference**

**1:00pm to 3:00pm 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 D5 technical guidelines on specially engineered landfills.
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 D5
   1. Seek views from the SIWG on the draft, and on key items outlined
6. Discuss progress and next steps on the technical guidelines for D10
7. Path forward to COP14
8. Co-chair Croteau welcomed new members to the working group (Japan, Senegal, and IPEN) and invited members to make any introductory remarks at this stage. One member provided comments related to the challenges developing countries may face in banning biodegradable waste from engineered landfills for household waste. Additionally, on the day of the call, one member provided a document with comments on the draft being discussed.
9. The revised draft of the D5 technical guidelines was circulated for the review of the SIWG members with a deadline of November 13, 2018. Co-chair Croteau recalled that comments were received from: El Salvador, the EU and HWE. The co-leads (Argentina and Canada) provided the group with a revised version of the document, and a tracking table showing comments and if/how they were incorporated, on December 21, 2018. At the OEWG there was a discussion in the technical matters contact group and the co-leads tried to integrate the comments provided in this version.

**Purpose and objectives of the meeting**

1. Co-chair Croteau outlined the purpose and objectives of the meeting, which were 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 revised 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. **Throughout the document on if numbers should be included**
2. Co-leads suggested including an Annex to the technical guidelines with numbers from national legislation for matters such as distance or hydraulic conductivity.
3. One member stated it would be preferable to leave out numbers for topics that are not directly related to ESM, such as distance to airports as they are not included in their legislation. However, if needed, ranges could perhaps be introduced as examples in brackets in the document. Key issues related to ESM should not be included in an Annex but instead directly in the text, similar to what is done in the POPs technical guidelines. For now they could be put in square brackets.
4. Another member supported this by suggesting that some numbers could be in the document, especially for technical matters related to environmental integrity of landfills, such as for the geological barrier. This is especially useful as ESM is not defined by national legislation. From an engineering point of view, there are some minimum numerical standards that are key. Other standards may change relative to the environment, whereas hydraulic conductivity must be low and the head of the liner must be small for ESM.
5. Co-chair Croteau concluded that numbers will not be included in an Annex, and key numbers will be brought back into the document.
6. **Paragraph 3 on terminology**
7. The co-leads sought guidance on what terminology should be used when referring to landfills.
8. One member suggested a footnote to be added, which will explain that this relates to the review of the Annexes process. This was agreed upon by members.
9. The same member said it would be useful in paragraph 1 or 2, to include a footnote with the full description on D5. This was agreed upon by members.
10. **Section IV.C.2 – bottom liner**
11. The co-leads sought clarification from the SIWG on whether a single liner or a double liner should be considered ESM.
12. Members discussed the change in the term from “liner system” to “bottom liner”. One member felt the original terminology should be retained, as the guidelines specifically discuss the lining at the bottom of the landfill. Another member responded that the liner is not only at the bottom, but also along the side. According to a member, in the engineering landfill community “liner” refers specifically to the bottom liner, though sometimes other people also mean top and bottom (e.g. the capping system). The member pointed out this does not make very much of a difference and both terms are acceptable.
13. The same two members agreed that “liner system” should be used in the document instead of only “liner”. Co-chair Croteau acknowledged this.
14. One member stated that the geological barrier is the most important part of the liner system (i.e. 5m of clay is better than a double liner). Another member stated that the liner is just as important as the natural barrier.
15. Members agreed that landfills for hazardous waste needs a double liner. For landfills for municipal waste, a double liner may not always be needed, but it depends on local conditions. It was agreed that geological and hydrological assessments are needed to make this decision. The document submitted prior to the meeting that day provided information on these changes. The co-leads said they will integrate it into the document.
16. **Title of Section IV.C.4 “Surface water management system”**
17. Co-leads suggested to change the title from “surface water management system” to “storm water management system” as “surface water” seems very broad and the section mostly deals with storm water, which is the main input into landfills. The suggested change would be for this section only.
18. One member suggested leaving the terminology as is, as it includes the leachate treatment, whereas storm water is limited in a language perspective. This section addresses water falling on the engineered landfill.
19. One member discussed that “surface water” deals with, for example, lakes and rivers which are used for monitoring beyond the landfill, whereas “storm water management” is to reduce the amount of water entering the landfill. Another member commented that this information is useful, but does not apply to this section of the document, as there is a monitoring section.
20. One member shared the perspective that according to their landfill directive, there is a difference between precipitation (which is checked daily) and surface water (which is checked quarterly). One of the co-leads suggested that “precipitation” could be more appropriate to use for this section.
21. Co-chair Croteau thanked the members for their views and indicated that the co-leads will consider them in further developing this section.

**Paragraph 88 and 89 on cell construction –keep the section on cell design or not.**

1. The co-leads sought guidance on if the section on cell construction should be further developed or removed.
2. One member withdrew the idea of using “section” instead of “cell” in the document, though mentioned it is important to define “cells”. This member gave a definition of “cells” according to their legislation. This member also stated it would be good to see how different countries define this term, and suggested defining this term earlier on in the document, in the general text on design.
3. Another member stated that landfills should be designed and constructed using the cell approach. There should be at least one paragraph about this in the guidelines, not necessarily a full section of the document. The member recommended to go with the cell approach in the design of a landfill.
4. It was agreed to retain guidance on cell construction in this section, though it will be addressed with less detail.
5. **Paragraphs 110-112 and 113 ground/surface water monitoring**
6. The co-leads asked for rationale on why these paragraphs were suggested to be deleted.
7. The member that proposed deletion mentioned he did not have the chance to speak with an expert. He said that originally the deletion was proposed to shorten the guidelines. He suggested it could be kept without the square brackets for now. Another member stated that these paragraphs are part of the design criteria and are important.
8. A member noted that the text in these paragraphs should be adjusted to use “should”, not “must”.
9. Co-chair Croteau agreed and stated the paragraphs would be kept, without square brackets. The language will also be adjusted.

**Issues raised by SIWG members**

1. **Paragraph 9 on “effective contaminating lifespan terminology”**
2. A member suggested the removal of this term and related text. This term is also linked to an additional paragraph in the “Closure” section of the document. The co-leads will reassess this terminology and its inclusion.
3. **Paragraph 48 on leachate detection system**
4. One member noted, in response to a written comment in this section, that a leachate detection system is extremely important, as if leaks are detected the cell can stop being used to prevent further leachate generation and leakages. Another member stated they were not happy with how the co-leads integrated the comment from another member in this same paragraph.
5. Co-chair Croteau acknowledged the comments and indicated that the co-leads will re-visit the paragraph and wording to address the concerns raised by the members.
6. **Paragraph 73 on daily/interim cover**
7. One member stated there is a difference between daily cover and interim cover. These covers use different soil types, have different objectives, and are used for different amounts of time. The co-leads asked for a text proposal to facilitate clarifying this section.
8. **Paragraph 77 and 78 on gas monitoring and biodegradable waste in landfills**
9. One member said that gas monitoring is important in both hazardous waste landfills and landfills for other wastes, and should be reflected in the text.
10. The same member expressed concern about the destination of biodegradable waste in developing countries if they are banned from landfills, and that alternatives should be provided. Members discussed if biodegradable waste should be banned from landfills, and whether or not text should be added regarding alternative destinations for biodegradable waste. However, members acknowledged that there are problems with having biodegradable waste in landfills.  
    One member suggested that all organic waste should be banned from landfills, not just biodegradable waste.
11. Co-chair Croteau acknowledged the comments and concerns raised on this issue.
12. **Paragraph 115 on waste acceptance criteria.**
13. A member noted that the co-leads stated more information would be added to this paragraph, but no further information was provided. This member suggested comments provided in an additional document this morning had suggestions on what information to add. The co-leads stated they will further develop this later and asked if new guidance should be in the body of the document or in an annex. The member said this issue should be decided later, but mentioned that if the additional text is small, it could be in a footnote, but if it is long, it should be in an annex.
14. **Paragraph 153 and 154 on landfill gas monitoring**
15. One member commented that these two paragraphs should include information on monitoring how much gas is leaking from the surface of the landfill.
16. The co-leads will explore adding the suggested concept into the paragraphs.

**Section V.F on transportation**

1. One member stated that two paragraphs in this section were unnecessary, and that they do not properly define what ESM is.
2. Co-chair Croteau stated this section will be re-visited.

**Conclusion**

1. The Co-leads concluded the discussions on the technical aspects. The Co-leads will revise the guidelines based on the discussions on the issues referred to above. The outcome will go to COP14.

**Progress and next steps on the technical guidelines on D10**

1. The Co-leads indicated that the work on integrating comments into the D10 draft technical guidelines was nearing completion, and a clean draft and a tracking table of comments will be provided to members prior to the meeting in the next few days. There was discussion that two drafts of D10 would be provided to members due to the complexity of integrating the comments, which will result in major changes to flow and formatting of the document. However, it was agreed upon to provide one draft and make large formatting changes following the teleconference.
2. Co-chair Croteau mentioned that the teleconference for D10 would be on February 4th, 2019.

**Path forward leading to COP-14**

1. The co-leads began discussions on a possible way forward leading to COP-14. A draft CRP will be circulated to the members before the COP for the intersessional work between COP14 and COP15, including a face-to-face meeting. The co-leads also suggested having one teleconference before COP-14 to review this document. The co-leads will introduce a CRP, after agreement with the SIWG, at COP14. One member suggested that the co-leads could include e.g. an invitation for comments in the draft CRP. The same member also expressed that a teleconference before COP-14 may not be necessary, and instead the co-leads could communicate with the SIWG via e-mail.

**The meeting was closed at 15h.**

**Annex I – List of attendees**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME** | | **REPRESENTING** |
|  | Ms. Alejandra Acosta | Argentina |
|  | Ms. Julie Croteau | Canada |
|  | Mr. Maxime Dube | Canada |
|  | Mr. Jose-Jorge Diaz-Del-Castillo | European Union |
|  | Mr. Michael Ernst | Germany |
|  | Ms. Reem Musleh | State of Palestine |
|  | Mr. Alain Heidelberg | Hazardous Waste Europe |
|  | Mr. Nicholas Humez | Hazardous Waste Europe |
|  | Ms. Mayumi Tamiya | Japan |
|  | Mr. Toru Terai | Japan |
| **BRS Secretariat** | | |
|  | Ms. Carla Valle-Klann | BRS Secretariat |