

## **Submission by Norway related to para. 10 of Decision IX/3 on the Strategic Plan and a new strategic framework (preliminary comments)**

### **General comments**

Norway bases the following comments on the fact that the obstacles to the effective implementation of the Basel Convention (BC) are many and well documented, including that the Basel Convention Regional Centres (BCRC) have not developed into efficient instruments as "*key delivery mechanisms*" under the BC.

A new strategic Framework (SF) for the implementation of the Basel Convention should, as the present Strategic Plan, primarily be designed to support implementation activities in developing countries and should in particular focus on the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes and the problem of illegal traffic as well as the environmentally sound management of priority waste streams.

### **Enforcement – illegal traffic of hazardous wastes**

- Activities promoting the objectives of the Ban amendment should be at the forefront in developing the SF. Despite the implementation of the BC, the illegal traffic of hazardous wastes continues. There are undoubtedly many reasons for this, but the SF must to a greater extent than previously under the SP focus on activities promoting the enforcement of the BC.
- The BCRCs should be further mobilised in providing assistance in legal and institutional matters.
- It should be considered to further expand the cooperation with the World Customs Organisation (WCO) and Interpol to combat the illegal traffic of hazardous wastes. Similarly, the work under the BC should be coordinated with other organisations/institutions in the field of implementation and enforcement of the BC, e.g. IMPEL.

### **Prioritised waste streams and activities**

- The SF should be "*substance oriented*". Priority waste streams should be identified and concrete, time-phased activities included. The policy needs to be based on updated knowledge of volumes and categories of hazardous waste generation as well as disposal methods and their effects.
- At the same time, the number of priorities and activities need to be realistic. Thus, the elaboration of the SF needs to be closely coupled with realistic discussions on financing and resource mobilisation.

- The implementation of the SF needs to be monitored and regularly reviewed and updated based on experience gained and development of knowledge and understanding on what should be priority waste streams and priority activities.
- The activities included in the Basel Declaration on Environmentally Sound Management (paragraphs (a) – (i) under the chapter on Environmentally Sound Management) seems in general well placed and still relevant. However, more emphasis needs to be put on activities to prevent and minimise waste generation.
- The provisions of technical assistance to developing countries have not been sufficient, and the SF needs to address how this situation can be improved.

### **Financing**

- The issue of financing is of importance. Developments on financing within the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other financial institutions (in particular development banks), as well as SAICM, will be important for BC and for the SF. The Parties need to discuss the role of the BC and its relationship to these institutions (whether or not the financing issue as such is included in the SF itself).
- The BCRCs should develop projects that can attract multiple sources of support.

### **Synergies**

- Following agreement in 2009 by the conference of parties to all three chemicals conventions (BC, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions) practical implementation of closer and more effective cooperation and coordination between the three conventions should be a key issue in the SF. This also relates to the role of the BCRCs.
- Moreover, regional cooperation to meet regional challenges needs more focus, making full use of the BRCRs.

### **Cooperation with other concerned organisations**

- As already mentioned, closer and more efficient cooperation with other concerned organisations is required, drawing upon the “*comparative advantage*” of each organisation.
- UNEP has expanded its work on waste issues, and the work and role of UNEP needs to be taken into account in developing the SF, in particular its work on the implementation of the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building and its work under SAICM and the Marrakech Process.

## **The role of the industry**

- The responsibility, cooperation and contribution by all stakeholders should be emphasised, as in the present SP, but in particular the role of industry should be more elaborated upon in a new SF.
- Norway supports the Partnership Programme as a core element of the work under the BC promoting cooperation between industry, governments and NGOs. These partnerships constitute an important instrument in implementing the new SF.