

Concept paper by Canada – Mozambique

ASP.net's user name

TECH_MZ

Submitted on

10/3/2016 1:46:44 PM

1. Question 1: Do you agree with the above objectives?

*** Yes ***

No

Please elaborate:

Because really is difficult to distinguish the three different types of mercury waste using the same Y code (Y29).

2. Question 2: Should there be any other objectives for this review?

Yes

*** No ***

Please elaborate:

I think for now we have enough objectives.

3. Other comments:

Not answered

4. Question 3: What would be the most effective mechanism to conduct this work?

Please elaborate:

Bearing in mind that we are looking for consistency and continuity in the approach and principles guiding the work ahead we suggest to establish a working group including Parties and others.

5. Question 4: Do you think that a working group post COP-13 should be established?

*** Yes ***

No

If yes should COP-13:

4a. Establish a new working group?

Yes

*** No ***

4b. Mandate an existing group to undertake the work?

*** Yes ***

No

4c. Mandate the OEWG to undertake the work?

*** Yes ***

No

Other (Please elaborate):

Because will be easy and flexible undertake the work.

6. Question 5: If a working group is to be mandated by COP-13 to undertake the work:

5a. Do you have specific views on the mandate of the group, bearing in mind your views on the objective of the review (questions 1 and 2 above)?

Yes

*** No ***

Please elaborate:

The mandate must be regulated according the specific rules

5b. Should the COP-13 adopt a workplan for the group?

* Yes *

No

5c. Should the COP-13 adopt terms of reference for the group?

* Yes *

No

5d. Should the COP-13 identify the level of priority of this work within the Open-ended Working Group programme of work?

* Yes *

No

If yes, what level of priority should be given for this work?

* High *

Medium

Low

Please elaborate:

Because there are needs to make clear the issues in overlapping to become easy the classifying process.

7. Question 6: Should the review of the Annexes be funded through the Convention's core budget (i.e. assessed contributions)?

* Yes *

No

Please elaborate:

I think it is extremely important to clarify the overlapping issues.

8. Question 7: Should the review of the Annexes be based on voluntary funding available?

Yes

* No *

Please elaborate:

Because the Convention's core budget is safe.

9. Question 8: If a working group is to be mandated to undertake the work, COP-13 will need to decide on its composition. Please review the various options below and indicate your preferences:

Open-ended

* Limited size *

Composed of representatives of Parties and observers

Composed of representatives of Parties and open to observers' contribution

10. Question 9: What information should be used beyond the documentation referred to in paragraph 2 above to conduct the review of the Annexes?

Please elaborate:

all the legal instruments related with.

11. Question 10: Some Parties suggested that two studies be conducted to facilitate the review of the Annexes namely:

1) a study analysing existing legislation of Parties relevant to Annexes I, III, IV and IX; and

2) a study on the use of disposal operations in practice:

10a. Do you think it would be useful to conduct these studies?

* Yes *

No

10b. Do you have any other suggestions on preliminary work that could facilitate the review of the annexes?

Please elaborate:
for now no.

12. Other comments:

Not answered

13. Question 11: Do you think Annex IV should be reviewed to:

11a. Update the list of operations listed in Annex IV A?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

11b. Update the list of operations listed in Annex IV B, for instance by including some recovery operations as they occur in practice?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

11c. Review the description of the disposal operations?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Is better to update, to get the harmonized procedures in legal instruments.

14. Question 12: Do you think a clearer distinction between Annex IV.A and B operations is needed?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

During or after two studies proposed in the question 10 we will see what we have to do exactly.

15. Question 13: Should the caption text be simplified and changed to "final disposal operations"?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Because the content described in above summarizes into final disposal operation.

16. Question 14: Should the caption text be reviewed in relation to the term "direct re-use"?

Yes

*** No ***

Unsure:

Please elaborate:

It's clear.

17. Question 15: Should the caption text be simplified and changed to "recovery operations"?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Because the content described in above summarizes into recovery operation.

18. Question 16: Should the caption text be reviewed in relation to the term "direct re-use"?

Yes

*** No ***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

It's also clear.

19. Question 17: Should there be changes to the introductory text?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

If applicable we can.

20. Question 18: Should there be changes to the introductory text?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

If applicable we can.

21. Question 19: Are there operations missing, which need to be included?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

May be the two studies proposed in question 10 may decide about this.

22. Question 24: Are there operations missing which need to be included?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

May be the two studies proposed in question 10 may decide about this.

23. Question 20: Are there operations which should be deleted?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

At least no. May be the two studies proposed in question 10 may decide about this.

24. Question 25: Are there operations which should be deleted?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

At least no. May be the two studies proposed in question 10 may decide about this.

25. Question 21: Should the description of certain disposal operations be updated?

*** Yes ***

No
Unsure
Please elaborate:

At least yes, but the two studies may support us in this decision.

26. Question 26: Should the description of certain disposal operations be updated?

Yes
No
Unsure
Please elaborate:

At least yes, but the two studies may support us in this decision.

27. Question 22: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes
No
*** Unsure ***
Please elaborate:

But I think there is no more.

28. Question 27: Should the description of operation R9 be reviewed in relation to the term "reuses"?

Yes
No
*** Unsure ***
Please elaborate:

but I think we talking about the operation R9 talk about reuse.

29. Question 23: Are there terms that would benefit from a definition?

Yes
*** No ***
Unsure

It's very clear.

30. Question 28: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes
No
*** Unsure ***
Please elaborate:

But I think there is no more

31. Question 29: Are there terms that would benefit from a definition?

*** Yes ***
No
Unsure
Please elaborate:

Used oil re-refining.

32. Other comments:

Not answered

33. Question 30: Should the text be reviewed in relation to the term "direct reuse"?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

I'm not sure but bearing in mind that we are in process to review the some annexes, is better to review all the issues.

34. Question 31: Should footnotes 20 and 21 be reviewed in relation to the term "reuse and direct re-use"?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

As I said above we can.

35. Other comments:

Not answered

36. Question 32: Are there waste streams missing that need to be included?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

I'm not sure, but I think there is some difficulties for proponents to integrate their waste in this Y code list (Block 14 of the transboundary movement form), for that I suggest to become clearer.

37. Question 33: Are there waste streams which should be deleted?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

As I said above we have to be clearer/more detailed this Y code list.

38. Question 34: Should the description of certain waste streams be updated?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

I think we can, because bearing in mind the results of the two proposed studies and the needs of the clarification of Y code list we will update.

39. Question 35: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not yet.

40. Other comments:

Not answered

41. Question 36: Are there characteristics missing that need to be included?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

I think the two studies proposed in question n° 10 will guide us.

42. Question 37: Should the description of certain hazardous characteristics be updated to be in line with the United Nations Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

We need to update or clearer some descriptions.

43. Question 38: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

may we check H4.2, H5.1

44. Other comments:

Not answered

45. Submitting Party:

Country:

Mozambique

46. Identification of the respondent:

Organization:

Ministry of Land, environment and Rural Development

Address:

Av. Acordos de lusaka, 2115, C.P. 2020- Maputo

Contact person:

+258 82 44 97030/+258 84 6718099

E-mail:

maife@gmail.com