

Concept paper by Canada – New Zealand

ASP.net's user name

TECH_NZ

Submitted on

10/31/2016 1:40:17 AM

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

*** Yes ***

No

Please elaborate:

We agree with the objectives outlined above. In addition to the examples outlined, we wish to highlight other sections where these objectives are relevant. Objective 1 is relevant to Annex 1 which has conflicting and overlapping provisions. There are also gaps in the waste streams that could be filled. Objective 1 is also relevant for the unclear relationship between annexes 8 and 9. Objective 2 is also relevant to annex 8 and 9 which are missing certain wastes or they are not clearly identified. Annex 3 also needs updating.

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

Yes

*** No ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

3. Other comments:

Not answered

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

Please elaborate:

Small, focused working group

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):

Not answered

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:

See question one for specific issues the group should be mandated to undertake work on.

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:

Not answered

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:

This work is critical, so it would be ideal if it could be funded through any means available - whether voluntary or core funding

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

*** Yes ***

No

Please elaborate:

This work is critical, so it would be ideal if it could be funded through any means available - whether voluntary or core funding

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:

Not answered

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 question 10a, we consider the second study would be helpful. The first study though, would be best approached as a limited survey of a sample of parties to identify specific problem areas they encounter with the annexes.

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:

Not answered

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure: ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

If the heading is amended, then it would be helpful to have definitions in the introductory text, including in respect of 'direct re-use'.

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

If the heading is amended, then clarity on the intent of the section would be helpful in the introductory text, including in respect of 'direct re-use'.

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

The operation of import for export is missing. For example, New Zealand receives some wastes from Pacific Islands for subsequent export (eg to Europe) for final disposal.

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

The operation of import for later export is missing, and recovery of components not covered by R4 or R7. An example of this is the scavenging of components from e-waste and even from used and non-functional vehicles.

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

D1 and D15 could be updated

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

R12 and R13 appear to cover the same operation

27. Question 22: Do you see conflicting text?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Conflicting text between D1 and D5 – these two should be distinct options, currently D5 is also D1.

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

A definition is needed of 'specially engineered landfill' in D5 and this needs to be excluded from D1 .

30. Question 28: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

The term 'exchange' is not clear. Does this mean that the material is gathered but no disposal is yet decided or is it a code for passing to another disposer? In the latter case the code would apply to most transboundary movements. The former would not appear to give any assurance that the waste will be managed in an environmentally sound manner.

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:

Not answered

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:

Yes, the distinction drawn in the footnotes suggests that direct reuse (which is a subset of reuse) involves items that are not waste. This can leave some items bound for reuse as waste. It is not clear how much repair, refurbishment and upgrading is needed before the term 'direct reuse' does not apply and hence the items are waste. The –e-waste guideline (especially the flow chart) gives some help but reflecting this in the footnotes/B110 and A1180 entries would be useful,

35. Other comments:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

The following waste streams are missing: Spent Catalyst, e-waste, other waste consumer items, oxidising waste, brominated flame retardants.

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

Yes

No

*** Unsure ***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

There would be benefit in updating Y18

39. Question 35: Do you see conflicting text?

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Y12 and Y13 can be used for the same waste, for example, paint. Currently e-waste is only captured through use of multiple codes from Y19 to Y45.

40. Other comments:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

It would be helpful to align with the GHS

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:

Descriptions should be updated, however, it should retain descriptions not covered by the GHS, for example H10 and H13

43. Question 38: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes

*** No ***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

44. Other comments:

Not answered

45. Submitting Party:

Country:

New Zealand

46. Identification of the respondent:

Organization:

Ministry for the Environment

Address:

23 Kate Sheppard Place, Thorndon, Wellington, New Zealand

Contact person:

Manager, International Climate and Environment

E-mail:

Basel@mfe.govt.nz