

# Concept paper by Canada – Republic of Azerbaijan

ASP.net's user name

TECH\_AZ

Submitted on

9/6/2016 9:24:30 AM

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

Yes

**\* No \***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

## 3. Other comments:

Комментариев нет.

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

Please elaborate:

Механизм проведения данной работы должен быть основан на правовые аспекты и требования Конвенции.

## 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:

Not answered

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:

Not answered

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

Yes

**\* No \***

Please elaborate:

Not answered

**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:

Нет информации

**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:  
Других предложений нет

**12. Other comments:**

Других комментариев нет

**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:

Not answered

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Объединить пункты D4 и D6 в один пункт

**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:

Not answered

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

**27. Question 22: Do you see conflicting text?**

Yes

**\* No \***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

**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

Not answered

**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:

Not answered

**32. Other comments:**

КОММЕНТАРИЕВ НЕТ

**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:

Эти термины похожи по смыслу

**35. Other comments:**

Нет других комментариев

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

**\* Yes \***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Алюминий, соединения алюминия

**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:

Not answered

**39. Question 35: Do you see conflicting text?**

Yes

**\* No \***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

**40. Other comments:**

Других комментариев нет.

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

Yes

**\* No \***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

**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:

Not answered

**43. Question 38: Do you see conflicting text?**

Yes

**\* No \***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

**44. Other comments:**

Других комментариев нет.

**45. Submitting Party:**

Country:

The Republic of Azerbaijan

**46. Identification of the respondent:**

Organization:

The Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources

Address:

AZ1073, B/Aghayev str.100a, Baku, Azerbaijan

Contact person:

Adil Zeynalov

E-mail:

adilzeynalov@mail.ru