

Concept paper by Canada – Malaysia

ASP.net's user name

BCFP_MY

Submitted on

10/28/2016 11:11:32 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:

Not answered

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

Please elaborate:

It is suggest to establish a working group to review the related Annexes involve.

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:

No comment.

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:

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:

Example D1 & D5.

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:

Example: co-processing activity.

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, D5 & D15.

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:

D1 & D5.

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

-The description of the "reuses" is not defined clearly. Please elaborate the term of "used oil" in R9(waste oil or cooking oil).

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:

R9

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:

Not answered

35. Other comments:

Not answered

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

*** Yes ***

No

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Y29

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:

Example: Household e-waste.

39. Question 35: Do you see conflicting text?

Yes

*** No ***

Unsure

Please elaborate:

Not answered

40. Other comments:

Not answered

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:

Not answered

45. Submitting Party:

Country:

Malaysia

46. Identification of the respondent:

Organization:

Department of Environment Malaysia

Address:

Hazardous Substances Division Department of Environment Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Level 2, Podium 3, Wisma Sumber Asli, No. 25, Persiaran Perdana, Presint 4, 62574 PUTRAJAYA, MALAYSIA

Contact person:

Datin Hanili Ghazali

E-mail:

nili@doe.gov.my