



SC

UNEP/POPS/POPRC.5/INF/12

Distr.: General
12 August 2009



Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

English only

Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

Fifth meeting

Geneva, 12–16 October 2009

Item 4 (f) of the provisional agenda*

Operational issues: report on the outcomes of activities undertaken for effective participation of Parties in the work of the Committee

Comments and responses relating to the pocket guide for effective participation in the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

Note by the Secretariat

The annex to the present note contains a table listing the comments received from Parties and observers on the pocket guide for effective participation in the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee and the responses thereto by the intersessional working group on support for effective participation. The pocket guide is contained in document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.5/INF/7. The table has been reproduced as submitted and has not been formally edited by the Secretariat.

* UNEP/POPS/POPRC.5/1.

K0952582 140809

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Annex

Comments and responses relating to the pocket guide for effective participation in the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

Minor grammatical or spelling changes have been made without acknowledgment. Only substantial comments are listed.

Pocket guide Section	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
General	China	The shorter version of the handbook helps the parties to better understand the procedures of listing new POPs and the data and information requirement during the review process.	
Handbook	China	The handbook analyzes possible difficulties in getting data and information in the reviewing process of listing new POPs, and proposes solutions for the problems. For instance, referring to the lack of information collection channel and identification capacity, the handbook suggests the establishment of the priority list, registration system and capacity building. However, this solution needs time, sufficient technical and financial support. It should be noted that the handbook itself can not address the key barriers for developing countries to effectively participate in the review work of listing new POPs.	Comment concerns handbook for effective participation and the POPRC procedure in general.
Handbook	China	Based on the previous disagreements on the review procedure and legal interpretation, the handbook should include instructions to the review procedure of listing new POPs and relevant legal interpretation (e.g. voting, nomination of isomers, how to deal with precursors); the handbook should analyse these questions and ways to deal with them in order to carry out review work to new POPs more scientifically and authoritatively;	Comment concerns handbook for effective participation.
Handbook	China	Handbook should include methods and standards on evaluating environment risk and socio-economic impact in Annex E and Annex F, and the measures to deal with the absence of adequate information. Although Annex D makes clear the screening criteria of identifying whether a chemical meets POPs standards, Annex E and F only point out the information requirements for conducting environment risk and socio-economic impact evaluation, leaving out clearly-defined assessment methodologies and standards, and measures for dealing with the absence of adequate information, which also resulted in disagreements in the previous review work of listing new POPs.	Comment concerns handbook for effective participation.
General	Croatia	The pocket guide is well written, no more comments on it.	
General	European Commission	The pocket guide is very concise and relevant.	
Chapter 2.4 and 2.5	European Commission	In 2.3, it is said "Observers can participate in the discussions....decisions" but such wording is not included in section 2.4 and 2.5. You could either insert this wording also in section 2.4 and 2.5 or add a new section 1.5 when you explain how the discussion takes place during the POPRC meeting. If you follow the last approach, I think that it could	The first approach was implemented (sentence was added to 2.4 and 2.5).

Pocket guide Section	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
		be interesting to say few words about "contact groups" and "drafting group" and their rules and objectives.	
General	Germany	We appreciate the development of this Pocket guide and its translation into the six official languages of the United Nations. It gives a good overview for newcomers and could be useful for experts as well.	
General	Germany	The Handbook is a better source of information, due to shortage of information in the "Pocket guide". The Handbook is written very clear, and concise – in our opinion the better choice.	
Chapter 2.4.1, 2.5.1	Germany	There is a discrepancy in wording used in the Handbook and the Pocket guide related to the "Executive Unit". In the pocket guide the term "Executive Unit" is not mentioned. It was either replaced by the term "National Focal Point" or by referring to the term "ad hoc working group" – somehow confusing.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.4.1	Germany	The last bullet point (Ministry of Industry) on page 7 does not exist in the Table 1 of the Handbook.	The bullet point was added in the pocket guide version only after the last revision of the handbook.
Chapter 2.4.1	Germany	On Page 8, Point (2) the last paragraph should contain a reference to the Handbook (list of information sources) with some examples picked out for the Pocket guide.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.4.2	Germany	The sentence from the Handbook (Page 29) "For reasons of conflict of interest the Committee has agreed that the chair should be a member from another Party than the nominating Party" should be included the first paragraph.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.4.2	Germany	It should be mentioned in the second paragraph that the final draft should contain a summary and a conclusion as well.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.4.3	Germany	The sentence from the Handbook (Page 32) "Lack of full scientific certainty shall not prevent the proposal from proceeding" should be added to the first paragraph.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.3	IPEN	Delete "all" in the sentence "The evaluation should address all the criteria as set out in Annex D and conclude for each criteria whether is has been fulfilled or not." as Using the word "all" suggests that every Annex D sub-criterion must be fulfilled. However some sub-criteria are separated by the word "or" implying that satisfying one of them would be sufficient to meet the particular characteristic.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.4.1	IPEN	Add "health risks of chemicals, policies related to health and regulations on chemicals, monitoring," to "Ministry of Health and Labor Responsible for information related to protection of workers and public from exposure to chemicals, compliance with international treaties." as In some countries the MOH is the lead agency on chemical safety instead of MOE.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.5.1	IPEN	Add "Import volume not available if claimed as CBI" to the difficulties column in table 1.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.5.1	IPEN	In table 2, the section 2 on Possible control measures and their impacts should be better balanced with regard to benefits of controlling POPs. Countries should be encouraged to think and report on the benefits of control measures and not just encouraged to reply negatively to any possible	Changes were partially accepted in the view of balancing positive and negative impacts of possible control measures.

Pocket guide Section	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
		control measures. Casting control of POPs in a negative light encourages is contrary to the Convention and is inappropriate for a Secretariat publication.	
Chapter 2.5.1	IPEN	In table 2, change “Economy (impact, costs, and benefits to the local, national or regional economy, and particularly to the industry sector, capital costs and benefits associated with the transition to the alternatives, and the economic impact on agriculture)” to “Economy (impact, costs, and benefits to the local, national or regional economy, the industry sector and agriculture)”.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.5.1 Section (2)	IPEN	Add “human health and environmental impacts and information” to “If restrictions, bans, or voluntary phase-outs of the chemical already exist at the national level, information that supported the control measures such as information on available alternatives could be included in the submission.”	Change is accepted.
General	Mauritius	The draft pocket guide user-friendly and we have no further comments to make.	
General	Poland	The pocket guide is a useful source of information and could be especially helpful for people who do not take part in the POPRC’s work, for people who need to get fast information about this issue, for non-experts. The “Handbook for effective participation in the work of the POPs Review Committee” is comprehensive and a very good source of information for experts, who take part in POPRC’s work, but probably „Pocket Guide for effective participation in the work of the POPs Review Committee (POPRC)” could be useful for experts, too. The flow charts are clear and may help users with putting information about these issues in order.	
Chapters 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4	Poland	Insert the following tables from the handbook: “Output of the nomination stage”, “Output of the verification process”, “Output of the screening process” and “Output of the risk profile development”, because they could be a useful source of information.	Tables were added, including tables on “Output of the risk profile decision stage”, “Output of the risk management evaluation development” and “Output of the risk management decision”.
General	Romania	After analysis of the pocket guide, no comments on it.	
2.1	Slovakia	<u>In the list of possible information sources on substance, add International health and safety organisations collecting data about effects of chemicals as RTECS, IPCS, IARC, NIOSH, Catalogues (Merck, Acros Org, Aldrich, Sigma) and MSDS (Material safety data sheets) from producers. Furthermore, add some useful web pages (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occupational_Safety_and_Health_Administration, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/, http://www.osha.gov/, http://www.cancer.org/, http://www.britannica.com/, http://www.chemguide.co.uk/basicorg/, http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/, http://library.dialog.com/, http://monographs.iarc.fr/).</u>	Change is accepted.
General	Sweden	Even though it is mainly to support POPRC members from developing countries, I would expect that it can be useful to all Parties in informing about the work of the POPRC .	
Appendix	Sweden	Put the illustrations in the appendix next to the	Change is accepted.

Pocket guide Section	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
		related text when possible.	
Front page	Sweden	Change title to „POCKET GUIDE for effective participation in the POPs Review Committee under the Stockholm Convention“.	Change is accepted.
Introductory page	Sweden	Change third paragraph to „To support all Parties to fully participate in the work of the Committee the “Handbook for effective participation in the work of the POPs Review Committee” was developed by the POPRC in 2008 and made available in English on the Convention website and in hard copy upon request to the Secretariat.“	Change is accepted.
General	Sweden	Add list of acronyms.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.1	Sweden	Delete detailed list of information sources and refer to handbook.	Change not accepted as more detailed information was provided and information collection is main focus of the pocket guide.
Chapter 2.4.1 Section (1)	Sweden	Add „The Risk profile (RP) is limited to approx. 20 pages and is entirely prepared based on the information collected and submitted by Parties and observers for review by the Committee.“	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.5.1	Sweden	Add „The Risk management evaluation is entirely based on the information collected and submitted by Parties and observers for review by the Committee.“	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.5.1 Section (3)	Sweden	Add „To submit the information specified in Annex F the Secretariat sends out a submission form and a work plan to all Parties and observers.“	Change is accepted.
Chapter 3	Sweden	Add „, and wastes“ to „Identify and manage stockpiles of the chemicals according to Article 6“.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 2.4	US EPA	In the last paragraph replace „are encouraged to“ to „must“ due to the COP4 Decision SC 4-20, paragraph 4 and Annex I, para (b) amending the POPRC Terms of Reference to require submission of proposals at least 5 months in advance of the a POPRC meeting at which they will be discussed. It is noted, however, that Para 3 of SC4-20 , regarding which the non-mandatory type language “encourage” in the draft is presumably based, is not completely consistent with the revised TOR that includes mandatory-type language - - and which should guide the POPRC process.	As SC-4/20 par (3) uses the term „encourages“ and Annex I „shall“, the latter term was used.
Chapter 2.3	US EPA	Refer to chapter 2.7 for more information regarding resubmission of proposals and appeals of POPRC decisions.	Change is accepted.
Chapter 3	US EPA	Add „,and wastes containing the chemicals“ to „Identify and manage stockpiles of the chemicals according to Article 6“.	Change is accepted.
General	Zimbabwe	The handbook is equipped with comprehensive credibly scientifically oriented data. It provides a robust, broad based gamut of information decentralisation with enough flexibility. The inclusion of various stakeholders, especially the observers edifies the POPRC mandate and role in tackling the various challenges presented to the environment by these Chemicals.	
General	Zimbabwe	The POPRC should also consider the promotion of credible observers to be involved in the final drafting of decisions, this would eliminate bias, improving on the transparency. In as much as the inclusion of the various stakeholders is critical, care must be taken in order to coerce them to be fully committed. This is so especially in generating the	Comments on the POPRC

Pocket guide Section	Source of Comment	Comment	Response
		<p>risk profile, where the industrial sector can offer natural resistance meant to protect their business interest. When undertaking a risk management evaluation, conducting a national survey by means of questionnaires, this should be done with a statistically valid sampling plan supported by strong scientific backing. The POPRC, may also have to play a caretaker role in administering its new technologies to the developing countries. There has to be harmonisation of the old and new technologies, supported by the POPRC. A consistent audit on the accountability of the key stakeholders has to be religiously followed in order for there to be continuity. The pocket guide is essentially plausible, for as long as there is full commitment from all the key stakeholders.</p>	