



Distr.: General
20 October 2005

English only



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Expert Group on Best Available Techniques and
Best Environmental Practices
First meeting**

Geneva, Switzerland, 28 November –2 December 2005
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

**Further work on the enhancement or strengthening, as appropriate,
of the guidelines on best available techniques and provisional guidance
on best environmental practice relevant to the provisions of Article 5
of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants**

**Analysis of comments received by the Secretariat on the draft
guidelines on best available techniques and provisional and
guidance best environmental practices relevant to Article 5 and
Annex C¹**

Note by the Secretariat

1. At its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention, in its decision SC-1/19, invited Parties and others to submit comments on the draft guidelines and provisional guidance, as contained in document UNEP/POPS/COP.1/INF/7, to the Secretariat by 31 August 2005 for consideration by the Expert Group at its first meeting.
2. In response to the invitation in the aforementioned decision the Secretariat received comments from 14 Parties and 13 Non Parties. The actual submissions are reproduced in document UNEP/POPS/EGBATBEP.1/INF/5.
3. The comments received regarding the draft guidelines and provisional guidance include general comments on the guidance, specific editorial changes and corrections, scope and structure, identified gaps, regional issues not covered, suggestions for improvement of the different sections.
4. In order to facilitate the work of the Expert Group, the comments received have been grouped into general comments and specific comments on the draft guidelines and provisional guidance. Table 1 below contains a summary of the general comments. Table 2 below, contains a checklist of the specific comments received indicating the section they refer to.

* UNEP/POPS/EGBATBEP.1/1.

¹ This document has not been formally edited.

Table 1. General comments submitted on the draft guidelines and guidance

COMMENTS	SUBMITTED BY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is no differentiation between BAT and BEP in document ▪ Document focuses too much on BAT giving hardly any attention to BEP which are of great relevance to the region. ▪ BAT go beyond the technical , financial, legal social capabilities available in the region 	Argentina
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments regarding, the content in the introductions of each chapter; use of SI-units and conversions; emission values with respect to the flue gas; editorial errors. 	Austria
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to include traditional brick burning as a source in the guidelines/guidance 	Bangladesh
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Suggested linking UNEP's Toolkit for Dioxin and Furan Emissions with the BAT/BEP guidelines so as to synchronize the source categories and related emission technologies. ▪ General comments on source control, practical technologies, patent issues, case studies of successes with emission reduction technologies. ▪ General comments on the application of the guidelines to other unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants. ▪ Comments on the legality of the guidelines. 	China
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on need to improve the format, user friendliness of the document, as well as a need to standardize the format for the different sections. ▪ Need to include socio –economic considerations integrating the realities of the productive sectors in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. ▪ Need to include references to case studies. 	Colombia
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the document. ▪ Technologies referred to are not applicable to the country's situation.; however the document is considered a valuable tool as a guide on technologies for the productive sector ▪ The document does not provide solutions national priority problems identified in the national inventories on POPs. 	Ecuador
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments on the need for a new expanded list of source categories, suggests the inclusion of: (i) smitheries and foundries and (ii) refineries ▪ Comments on the need to consider other unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants. 	France
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concurs with the decision SC-1/19 of the COP-1, on the need to review, strengthen and refine the information in the guidance document. 	Italy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments on the usefulness of the document, however, indicates that only few source categories apply to them. 	Lithuania
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the strength and weaknesses of the guidelines/guidance document. ▪ Recommends developing a guide on how to use the document holding a series of training workshops. 	Madagascar
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the guidelines/ guidance document. ▪ Reference to burning of sugarcane bagasse for the generation as fuel or power generation should be included in the document; ▪ Emphasis should be made on composting and the substitution of plastic bags 	Mauritius
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reinstated issues reflected in decision SC-1/19. 	Mexico
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments on the user friendliness of the document and requested consideration for BAT/BEP technologies specific for the developing countries. ▪ Comments on information on alternatives and the development of 	Palestine

COMMENTS	SUBMITTED BY
criteria for evaluating them.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Valuable tool in emissions reduction of POPs. 	Portugal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the applicability of the guidelines/guidance document in Rwanda ▪ General editorial comments for improving the document ▪ General language and editorial comments to be reflected in the French translation 	Rwanda
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comments on lack of consistency in the guidance document and need to improve its user friendliness and guidance as to its use. ▪ Comments on the need for adequate provision of alternatives. ▪ Comments on addressing needs of the developing countries. 	Trinidad and Tobago
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the structure, user friendliness and the need for more information on performance levels. ▪ Comments on unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutant monitoring, cost and effectiveness data, plus how to address best needs of the developing countries. 	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the format and standardization of the chapters. ▪ Need for a CD format of the document with hyperlinks and cross-references for more efficient navigation through the document. ▪ Need for a glossary, and information on the reduction of other unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants. ▪ Addition of case studies could help users understand how to use the document; ▪ More information required to stress the co-benefits of controlling other pollutants through the control of unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants 	United States of America
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the inclusion of all the halogens in statements where chlorine is mentioned since the end products (halogenated dioxins and furans) behave in more or less similar ways. ▪ 	Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on lack of user friendliness of the Guidelines/Guidance, need to improve format, need to address POPs releases to media other than air in the individual source category guidance ▪ need to fully reflect Convention goals and obligations in guidelines for individual source categories, need to “Material Substitution” and its importance regarding the issue of alternatives 	IPEN
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detailed comments on the structure, scope and limitations of the document. ▪ Comments on the legal status of the document. ▪ Comments on a way of taking users through the document and show them how to use it efficiently. ▪ General comments regarding inconsistencies throughout the document. ▪ General comments on harmonization of the styles used by the different authors, and wording used throughout the document. 	UNEP
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General comments on the legal nature and use of the BAT/BEP guidance document for guidance purposes. ▪ General comments strongly supporting the current draft and stating that the Guidelines should NOT be significantly revised or rewritten and the BAT/BEP Expert Group should NOT try to define “lesser” BAT/BEP. 	WCC/ICCA

Table 2. Check list of detailed comments on specific sections of the Guidelines/guidance document

GUIDANCE DOCUMENT SECTION		COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY
Section I : Introduction		
I.A	Purpose	
I.B	Structure of document	
I.C	Chemicals listed in Annex C	UNEP
I.D	Article 5	
I.E.	Relationship to the Basel Convention	Germany, IPEN
Section II : Consideration of Alternatives in the application of best available techniques		
II. A	Consideration of Alternatives in the Stockholm Convention	IPEN
II. B	Consideration of alternatives for new sources: a checklist approach	
II.C	Other considerations of the Stockholm Convention	Madagascar
Section III: Best available techniques and best environmental practices: Guidance, principles and cross cutting considerations		
III.A	Guidance	UNEP
III.B	General Principles	Madagascar, United States of America
III.C	Cross cutting considerations	Austria, China, France, Madagascar, Poland, USA, IPEN, UNEP
Section IV Compilation of summaries		Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF), UNEP
Section V Guidance/guidelines by source categories: source categories in Part II of Annex C		
V.A	Waste incinerators	Austria, Bangladesh, China, Poland and Rwanda, IPEN, UNEP
V.B	Cement Kilns firing hazardous waste	Austria, Rwanda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, IPEN, World Wide Fund for Nature
V.C	Production of Pulp using elemental chlorine or chemicals generating elemental chlorine	Austria, China, Rwanda , United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, American Forest & Paper Association, UNEP
V.D	Thermal processes in the metallurgical industry	Austria, China, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, UNEP
Section VI Guidance/guidelines by source categories: source categories in Part III of Annex C		
VI.A	Open burning of waste including burning of landfill sites	Germany, Poland, Rwanda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, UNEP
VI.B	Thermal processes in the metallurgical industry not mentioned in Annex C Part II	Bangladesh, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, IPEN, UNEP
VI.C	Residential Combustion sources	Rwanda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Poland, United States of America
VI.D	Fossil Fuel fired utility and industrial boilers	
VI.E	Firing installations for wood and other biomass fuels	China, United States of America
VI.F	Specific chemical production processes releasing chemicals listed in Annex C	China, Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF), IPEN
VI.G	Crematoria	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
VI.H	Motor Vehicles particularly those burning leaded gasoline	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

GUIDANCE DOCUMENT SECTION		COMMENTS SUBMITTED BY
VI.I	Destruction of animal carcasses	
VI.J	Textile and leather dyeing and finishing	Bangladesh, Germany, Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF)
VI.K	Shredder plants for treatment of end-of-life vehicles	
VI.L	Smouldering of copper cables	Germany, Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF)
VI.M	Waste oil refineries	Bangladesh, Bromine Science and Environmental Forum (BSEF)

Possible action by the Expert Group

5. The Expert Group may wish to consider the comments submitted by Parties and others pursuant to the invitation from the Conference of the Parties as contained in decision SC-1/19 and in doing so, may wish to set up a process to incorporate, as appropriate, into the draft guidelines/guidance, the relevant editorial comments submitted by Parties and others, as well as any textual corrections and technical updates deemed necessary by the Expert Group.