



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
11 September 2006

English only

Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee

Geneva, 6–10 November 2006

Item 4 (f) of the provisional agenda*

**Operational issues: submission of information
specified in Annex F of the Convention**

**Comments and responses relating to the submission of
information specified in Annex F of the Convention**

Note by the Secretariat

1. The ad hoc intersessional working group on confidentiality and Annex F on information on socio-economic considerations prepared the following, which are set forth in annexes I–V to document UNEP/POPS/POPRC.2/6:

- (a) Draft elements of a letter to Parties and observers inviting them to submit pursuant to Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention the information specified in Annex F;
- (b) A draft format for submitting pursuant to Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention the information specified in Annex F;
- (c) Draft explanatory notes to the format for submission of information specified in Annex F;
- (d) A draft risk management evaluation outline;
- (e) A draft work plan for the intersessional period between the second and third meetings of the Committee for the possible preparation of the risk management evaluation.

2. Listings of the comments received on a preliminary version of the draft format for submitting pursuant to Article 8 of the Stockholm Convention and on a preliminary version of the draft risk management evaluation outline and the responses thereto are set forth in annex I and annex II to the present note. The annexes were prepared by the intersessional working group and have not been formally edited

* UNEP/POPS/POPRC.2/1.

Annex I

Comments and responses on the draft format for submitting Annex F information, June 2006

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
General comments	EC	The main problem with the Annex F evaluation will be that without relevant and sufficiently comprehensive information from Parties / observers, POP RC will not be able to prepare a meaningful evaluation. This puts a lot of pressure on getting the data enquiry format right and easy to use. POP RC itself cannot prepare a comprehensive global socio-economic analysis, it can merely summarise the information and available analysis provided by Parties and stakeholders.	Acknowledged.
	ICCA-WCC-CLI	The risk management evaluation is a critical step in the review of candidate chemicals under the Stockholm Convention. Therefore, it is imperative that these documents provide clear guidance on the types of information to be submitted for the risk management evaluation and clear guidance for what information should be included in the actual risk management evaluation report. We offer the attached comments in an effort to help clarify some of the issues outlined in these documents and improve their overall usefulness.	Acknowledged.
	Germany	For annex E information, the draft format was separate from the explanatory note, we should do the same here. The introductory part duplicates partly the information in the letter and should be transferred to the letter (see changes recommended in draft format)	Final version modified accordingly. Final version modified accordingly.

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
Editorial	Several	Several parties made editorial comments, which are not listed in this table.	Text modified accordingly.
Preamble	EC	<p>Start this section with the phrase “In accordance with Article 8(7)(a) and Annex F,” In the same first paragraph, add “risk management” before “evaluation,” replace “regarding” by “that includes an analysis of”, and delete phrase “encompassing the full range of options, including management and elimination.”</p> <p>In the second paragraph, replace “may” by “are invited to” and delete “The evaluation shall include an analysis of the possible control measures for the chemical.”</p> <p>[NB: One should add the reference to the relevant Risk Profile prepared for the chemical in question because that will include relevant data on production, uses and releases of the chemical, i.e. it will for the basis for identification and analysis of control measures.]</p> <p>[NB: One should consider whether POP RC, when agreeing on a Risk Profile, could already give indicative list of possible control measures for the chemical in question. This would facilitate the task of Parties and observers to give input to the analysis. Otherwise we need to ask the data provider to clearly explain what they consider as ‘possible control measures’;]</p> <p>At the end of the second paragraph, add two footnotes:</p> <p>¹ Reference to the relevant Risk Profile prepared for the chemical in question should be added because it will include relevant data on production, uses and releases of the chemical, i.e. it will provide the basis for identification and analysis of control measures.</p> <p>² It should be considered whether POPRC, when agreeing on a risk profile, could already give an indicative list of possible control measures for the chemical in question. This would facilitate the task of Parties and observers to give input to the analysis. Otherwise, it would be necessary to ask the provider of information, to clearly explain what they consider as ‘possible control measures’.</p>	Preamble eliminated from this format. Pertinent information taken into account in the draft elements of the accompanying letter to Parties and observers.
	IPEN	<p>Add phrase “and any other relevant information” at the end of the first paragraph.</p> <p>Agrees with EC regarding the two footnotes at the end of the second paragraph</p> <p>Also, add phrase “wherever possible.” around t the middle of the third paragraph, after “...for that information,”</p>	

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	USA	<p>In the second paragraph, replace “Provides a basis” by “thus includes much information relevant to the development of”. The original phrase seems overly broad.</p> <p>Regarding footnote 1 proposed by EC: Per comment above, while the Risk Profile will certainly include information relevant to the identification and analysis of control measures, suggesting that it will “provide the basis for identification and analysis of control measures” seems too broad in light of the additional, socio-economic considerations that need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Regarding footnote 2 proposed by EC: Recognizing it would be useful to provide a framework/indicative list to guide information submission, suggesting risk management options before the appropriate evaluation seems inappropriate and might limit the scope of information submitted and subsequent analyses. Objection to such language.</p>	
Chemical name and introductory information	IPEN	Replace “Chemical” by “ Chemical/s Identity including any precursors/breakdown products listed in the nomination ”	Rejected. Final draft version reads “Chemical name (as used by the POPRC)”.
	USA	<p>Regarding Explanatory note 1: Is this intended to be an explanatory note? It does not seem needed as the item “Chemical name (as used by the POPRC)” seems pretty self-explanatory - - or necessarily appropriate (e.g., the last sentence suggests there is adequate info on the chemical and its properties. Adequate info on what – and what properties/ adequate for what purpose?)”</p> <p>Disagrees with IPEN’s suggestion [Note: Precursors or breakdown products don’t seem to fit under this section unless they are relevant to chemical’s name/ID]</p>	Accepted Final draft version reads “Chemical name (as used by the POPRC)”.

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
<p>(a) Efficacy and efficiency of possible control measures in meeting risk reduction goals</p>	<p>ICCA-WCC- CLI</p>	<p>This item could be further clarified, see explanatory notes 1 and 2.</p> <p>1. “Possible control measures” refers to Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention and includes measures to prohibit the production and use of chemicals listed in Annex A subject to the provisions of that Annex; measures to restrict the production and use of chemicals listed in Annex B subject to the provisions of that Annex. More than one control measure is possible for the same chemical substance. Consideration should be given to the full range of possible control measures including, pollution prevention options, restriction of a substance’s production or use for specified purposes, and elimination of the substance entirely.</p> <p>Later: In this explanatory note, insert “labelling, process control methods” after “Consideration should be given to the full range of possible control measures including,”</p> <p>2. We do not believe this is the proper description of risk reduction goals, we would suggest: “Risk reduction goals” refer to targets/goals to reduce levels in the environment/exposure of a substance such that the long-range environmental transport of a substance is unlikely to lead to significant adverse human health and/or environmental effects.</p> <p>Later: add “, such that global action is warranted” at the end of explanatory note 2.</p> <p>In item (a) (i) Technical feasibility, add “identification of critical uses” as an explanatory note</p> <p>Add an explanatory note (number 3): “3. Costs of implementing the control measure, including environmental and health costs.”</p> <p>Add an explanatory note (number 4): “4. If relevant, provide information related to the identification of critical uses for which there may be no suitable alternative or for which the analysis of socioeconomic factors justify the inclusion of an exemption when considering listing decisions under the Convention.”</p>	<p>All comments accepted, with further corrections suggested by others.</p>

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	IPEN	<p>In explanatory Note 1 delete phrase proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI: “Consideration should be given to the full range of possible control measures including, pollution prevention options, restriction of a substance’s production or use for specified purposes, and elimination of the substance entirely.”</p> <p>Regarding explanatory note “3. Where relevant and possible “costs” should be expressed in US dollars per year:” This comment is too limiting. For most countries, it is nearly impossible to cost in dollar terms, the impacts on the environment and health of particular management options.</p> <p>Edit explanatory note 2 this way: “Risk reduction goals” refer to targets/goals to reduce or eliminate releases from: intentional production and use; unintentional production; and stockpiles and wastes.”</p> <p>At the end of explanatory note 4 proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI, add: “Justify identification of critical uses by detailing the negative impacts on society that would result if no exemption was permitted.”</p>	<p>Reasons for most of the proposed changes are not provided. In Explanatory note 3, expressing costs in US dollars is not mandatory.</p> <p>Not accepted. No change.</p>
	EC	<p>See previous note [NB: One should consider whether POP RC, when agreeing on a Risk Profile, could already give indicative list of possible control measures for the chemical in question. This would facilitate the task of Parties and observers to give input to the analysis. Otherwise we need to ask the data provider to clearly explain what they consider as ‘possible control measures’;]</p>	<p>Acknowledged. No action taken.</p>
	USA	<p>In explanatory note 4, add: “ or otherwise potentially acceptable” after “If relevant, provide information related to the identification of critical”</p>	<p>Accepted, text modified accordingly</p>
(b) Alternatives (products and processes)	ICCA-WCC-CLI	<p>(iii) Efficacy This item could be further clarified, see explanatory note 3 3. The evaluation of the efficacy should include any information on the benefits and limitations of potential alternatives, as well as the identification of any critical uses for which there are no alternatives. The evaluation should be conducted on a life-cycle basis evaluating performance and impact over the entire life-cycle of any alternatives.</p> <p>(iv) Risk This item could be further clarified, see explanatory note 4 4. The evaluation of the risk of the alternative should include any information on whether the proposed alternative has been thoroughly tested/evaluated in order to avoid inadvertently increasing risks to human health and the environment. The evaluation should include any information on potential risks associated with untested alternatives and any increased risk over the life-cycle of the alternative – including manufacture, distribution, use, maintenance and disposal.</p>	<p>Accepted, text modified accordingly</p>
	Australia	<p>Suggests that informants be asked to say whether the alternative they are proposing has actually been implemented (and give details), whether it has only reached the trial stage (again, with details) or whether it is just a proposal that has not yet been reduced to practice.</p>	<p>Explanatory notes 1, 6, 7, and 8 seem to address this issue. (Open to discussion)</p>

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	IPEN	<p>(ii) Costs “for most countries, it would be very difficult to cost in dollar terms, the impacts on the environment and health of an alternative option”</p> <p>(iv) Risk “It would be difficult to assess ‘risk’ of an alternative in some cases not yet tried, perhaps an explanatory note explaining that information on projected impacts would also be useful”</p> <p>(v) Availability “It may be worth having an explanatory note requesting any comments / information on improving availability of alternatives”</p> <p>(vi) Accessibility “It may be worth having an explanatory note requesting any comments / information on improving availability of alternatives”</p> <p>Explanatory note 2: Add “(including non chemical alternatives),” after “...chemical under consideration”</p> <p>Explanatory note 3 should read: “3. The evaluation of the efficacy should include any information on the performance, benefits and limitations of potential alternatives. The evaluation should be focused on the principal uses of the product or process.”</p> <p>Explanatory note 4 should read: “4. The evaluation of the risk of the alternative product or process should include any toxicity information or potential risks in order to avoid inadvertently increasing risks to human health and the environment. For products, this may include risks resulting from manufacture, distribution, use, maintenance and disposal.”</p> <p>Delete explanatory note 5. “Regarding “risk”, if the alternative has not been tried or tested, information on projected impacts may also be useful.”</p>	<p>Expressing costs in US dollars is not mandatory. Not accepted.</p> <p>Comment regarding risk is accepted. (see explanatory note 6)</p> <p>Comments regarding availability and accessibility are accepted. (see explanatory note 8)</p> <p>Accepted, text modified accordingly</p> <p>No action taken (open to discussion)</p> <p>No action taken (open to discussion)</p> <p>Accepted, text modified accordingly</p>
<p>(c) Positive and/or negative impacts on society of implementing possible control measures</p>	EC	<p>“(v) Movement towards sustainable development” is a very general consideration; an example would help</p>	<p>Acknowledged (open to discussion)</p>
	Sweden	<p>In explanatory note 1, add “and benefits” after “...capital costs...”</p>	<p>Accepted. Text modified accordingly.</p>
	IPEN	<p>Explanatory note 1 should read: 1. Socio-economic considerations should include any information on the impact (if any) on local manufacturing and its effect on society, including the costs and positive impacts on society associated with transitioning to the alternatives.</p>	<p>Accepted, with further edits suggested by others. Text modified accordingly.</p>

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	ICCA-WCC-CLI	Add explanatory note 1 that should read: 1. Socio-economic considerations should include any information on the impact (if any) on local manufacturing, including the capital costs associated with transitioning to the alternatives” Later: Explanatory note 1 should read: 1. Socio-economic considerations should include any information on the impact (if any) on the local economy, including the manufacturing sector (e.g., capital costs associated with transitioning to the alternatives).	Accepted, with further edits suggested by others. Text modified accordingly.
	U.S.A.	In explanatory note 1, add “, among other things,” after “1. Socio-economic considerations should include”	Accepted. Text modified accordingly.
(e) Access to information and public education	IPEN	An explanatory note stating information on information access and public education for both the control measures and alternatives would be useful	Accepted. Text modified accordingly.
	EC	Again, very general consideration, an example would help	Acknowledged (open to discussion).
	U.S.A.	At the end of explanatory note fix the double dot.	Accepted. Text modified accordingly.
(f) Status of control and monitoring capacity	IPEN	An explanatory note stating information on monitoring capacity for the nominated chemical/s is what is required as it could be read information on monitoring capacity for alternatives is needed	Accepted. Text modified accordingly.
(g) Any national or regional control actions taken, including information on alternatives, and other relevant risk management information	ICCA-WCC-CLI	Add explanatory notes: 1. Actions or measures taken could include non-regulatory initiatives. 2. Information should include whether the control actions have been cost-effective and have had a measurable impact on reducing levels in the environment and contributed to achieving risk reduction goals.	Accepted, with further edits suggested by others. Text modified accordingly.
	EC	In the item title add adjective “ already ” before “ taken ” [This could actually be moved in the beginning.]	Addition accepted. Text modified accordingly. Moving the text is open to discussion.
	Sweden	In explanatory note 2 add “in providing the desired benefits” after “...have been cost-effective...”	Accepted. Text modified accordingly.

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	IPEN	<p>IPEN agrees with this comment. [EC: This could be moved to the beginning of the format]</p> <p>Explanatory note 1 should read: “1. Actions or measures taken could include prohibitions, phase-outs, restrictions, cleanup of contaminated sites, waste disposal, non-legally binding initiatives, etc.”</p> <p>Explanatory note 2 should read: “2. Information should include whether the control actions have reduced or eliminated releases from: intentional production and use; unintentional production; and/or stockpiles and wastes.</p>	<p>Moving the text is open to discussion.</p> <p>Edits to explanatory notes 1 and 2 are not accepted. No changes.</p>
<p>Other relevant information for the risk management evaluation:</p>	ICCA-WCC-CLI	<p>Add explanatory note 2:</p> <p>2. Any information relevant to whether certain risk management options/control measures are likely to distort competition and/or whether such options/measures are consistent with other international obligations – in particular commitments under the WTO such as the Technical Barriers to Trade and the Sanitary and Phytosanitary agreements</p>	<p>To be discussed</p>
	Sweden	Delete explanatory note 2 proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI	
	IPEN	<p>Delete explanatory note 2 proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI</p> <p>IPEN Note: The Stockholm Convention negotiations clearly established that there was no need for a savings clause in the Treaty.</p>	

Annex II

Comments and responses on the draft risk management evaluation outline, June 2006

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
General comments	EC	The main problem with the Annex F evaluation will be that without relevant and sufficiently comprehensive information from Parties / observers, POP RC will not be able to prepare a meaningful evaluation. This puts a lot of pressure on getting the data enquiry format right and easy to use. POP RC itself cannot prepare a comprehensive global socio-economic analysis, it can merely summarise the information and available analysis provided by Parties and stakeholders.	Acknowledged.
	ICCA-WCC	The risk management evaluation is a critical step in the review of candidate chemicals under the Stockholm Convention. Therefore, it is imperative that these documents provide clear guidance on the types of information to be submitted for the risk management evaluation and clear guidance for what information should be included in the actual risk management evaluation report. We offer the attached comments in an effort to help clarify some of the issues outlined in these documents and improve their overall usefulness.	Acknowledged.
Editorial	Several	Several parties made editorial comments, which are not listed in this table.	Text modified accordingly.
1. Introduction	IPEN	1.1 Add “for example its precursors/breakdown products” at the end of phrase in the second bullet 1.2 Agrees with idea of deleting “The Committee evaluated Annex D information (add reference to the meeting and the decision) and concluded that [...]” 1.3 Agrees with idea of deleting “in Annex D and Annex E screening” 1.5 Agrees with idea of deleting “including information on non-regulatory measure alternatives, and other relevant risk management information.”	1.1 Reject IPEN’s suggestion of adding “for example its precursors/breakdown products” at the end of phrase in the second bullet. 1.2 Delete first bullet [“The Committee evaluated Annex D information [...]”] Also, eliminate “In addition” at the beginning of the second bullet. 1.3 Delete “in Annex D and Annex E screenings”, at the end of the first bullet. Also, add “risk” before “management” in the third bullet. 1.5 Delete phrase “including information on non-regulatory measures, alternatives, and other relevant risk management information”
	Yemen	1.1 Agree with IPEN’s suggestion 1.2 Keep it as it is (Do not agree with EC’s suggestion below) 1.3 Delete “in Annex D and Annex E screenings”, at the end of the first bullet 1.5 Agree with EC’s and ICCA-WCC-CLI’s suggestions	
	EC	1.2 First bullet could be deleted as the Risk Profile is more important. Also, eliminate “In addition” at the beginning of the second bullet. 1.3 Delete “in Annex D and Annex E screenings”, at the end of the first bullet. Also, add “risk” before “management” in the third bullet. 1.5 Delete phrase “including information on non-regulatory measures, alternatives, and other relevant risk management information”	
	ICCA-WCC-CLI	1.1 Delete phrase “for example its precursors/breakdown products” proposed by IPEN, at the end of phrase in the second bullet. [Respectfully, this comment is inappropriate for Annex F. The chemical identity and proposed substances is determined by the original nomination of a substance and evaluation of a chemical under Annexes D and E of the Convention.] 1.5 Add adjective non-regulatory to measures	

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	U.S.A.	1.1 Disagrees with IPEN’s suggestion [Note: Precursors or breakdown products don’t seems to fit under this section unless they are relevant to chemical’s name/ID]	1.5 Delete “including information on non-regulatory measure alternatives, and other relevant risk management information.”
2. Summary information relevant to the risk management evaluation	EC	A main suggestion by EC is to reorganize the items under Section 2.	To be discussed
	Yemen	Agrees with EC’s request of reorganization of items under Section 2	
	IPEN	Agrees with EC’s request of reorganization of items under Section 2 In the Critical uses footnote: “This issue relates to the identification of critical uses for which there may be no suitable alternative or for which the analysis of socioeconomic factors justify maintaining as an exemption when considering listing decisions under the Convention,” justify identification of critical uses by detailing the negative impacts on society that would result if no exemption was permitted.	
2.1	ICCA-WCC- CLI	“identification of critical uses” should be added as a sub-bullet under either sections 2.1 or 2.3 of the draft risk management evaluation outline.	To be discussed. The proposed bullet is currently under section 2.2
	U.S.A.	Regarding “articles in use”, note that articles are exempted until they become wastes. To change this convention provision to require phase-out of articles would require a change to the convention. Regarding “contaminated sites”, the Convention includes requirements for managing contaminated sites and as for articles, requiring work beyond that in the convention would require a change in the convention. Note that contaminated sites are otherwise dealt with under Annex F.d (and section 2.5 below in this paper) which talks about “Waste and disposal implications” thus it is not clear that specific control measures for wastes and contaminated sites beyond Art 6 are contemplated under an Art 8 process. This is an important point that we should consider carefully	To be discussed

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
2.2	ICCA-WCC-CLI	In the second bullet (“Identification of critical uses”) and its corresponding footnote, delete the adjective “critical” In 2.2, third bullet, add “ of implementing possible control measures ” after costs In 2.2, in the fourth bullet, add: “, including benefits and limitations of alternatives versus nominated substance and identification of any critical uses for which there is no alternative, ” after Efficacy. Risk is explicitly listed in Annex F and should be included here. Therefore, add a fifth bullet that reads “ Risk, including information on whether the proposed alternative has been tested/evaluated and any information on potential risks associated with untested alternatives over the life-cycle of the alternative ”	Changes to be discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second bullet and corresponding footnote: “Identification of critical uses” to be edited or deleted, pending discussion Third bullet (Bullet regarding costs)
	Yemen	Supports ICCA-WCC-CLI’s suggestions	
	Sweden	Eliminate “Identification of critical uses” as proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI In the third bullet add (2 times) “and benefits” after “costs”	
	U.S.A.	In the second bullet add: “or otherwise potentially acceptable” before “uses”. In the corresponding footnote, add “or an acceptable purpose” before “when considering listing decisions under the Convention.”	
2.3	ICCA-WCC- CLI	“identification of critical uses” should be added as a sub-bullet under either sections 2.1 or 2.3 of the draft risk management evaluation outline.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Identification of critical uses” is to be discussed. The proposed bullet is currently under section 2.2 At the end of the bullet regarding “Efficacy”, the phrase “at present” has been added before “no alternative” Proposal by U.S.A. to be discussed
	Sweden	Eliminate “Identification of critical uses” as proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI At the end of the bullet regarding “Efficacy”, add “at present” before “no alternative”	
	Yemen	Agree with Sweden’s comment regarding 2.3 bullet fourth In the fifth bullet, ICCA-WCC-CLI’s comment that: “Risk is explicitly listed in Annex F and should be included here”. Would possibly support text as edited in the second draft.	
	U.S.A.	In the fifth bullet, add “known or potential” before “risks associated with alternatives over the life-cycle of the alternative.” Also, delete “untested” before “alternatives over the life-cycle of...” [Note: There is no reason to limit this to “untested” alternatives]	
2.4	EC	EC suggests to replace “Positive and/or negative” by “ Summary of information on ” Also, add a last bullet “ Other impacts ”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacing “Positive and/or negative” by “Summary of information on” is to be discussed Bullet “Other impacts” has been added
	Yemen	Agrees with EC’s suggestion to replace “Positive and/or negative” by “ Summary of information on ” Does not necessarily agree with Sweden’s suggestions regarding bullets fourth and sixth. Agrees with EC’s suggestion to add a last bullet “Other impacts”	
	Sweden	In the fourth bullet, add: “(including costs and benefits for producers and consumers and the distribution of costs and benefits)” after Economic aspects. In the sixth bullet, add: “(employment etc.)” after Social Costs.	

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	IPEN	Agrees with EC's suggestion to replace "Positive and/or negative" by " Summary of information on "	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes proposed by Sweden have been accepted, text modified accordingly.
	U.S.A.	Disagrees with EU and IPEN: "Hard to justify the EU's suggestion since the language comes right from the text of annex F."	
2.5	EC	EC suggests to delete all this item	To be discussed
	Yemen	Agrees with EC's suggestion	
	IPEN	Bullet regarding cost should be deleted	
	U.S.A.	Disagrees with IPEN [As "cost" is specifically identified in Annex F, it seems appropriate that it remain.]	
2.6	EC	EC suggests to add item 2.6 "Other considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to information and public education Status of control and monitoring capacity" 	Accepted. Text modified accordingly.
	Yemen	Agrees with EC's suggestion	
3. Synthesis of information	IPEN	Regarding footnote: " The previous formulation of this footnote is based too much on the risk assessment paradigm. To have reached this stage in the POP RC assessment process, it is acknowledged that the nominated chemicals cannot be addressed through the standard risk analysis, assessment and management process. To have reached this stage the nominated chemical is known to be transboundary, persistent, toxic and bioaccumulative. The impact on intergenerational equity cannot be dealt with through the widely diverse and differing forms of risk assessment. " Second bullet proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI is redundant and is not needed	All proposed changes to be discussed
	Sweden	In the second bullet add ", where possible," after "conclude. Also, at the end of that bullet, replace "likely to have a measurable impact on releases to the" by "provides benefits to human health and the"	

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	ICCA-WCC-CLI	<p>Regarding footnote: “The formulation of this footnote is based on the exact risk assessment paradigm included in the Convention. The IPEN interpretation would in effect read out of the Convention the risk assessment processes agreed to by the Parties. Furthermore consideration of risk is critical in evaluating what potential risk management options might be appropriate if governments and stakeholders are to focus their limited resources on priority issues and the most effective options.”</p> <p>Add a second bullet that reads: “The analysis of possible control measures should evaluate the full range of potential control measures and conclude whether the recommended strategy/strategies are consistent with other international obligations, cost-effective, market neutral, and likely to have a measurable impact on releases to the environment.”</p>	
	Yemen	Agrees with ICCA-WCC-CLI ‘s suggestion	
	EC	This is a possible way of structuring POP RC deliverables. However, it might be more feasible to keep the risk management evaluations and risk profiles separate and then to prepare a final POP RC recommendation for the COP (where the other documents should be attached). Open for discussion!	
	Canada	<p>Agrees with EC’s suggestions.</p> <p>“I would refer to Article 8.9 of the Convention:</p> <p>9. The Committee shall, based on the risk profile referred to in paragraph 6 and the risk management evaluation referred to in paragraph 7 (a) or paragraph 8, recommend whether the chemical should be considered by the Conference of the Parties for listing in Annexes A, B and/or C. The Conference of the Parties, taking due account of the recommendations of the Committee, including any scientific uncertainty, shall decide, in a precautionary manner, whether to list the chemical, and specify its related control measures, in Annexes A, B and/or C.</p> <p>As indicated, the Committee shall make its recommendation based on the risk profile AND the risk management evaluation. The ultimate Recommendation should not be part of the risk management evaluation, but should be a separate Decision recorded as such at a meeting of the Committee. I would therefore like to concur with the comments from the EC appearing in the Second Draft of the Outline (Sections 3 and 4), notably with regards to the need for further discussion of this issue.”</p>	
	U.S.A.	<p>Regarding footnote: [What does “recommendations for strategy implementation, supervision, and review” mean? The POPRC is not empowered to make such recommendations; this clearly goes beyond what Art 8 envisions]</p> <p>Supports suggestions made by EC</p> <p>Regarding the second bullet proposed by ICCA-WCC-CLI, the last phrase: “and likely to have a measurable impact on releases to the environment.” goes beyond what is called for under art 8</p>	
4 Concluding statement	EC	<p>In the first bullet suggests eliminating “/ is not” [Reason: Risk management evaluation is only done in case the outcome of the risk profile is clear; otherwise the procedure stops.]</p> <p>Text in the second bullet could be put in the final POP RC recommendation</p>	

Section	Party, Observer	Comments	Response
	Yemen	Agrees with EC's suggestions	To be discussed
	U.S.A.	Comments regarding EC's suggestion of deleting "/ is not" in the first bullet: "This is interesting – what does the committee transmit if it does not conclude "is likely" and the COP otherwise overrides that decision – does that mean de facto that the POPRC has concluded "is likely". I don't think so... The procedure does not necessary stop if the POPRC finds no likely effects associated w/ LRET. See Article 8 paras 8 and 9.	
	Canada	<p>Agrees with EC's suggestions.</p> <p>"I would refer to Article 8.9 of the Convention:</p> <p>9. The Committee shall, based on the risk profile referred to in paragraph 6 and the risk management evaluation referred to in paragraph 7 (a) or paragraph 8, recommend whether the chemical should be considered by the Conference of the Parties for listing in Annexes A, B and/or C. The Conference of the Parties, taking due account of the recommendations of the Committee, including any scientific uncertainty, shall decide, in a precautionary manner, whether to list the chemical, and specify its related control measures, in Annexes A, B and/or C.</p> <p>As indicated, the Committee shall make its recommendation based on the risk profile AND the risk management evaluation. The ultimate Recommendation should not be part of the risk management evaluation, but should be a separate Decision recorded as such at a meeting of the Committee. I would therefore like to concur with the comments from the EC appearing in the Second Draft of the Outline (Sections 3 and 4), notably with regards to the need for further discussion of this issue."</p>	
	IPEN	Agrees with EC on eliminating "/ is not" in the first bullet	