**Meeting of the Small Intersessional Working Group on on POP wastes technical guidelines (teleconference)**

Date: 27th of February 2018
Time: 14:00h to 16h (Geneva Time)

For the list of attendees, please see Annex I of this document.

Agenda and summary of the discussion:

As a basis for the discussion, the consultant who is working on the current version of the General technical guidelines has prepared a document showing the main comments provided by Parties and other stakeholders (based on the version of the guidelines sent to the SIWG on 15/Dec/2017), especially on low POP content values and on destruction technologies.

1. **Discussion on low POP content values (LPC)**
* The group discussed the need to have values on Table 2 of the General technical guidelines for the most recent POPs listed under the Stockholm convention.
* Different points of view were presented.
* The European Commission has commissioned a new study which will include information related to LPC. The study is expected to be finalized by the end of 2018. Based on the study, values for LPC could then be proposed by the European Union and its Member States.
* One participant recalled the need to revise the LPC for dioxins and furans, as it was discussed during the face-to-face meeting of this SIWG in Bonn in 2017, and during COP-13, also based on the needs expressed by African countries in those occasions.
* There were further discussions on the reasons why values presented in the European Regulation on Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) are not used, for example, in the guidelines. In this context, it was mentioned that, so far, no Party has proposed any concrete value for decaBDE, and that the REACH regulation has other objectives in what concerns LPC values than those included in the guidelines.
* The group briefly discussed the application of LPC on products and wastes, and participants made reference to Article 6 of the Stockholm Convention where the requirements are defined for waste.
* The group discussed the issue of separation of plastics containing brominated flame retardants (BFR), in the area of recycling. It was mentioned that separation is handled differently depending on the complexity of the waste stream/type. For example, end-of-life vehicles (ELVs) are considered to be a complex waste type to manage, which may contain BFR. In this case, because of the complexity of the waste type, the separation of plastic containing POPs from the POPs free plastic may need to happen after shredding. The conclusion was that separation is necessary before or after shredding, in any case, not to allow recycling plastic to be contaminated with POPs above the LPC.
* Some participants expressed the view that the regulations sometimes are not easy to interpret and that industries are having difficulties in knowing exactly what they are supposed to follow/do. The group discussed that some difficulties raised by different stakeholders are related to the implementation of the regulations, which is not the scope of the work of the SIWG.
* The group decided that in the next version of the General technical guidelines two options in Table 2 should be proposed: decaBDE in a separate line and decaBDE in the line together with the other POP-BDEs.
1. **Discussion on destruction technologies**
* The group discussed the comments from different stakeholders to amend, delete and to add new technologies to the guidelines. Some arguments were presented in favour of deleting Advanced Solid Waste Incineration. The same happened on the suggestion to delete the method on Thermal and metallurgical production of metals, and on the suggestion to add a new method on Catalytic dechlorination using copper catalysis.
* In general, the group felt that more time is required to assess the comments and documents provided by the different stakeholders in order to make sound decisions in these areas.
* The group mentioned that the consultant working on these guidelines could try to advance some analysis of what was provided by the members of the group, but that the number of documents provided requires more time to be analysed.
* Also members of the group could help in the process by sharing more recent papers (i.e. from 2016 onwards) and sound references (i.e. published studies, journal and conference papers, etc.) on this area.
* The group decided that no addition of a new method and no deletion of old methods should take place in this round of revision and agreed that more time is necessary to assess information available on each technology.
* The group discussed the issue of language such as “very low” or “very small” in the items on “emissions of residues” on different technologies. The group agreed that this expression should be removed/changed, when possible.
* The group discussed whether a specific technology could be considered ESM if no information is available about UPOPs emissions. The conclusion was that linkages to UPOPs regulatory levels are not covered in the technical guidelines. Therefore UPOPs emission is not a criterion to define the ESM characteristic of a technology.
* The group discussed whether DE and DRE are still valid criteria to assess destruction technologies. Participants mentioned that this is a recurrent item for discussion in this group. The conclusion was that these are not the only criteria for assessing the validity of the destruction technologies. Section B of the General technical guidelines “*B. Levels of destruction and irreversible transformation*” provide more details on the use of DE and DRE and their relation to the destruction technologies listed in the guidelines. Another paragraph of the guidelines explain the current views on these concepts (paragraph 156 of the current version of the guidelines and/or the version adopted at COP-13 - UNEP/CHW.13/6/Add.1/Rev.1). The concepts of DE and DRE are to be used as benchmark, but not as criteria for the validity of specific destruction technologies listed in the guidelines.
* The group discussed also that the current version of the guidelines includes technologies that were approved by the group before, and the list reflects the consensus achieved, based on information available at the time.
* It was agreed that for new technologies a separate document with information for consideration of the group could be created, before the group reaches consensus to include the required details in the guidelines (similar to what happened in the previous round – between 2015 and 2017 – for the CreaSolv techniques).
* One participant raised the awareness of the group that some discussion and analysis should take place in relation to brominated POPs in the areas of DE and DRE, since the group only discussed, in the past, these concepts when applied to chlorinated POPs.
* The group discussed the issue of references in the guidelines, especially when the reference is not yet published.
1. **Other matters**
* The group discussed the needs of sharing information and documents on the Basel Convention website, and decided that draft versions of the guidelines (e.g. revision of December 2017, March 2018, etc.), as well as comments provided in each round of revisions, should be made available on the website. Meeting notes should also be made available on the Basel Convention website.
* Additionally, the Secretariat should continue to share information, when possible, via email, and also make use of the Cloud Server to serve as an extra means of sharing information/documents among members of the group.
* The representative of the Secretariat mentioned that the next revised versions of the guidelines, with a deadline of 1 March 2018, would possibly be a bit delayed due to the workload required in the revisions.
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