

# Report to plenary on the initial assessment of reports on dumping permits issued in 2015 and 2016

(LC/SG 41/5/1 and LC/SG 41/5)

Presented on behalf of the  
Correspondence Group on Assessment  
of Dumping Reports (CGADR)

SCIENTIFIC GROUP OF THE LONDON  
CONVENTION – 41st Meeting; and

LC/SG 41/5/1  
9 March 2018  
ENGLISH ONLY

SCIENTIFIC GROUP OF THE LONDON  
PROTOCOL – 12th Meeting  
30 April – 4 May 2018  
Agenda item 5

#### REPORTING ON DUMPING ACTIVITIES

##### Final draft summary report on dumping permits issued in 2015

###### Note by the Secretariat

###### SUMMARY

*Executive summary:* This report has been compiled by the Secretariat on the basis of submissions received from Contracting Parties, directly or through regional bodies, and covers only permits issued in 2015, which are categorized in accordance with article 9 of the London Protocol.

*Action to be taken:* Paragraph 8

*Related documents:* LC/SG 40/5 and LC 39/16, paragraph 7.8.4.2

#### Introduction

1 The overview for the final draft summary report on dumping activities of Contracting Parties covering the year 2015 is attached in the annex. The permits in this report are categorized in accordance with article 9 of the London Protocol. Maps showing the locations of wastes dumped will be attached to the final version of this report, where they have been provided.

2 This report has been compiled by the Secretariat on the basis of submissions received from Contracting Parties, directly or through regional bodies responsible for implementing instruments related to dumping or incineration of wastes at sea.

3 The information, as submitted by several Contracting Parties, may not be complete since reporting through secretariats of regional conventions does not always include information covering sea areas outside that regional convention area.

4 The use in this document of particular designations of countries and territories does not imply any judgement by the Secretariat as to the legal status of such countries or territories, of their authorities and institutions or of the delimitation of their boundaries.

SCIENTIFIC GROUP OF THE LONDON  
CONVENTION – 41st Meeting; and

LC/SG 41/5  
9 March 2018  
ENGLISH ONLY

SCIENTIFIC GROUP OF THE LONDON  
PROTOCOL – 12th Meeting  
30 April – 4 May 2018  
Agenda item 5

#### REPORTING ON DUMPING ACTIVITIES

##### Preliminary overview of the number of dumping permits reported in 2016

###### Note by the Secretariat

###### SUMMARY

*Executive summary:* An overview is provided of the number of dumping permits which Contracting Parties reported to the Secretariat for the year 2016.

*Action to be taken:* Paragraph 5

*Related document:* LC 39/16, paragraph 7.8.4.2

#### Introduction

1 An overview is provided of the number of dumping permits which Contracting Parties reported to the Secretariat for the year 2016.

2 In 2016, **87** States were registered as Contracting Parties to the London Convention and **48** States were registered as Contracting Parties to the London Protocol. To date, 21 Contracting Parties have provided a report on their dumping activities for that year.

3 Out of the 21 reporting Parties, six are Party only to the Convention, and 11 are Party to the Protocol (either only the Protocol or both the Convention and Protocol). This is equivalent to a reporting rate of 7% for the Convention only Parties, and 23% for the Protocol Parties.

4 Contracting Parties that have not yet reported on dumping activities carried out in 2016, are requested to do so, **as soon as possible**.

#### Action requested of the Scientific Groups

5 The Scientific Groups are invited to take note of the information provided and to comment, as they deem appropriate.

\*\*\*

# Are low reporting rates a 'Convention problem'?

## From: Final draft summary report on dumping permits issued in 2015 (LC/SG 41/5/1)

6. Out of the 35 reporting Parties, ten are Party only to the Convention, and 25 are Party to the Protocol (either only the Protocol or both the Convention and Protocol). This is equivalent to a reporting rate of 11% for the Convention only Parties, and 54% for the Protocol Parties.

## From: Preliminary overview of the number of dumping permits reported in 2016 (LC/SG 41/5)

3. Out of the 21 reporting Parties, six are Party only to the Convention, and 11 are Party to the Protocol (either only the Protocol or both the Convention and Protocol). This is equivalent to a reporting rate of 7% for the Convention only Parties, and 23% for the Protocol Parties.

# Summary of parties reporting: comparison of 2015 & 2016

Status	Parties to LC only	
	No. parties	No. reporting
2015	52	10 (19.2%)
2016	50	11 (22%)
Status	Parties to both LC & LP	
	No. parties	No. reporting
2015	35	23 (65.7%)
2016	37	9 (24.3%)
Status	Parties to LP only	
	No. parties	No. reporting
2015	11	2 (18.2%)
2016	11	1 (9.1%)

## Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: some observations and questions

- 2015 was the final year in which Korea permitted the dumping at sea of sewage sludge and in which Japan permitted dumping of bauxite residue (as inert material)
- Quantities dumped had declined from 2014 values in both cases, as expected
- Both of these former dumping activities should therefore be absent from the dumping reports for 2016 onwards

## Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: some observations and questions

- Australia reports 6 permits for total 835 m<sup>3</sup> sewage sludge in 2015, down from 7 permits for total 3 009 m<sup>3</sup> in 2014 – is this evidence for a downward trend?
- Australia also reports permitting of 391 000 litres sewage sludge disposal in to the Coral Sea for 2015, identical to the amount permitted for 2014 – is this correct?

## Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: some observations and questions

- New Zealand also reports permit for dumping of sewage sludge in 2015, for 52 650 t. This is lower than the value permitted in 2014, of 8 760 000 t for sewage and wastewater.
  - Is this also evidence of a downward trend?
  - Is it coincidence that the quantity of sewage sludge permitted for 2015 is identical to the tonnage for the vessel permit in the next row of the table, or is this an error?

## Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: some observations and questions

- UK issued 2 permits for the disposal of a total of 2 120 t of organic material in 2015, which was identical to the amount permitted in 2014.
  - Is that correct?
  - Can the nature of that organic material be stated?
- South Africa issued two permits for disposal of vessels in 2015, one of which led to disposal – can any information be given on the size of the vessel?



## Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: some observations and questions

- Costa Rica reported a permit issued for disposal of 2 197 159 t of mining waste in the Caribbean region.
  - Can more details be provided as to what that material was and whether this is a one off or ongoing activity?
  - Is it appropriate to list this material under organic material of natural origin?

## Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: some observations and questions

- Canada issued 7 permits for disposal of inert material in 2015, for a total of 357 348 t – could more details be provided on the nature of that material?
- The Marshall Islands reported a permit for disposal of 52 Mt of a spoilt cargo of sodium hydroxide and styrene monomer in the mid North Atlantic in 2015 – could more information be provided on the permitting decision and impact assessment/monitoring?

# Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: conclusions

- Low reporting rates continue to limit overall assessment of trends in types and quantities of materials dumped at sea
- Assessment is necessarily retrospective, but could be more efficient and effective if a little more information could be provided by Parties and/or incorporated into summary reports from the outset (to anticipate questions on the nature of material) – could this be done for 2016...?

# Final draft summary on permits issued in 2015: conclusions

- Assessment of trends and developments might also be facilitated if permits issued for dredged material and for wastes other than dredged material could be presented separately - this could enable greater focus on, and scrutiny of, the nature of those other wastes and trends in their quantities dumped
- NIL reports could be part of a success story rather than being an unnecessary burden and should be encouraged