

OSPAR Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic

Meeting of the OSPAR Commission

Bergen: 20-24 September 2010

---

## Review of Applicability of Decisions, Recommendations and Other Agreements within the Framework of the OSPAR Convention

# Review of Applicability of Decisions, Recommendations and Other Agreements within the Framework of the OSPAR Convention

List of OSPAR Measures set aside as agreed by OSPAR 2010:

List of Decisions, Recommendations and Other Agreements that have been considered fulfilled or overtaken by measures adopted at national level or within other fora and therefore not followed by OSPAR anymore. As a consequence, while being set aside, they are retained as part of OSPAR's 'acquis'

## PART A: Decision/Recommendation

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
1.	OSCOM Recommendation 77/1 on the Disposal of Pipes, Metal Shavings and Other Material Resulting from Offshore Hydrocarbon Exploration and Exploitation Operations			Implementation report in 1989 showed that the provisions were introduced in Contracting Parties national regulations, but not information about effectiveness.	Overtaken by the ban on dumping of wastes and other matter under OSPAR Convention, Annex III.
2.	PARCOM Decision 80/2 on limit values for mercury emissions in water from existing and new brine recirculation plants (exit of the purification plant)			No reporting requirement, but effectiveness reporting in the annual chlor-alkali report.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
3.	PARCOM Decision 80/1 on environmental quality standard for mercury in organisms			No reporting requirement.	Overtaken by Directive 2000/60/EC (WFD) and subsequent guidance
4.	PARCOM Decision 81/1 on limit values for			No reporting	Overtaken by IPPC Directive and associated

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
	existing brine recirculation chlor-alkali plants (exit of the factory site)			requirement, but effectiveness reporting in the annual chlor-alkali report.	BREF.
5.	PARCOM Recommendation 81/1 on other land-based sources of mercury pollution (thermometers, batteries, dental fillers)			Not required.	Overtaken by Directive 2007/51/EC relating to restrictions on the marketing of certain measuring devices containing mercury and Directive 2006/66/EC on batteries and accumulators and waste batteries and accumulators.
6.	PARCOM Decision 81/2 on limit values for existing waste brine chlor-alkali plants			No reporting requirement, but effectiveness reporting in the annual chlor-alkali report.	Overtaken by IPPC Directive and associated BREF.
7.	PARCOM Recommendation 81/2 on the production, collection, regeneration and disposal of waste oils			Not required.	Covered by a suite of EC Directives regulating waste streams, including Directive 75/439/EEC on waste oils, Directive 87/101/EEC on incineration of waste oil, Directives 75/442 and 91/689/EEC on hazardous waste, Regulation (EEC) 259/93 on shipment of waste, Directive 96/59/EC on PCB containing waste, Directives 89/429/EEC, 89/369/EEC and 94/76 on incineration of waste, and Directive 2007/71/EC on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues.
8.	PARCOM Decision 82/1 on new chlor-alkali plants using mercury cells			No reporting requirement, but effectiveness reporting in the annual chlor-alkali	Overtaken by IPPC Directive and associated BREF.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
				report.	
9.	PARCOM Recommendation 82/1 on other land-based sources of mercury pollution			Not required.	Covered by Directive 76/769/EEC relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.
10.	PARCOM Recommendation 83/1 on reduction programmes for discharges from existing refineries			Not required.	Overtaken by PARCOM Recommendation 89/5 and IPPC/BREF.
11.	PARCOM Recommendation 84/2 for reducing cadmium pollution			Not required.	Brought forward in PARCOM Decision 85/2.
12.	PARCOM Recommendation 84/1 on pollution by titanium dioxide wastes			Not required.	Covered by IPPC and Directive 92/112/EEC on procedures for harmonizing the programmes for the reduction and eventual elimination of pollution caused by waste from the titanium dioxide industry
13.	PARCOM Decision 85/1: Programmes and measures on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by sectors other than the chlor-alkali industry			Article 4.1 requires assessment of the implementation of these programmes and measures every four years. No implementation report but effectiveness reporting in the annual chlor-alkali report.	Overtaken by various EC measures such as the EQS Directive 2008/105/EC, Dangerous substances Directive 2006/11/EC, WFD 2000/60/EC and the IPPC Directive 2008/1/EC
14.	PARCOM Decision 85/2: Programmes and measures on limit values and quality objectives for cadmium discharges			Article 31 requires assessment of the implementation of these programmes and measures every five years. No implementation report but effectiveness	Covered by various EC measures such as EQS Directive 2008/105/EC, Dangerous substances Directive 2006/11/EC, WFD 2000/60/EC and the IPPC Directive 2008/1/EC.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
				reporting in the cadmium background document.	
15.	PARCOM Recommendation 85/1 on limit values for mercury emissions in water from existing brine recirculation chlor-alkali plants (exit of factory site)			No reporting requirement, but effectiveness reporting in the annual chlor-alkali report.	Covered by the EQS Directive 2008/105/EC and the IPPC Directive 2008/1/EC.
16.	OSCOM Recommendation 86/1 Concerning the Control of the Execution of Dumping Operations at Sea			No implementation reporting requirements.	The provisions are mostly obsolete, apart from paragraphs 6.1 and 7, but paragraph 6.1 is covered by the dredged material guidelines (Nr 93). Paragraph 7 is covered in the dredged material guidelines and the fish waste guidelines (Nr 14) in a similar form of words.
17.	PARCOM Recommendation 87/1 on the use of tributyl-tin compounds			Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 253/2006). France, Iceland, Ireland and Luxembourg have not reported.	Overtaken by IMO AFS Convention; Marketing and use restriction EC Directives 89/677/EEC and 2002/62/EC; Regulation 782/2003; and EQS set under the EQS Directive 2008/105/EC.
18.	PARCOM Recommendation 89/3 on programmes and measures for reducing mercury discharges from various sources			Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 253/2006). No evidence from DK, IE, LU and PT.	Overtaken by various EC measures: IPPC, WEEE, RoHS, and Directive 76/769/EEC relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.
19.	PARCOM Recommendation 89/4 on a Coordinated Programme for the Reduction of Nutrients			Implementation reporting ceased (EUC 2008)	Overtaken by EC measures.
20.	PARCOM Recommendation 89/5		UK	Reporting ceased for all	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
	concerning refineries			Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2002 and 2004). No evidence from Portugal.	
21.	PARCOM Decision 90/2 on programmes and measures for mercury- and cadmium-containing batteries			Not required.	Overtaken by EC measures: Batteries Directive 2006/66/EC and Directive 76/769 relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations.
22.	PARCOM Recommendation 90/1 on the definition of the Best Available Technology for secondary iron and steel plants			Not required. HSC 2005 concluded that measure is fully implemented.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
23.	PARCOM Recommendation 91/2 on the definition of Best Available Technology in the primary iron and steel industry			Not required. HSC 2005 concluded that measure is fully implemented.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
24.	PARCOM Recommendation 91/3 on measures to be taken and investigations to be carried out in order to reduce pollution from secondary iron and steel production			Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (HSC 2005).	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
25.	PARCOM Recommendation 91/5 on the Disposal of Radioactive Wastes into Sub-Seabed Repositories Accessed from Land			No implementation reporting requirements.	Obsolete interpretation of the Paris Convention. OSPAR Convention covers this case as described in Article 1.e Radioactive Substances Strategy covers this case in Section 3, §.3.1.
26.	PARCOM Decision 92/1 on the reduction of discharges of chlorinated organic substances from the production of bleached kraft and sulphite pulp		Finland	Overview assessment in 1999. HSC 2005 concluded that reporting could be ceased for all Contracting Parties.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
27.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/1 on Best Available Technology for plants producing anodes and for new electrolysis installations in the primary aluminium industry	1		Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 347/2008) and OSPAR 10/7/3.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
28.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/2 concerning limitation of pollution from new primary iron and steel production installations			Not required. One-off reporting in 1996 cf. PRAM 96/4/20. OSPAR 2006 concluded to cease all reporting. No evidence from Portugal.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF on Production of Iron and Steel
29.	PARCOM Decision 92/3 on the phasing out of PCBs and hazardous PCB substitutes			Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 258/2006) No evidence from IE, LU, PT.	Covered by Directive 76/769/EEC relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations
30.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/3 concerning limitation of pollution from new secondary steel production and rolling mills			Not required. One-off reporting in 1996. cf. PRAM 96/4/18. OSPAR 2006 concluded to cease all reporting. No evidence FR, and DE.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF on Ferrous Metals Processing Industry
31.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/4 on the reduction of emissions from the electroplating industry			Overview assessment 259/2006. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (HSC 2008). No evidence from ES, IE.	Overtaken by the IPPC/BREF on Surface Treatment of Metals and Plastics
32.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/5 concerning Best Available Technology in the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry			Overview assessment updated in 2004. Reporting ceased for all	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF on Organic Fine Chemicals.

<sup>1</sup> Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
				Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from FR, LU, PT.	
33.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/7 on the Reduction of Nutrients Inputs from Agriculture into Areas where these Inputs are Likely, Directly or Indirectly, to Cause Pollution			Implementation reporting ceased.	Overtaken by EC measures.
34.	PARCOM Recommendation 92/8 on nonylphenol-ethoxylates			Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 260/2006) No evidence from LU.	Covered by Directive 2003/53/EC relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (nonylphenol, nonylphenol ethoxylate and cement.
35.	PARCOM Recommendation 93/1 concerning the limitation of pollution from existing primary iron and steel production installations		Belgium	Overview assessment in 2002. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from ES, LU and PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
36.	PARCOM Recommendation 93/4 on the phasing out of cationic detergents DTDMAC, DSDMAC and DHTDMAC in fabric softeners			Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 261/2006).	Overtaken by EC Regulation 648/2004.
37.	PARCOM Recommendation 93/5 Concerning Increases in Radioactive Discharges from Nuclear Reprocessing Plants		France, UK	No implementation reporting requirements.	Overtaken by OSPAR Decision 2000/1
38.	PARCOM Recommendation 94/1 on Best Available Techniques for new aluminium electrolysis plants	<sup>2</sup>		Reporting only required for commissioning of new plants. Reporting	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.

<sup>2</sup> Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
				ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006).	
39.	PARCOM Recommendation 94/2 on Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practice for the integrated and non-integrated sulphite paper pulp industry			Overview assessment 2005. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from FR and PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
40.	PARCOM Recommendation 94/3 on Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practice for the integrated and non-integrated kraft pulp industry			Overview assessment 2005. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from ES, FR and PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
41.	PARCOM Recommendation 94/4 on Best Available Techniques for the Organic Chemical Industry		UK	Overview assessment 2002, supplemented in 2004. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
42.	PARCOM Recommendation 94/5 on Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practice for wet processes in the textile processing industry		UK	Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties in 2005 (HSC 2005 and OSPAR 2006). No evidence from FR, PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF on Textiles Industry.
43.	PARCOM Recommendation 94/9 Concerning the Management of Spent Nuclear Fuel			Obligation carried out. Study has been done. Radiological impacts on spent nuclear fuel management options. A comparative study.	Obsolete since the study required on Radiological impacts of spent nuclear fuel management options has been done.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
				Nuclear Energy Agency of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2000.	
44.	PARCOM Decision 95/2 on discharges and emission limit values for the integrated and non-integrated sulphite paper pulp industry		Finland	Overview assessment 2005. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from FR and PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
45.	PARCOM Decision 95/3 on discharges and emission limit values for the integrated and non-integrated kraft pulp industry		Finland	Overview assessment 2005. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from ES and PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF
46.	PARCOM Decision 96/1 on the phasing-out of the use of hexachloroethane in the non-ferrous metal industry			Measure fully implemented (HSC 2005).	Covered by Directive 2002/45/EC amending Directive 76/769/EEC
47.	PARCOM Recommendation 96/1 on Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practice for existing aluminium electrolysis plants.	<sup>3</sup>	France	Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 347/2008) and OSPAR 10/7/3.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
48.	PARCOM Decision 96/2 on the phasing-out of processes using molecular chlorine (Cl <sub>2</sub> ) in the bleaching of kraft and sulphite pulp	<sup>4</sup>		Overview assessment 2005. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.

<sup>3</sup> Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1.

<sup>4</sup> Switzerland lifted its reservation in 2004. Spain lifted its reservation in 2005.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
49.	PARCOM Recommendation 96/2 concerning Best Available Techniques for the manufacture of vinyl chloride monomer			Reporting to cease for all CPs (see OSPAR 10/7/3)	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
50.	PARCOM Recommendation 96/3 concerning Best Available Techniques for the manufacture of suspension-PVC from vinyl chloride monomer			Reporting to cease for all CPs (see OSPAR 10/7/3)	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
51.	PARCOM Recommendation 97/1 concerning reference values for effluent discharges for wet processes in the textile processing industry			Overview assessment 2005. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties in 2005 (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from ES, FR and PT.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
52.	PARCOM Recommendation 97/2 on measures to be taken to limit emissions of heavy metals and persistent organic pollutants due to large combustion plants ( $\geq 50$ MWth)	<sup>5</sup>	Germany	Overview assessment 2002. Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 2006). No evidence from DK.	Covered by EC Directive 80/2001 on large combustion plants and IPPC directive (BREF).
53.	OSPAR Decision 98/4 on emission and discharge limit values for the manufacture of vinyl chloride monomer (VCM) including the manufacture of 1,2-dichloroethane (EDC).	<sup>6</sup>		Reporting to cease for all CPs (see OSPAR 10/7/3)	Covered by the IPPC/BREF for Large Volume Organic Chemical Industry, which includes EDC/VCM.
54.	OSPAR Decision 98/5 on emission and discharge limit values for the vinyl chloride sector, applying to the manufacture of suspension-PVC (s-PVC) from vinyl chloride monomer (VCM).	<sup>7</sup>		Reporting to cease for all CPs (see OSPAR 10/7/3).	Overtaken by the IPPC/BREF for Polymers, which includes PVC.

<sup>5</sup> Adopted on 10 March 1998 by written vote. OSPAR 1989 corrected a typographical error in this Recommendation (see OSPAR 98/14/1, §A-4.4)

<sup>6</sup> Amended by OSPAR Decision 2006/1 (on reporting formats for the vinyl chloride industry). Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2006/1.

<sup>7</sup> Amended by OSPAR Decision 2006/1 (on reporting formats for the vinyl chloride industry). Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2006/1.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
55.	OSPAR Recommendation 98/1 concerning Best Available Techniques and Best Environmental Practice for the primary non-ferrous metal industry (zinc, copper, lead and nickel works).	8		Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 348/2008).	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
56.	OSPAR Recommendation 98/2 on emission and discharge limit values for existing aluminium electrolysis plants	9	France	Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 347/2008) and OSPAR 10/7/3.	Covered by IPPC/BREF.
57.	OSPAR Recommendation 99/1 on the Best Available Techniques for the manufacture of emulsion PVC (e-PVC)	10		Reporting to cease for all CPs (see OSPAR 10/7/3).	Overtaken by the IPPC/BREF for Polymers, which includes PVC.
58.	OSPAR Recommendation 2000/3 on emission and discharge limit values for the manufacture of emulsion-PVC (e-PVC) from vinyl chloride monomer	11		Reporting to cease for all CPs (see OSPAR 10/7/3)	Overtaken by the IPPC/BREF for Polymers, which includes PVC.
59.	OSPAR Recommendation 2000/4 on a Harmonised Pre-Screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals (as amended)	12		Last implementation reporting on compliance in 2007. No report from Spain. The other relevant Contracting Parties comply with the measure. Effectiveness reporting continues.	To be replaced by OSPAR Recommendation 2010/X on a Harmonised Pre-Screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals
60.	OSPAR Recommendation 2000/5 on a	13		Last implementation	To be replaced by OSPAR Recommendation

<sup>8</sup> Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1.

<sup>9</sup> Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1.

<sup>10</sup> Amended by OSPAR Decision 2006/1 (on reporting formats for the vinyl chloride industry). Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2006/1.

<sup>11</sup> Amended by OSPAR Decision 2006/1 (on reporting formats for the vinyl chloride industry). Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2006/1.

<sup>12</sup> Amended by Recommendation 2008/1.

<sup>13</sup> Amended by Recommendation 2005/3 and Recommendation 2008/2.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
	Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF) (as amended)			reporting on compliance in 2007. No report from Spain. The other relevant Contracting Parties comply with the measure. Effectiveness reporting continues.	2010/X on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF)
61.	OSPAR Decision 2001/1 on the Review of Authorisations for Discharges or Releases of Radioactive Substances from Nuclear Reprocessing Activities	<sup>14</sup>		No requirement for implementation reporting.	Discharges authorisations have been reviewed.
62.	OSPAR Recommendation 2002/1 on discharge limit values for existing aluminium electrolysis plants.	<sup>15</sup>	France	Reporting ceased for all Contracting Parties (OSPAR 347/2008) and OSPAR 10/7/3.	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF.
63.	OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1 on reporting formats on the implementation and effectiveness of OSPAR measures relating to the non-ferrous metal industry			Not relevant.	All measures to which the Recommendation refers are Category 3 and reporting has ceased for all Contracting Parties.
64.	OSPAR Recommendation 2005/3 Amending OSPAR Recommendation 2000/5 on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format				To be replaced by OSPAR Recommendation 2010/X on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF)
65.	OSPAR Decision 2006/1 amending OSPAR Decisions 98/4 and 98/5 on the vinyl chloride sector			All CPs reported (see Dec. 98/4 and 98/5)	Overtaken by IPPC/BREF – see Dec. 98/4 and 98/5
66.	OSPAR Recommendation 2006/1 on Reporting Formats on OSPAR Measures				All measures to which the Recommendation refers are Category 3 and reporting has

<sup>14</sup> Adopted at OSPAR 2001 by three quarters majority. France, Switzerland and the UK abstained from voting.

<sup>15</sup> This Recommendation supersedes some sections of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1. Section on implementation reporting amended by the adoption of OSPAR Recommendation 2005/1.

Nr	Decision / Recommendation	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Implementation Reporting	Explanation
	relating to the Vinyl Chloride Industry				ceased for all Contracting Parties.
67.	OSPAR Recommendation 2008/1 amending OSPAR Recommendation 2000/4 on a Harmonised Pre-Screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals				To be replaced by OSPAR Recommendation 2010/X on a Harmonised Pre-Screening Scheme for Offshore Chemicals
68.	OSPAR Recommendation 2008/2 amending OSPAR Recommendation 2000/5 on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format				To be replaced by OSPAR Recommendation 2010/X on a Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF)

#### PART B: Other Agreements

Nr	Other Agreements	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Explanation
1.	1980-2 PARCOM binding guidelines for discharges from new refineries		Finland	Partly overtaken by PARCOM Recommendation 89/5. BAT outdated.
2.	1980-3 Adoption of a “standstill principle” for mercury concentrations in water			Overtaken by the OSPAR hazardous substances objective
3.	1984-2 Considerations Relevant to Selection and Monitoring of Dumping Grounds			Outdated; site selection is included in dredged material guidelines (Nr 93) and guidelines for fish waste (Nr. 14).
4.	1988-3 Interpretation of the Paris Convention - Repositories for radioactive wastes			Obsolete interpretation of the Paris Convention. Radioactive Substances Strategy covers this in Section 3, §.3.1.
5.	1989-4 Parameters (for monitoring)			Superseded by the CEMP agreement
6.	1990-2 Methods of Monitoring Dumping Grounds for Sewage Sludge			

Nr	Other Agreements	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance**	Explanation
7.	1997-15 Agreed Ecotoxicological Assessment Criteria for trace metals, PCBs, PAHs, TBT and some organochlorine pesticides			Superseded for the QSR 2010.
8.	1999-3 Format and procedures for reporting basis information on National Monitoring Programmes in the Maritime Area			Superseded by ASMO(2) 2009 to suspend the evaluation of implementation of the CEMP until guidance on its requirements is in place
9.	2001-3 Programme for the More Detailed Implementation of the OSPAR Strategy with regard to Radioactive Substances	16 17		In the current draft revised Radioactive Substances Strategy the “Bremen issues” are addressed.
10.	2002-5 OSPAR List of Substances/Compounds Liable to Cause Taint			Obsolete. By OSPAR Recommendation 2005/3 taint was deleted as a criterion to be addressed under OSPAR Recommendation 2000/5 when providing ecotoxicological information. Consequently, OSPAR Guidelines for Completing the HOCNF (2000-1) were amended to delete any reference to taint and the OSPAR List of Substances/Compounds Liable to Cause Taint.
11.	2003-2 Programme for the Establishment of Environmental Goals for			Obsolete because the action has been completed by Recommendations 2005/2 and 2006/3.

<sup>16</sup> Supersedes the previous Agreement 2000-11, which was revised so that the deadline of 31 December 2002 for the provision of the details of national plans set out in the Programme for the More Detailed Implementation of the OSPAR Strategy with regard to Radioactive Substances should be brought forward to 1 July 2002.

<sup>17</sup> At OSPAR 2001 France declared that it was able to meet the revised deadline for the submission of a national plan, but that it might need until 31 December 2002, to complete its full report as agreed at OSPAR 2000.

Nr	Other Agreements	Notes	Reservations/ Non-Acceptance **	Explanation
	Chemicals Discharged Offshore and the Implementation of such Goals			
12.	2003-22 Strategy for a Joint Assessment and Monitoring Programme			It will be replaced with new agreement
13.	2005-6 Agreed Background Reference Concentrations for Contaminants in Sea Water, Biota and Sediment			Superseded by Agreement 2009-2 although this agreement is not time limited
14.	2005-18 Baseline figures for Recommendation 2001/1			To be incorporated in the Overview Assessment of implementation reports on OSPAR Recommendation 2001/1.
15.	2006-2 Agreement on the production of the QSR 2010			It served its purpose by 2010
16.	2007-3 Guidance on the preparation of JAMP thematic assessments intended to contribute to the QSR 2010			It served its purpose by 2010
17.	2007-4 Editorial guidance for contributions to the QSR	<sup>18</sup>		It served its purpose by 2010
18.	2008-5 OSPAR Guidelines for Completing the Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (HOCNF).	<sup>19</sup>		To be replaced by OSPAR Guidelines for Completing the Harmonised Offshore Chemical Notification Format (Agreement 2010/X)

<sup>18</sup> Updated in 2008

<sup>19</sup> Replaces Agreement 2005-13.

\*\* The entry into force of the 1992 OSPAR Convention on 25 March 1998 required Contracting Parties which were not Contracting Parties to the former Oslo Convention (European Community, Luxembourg, Switzerland) and the former Paris Convention (Finland, Luxembourg, Switzerland) to indicate their position with respect to the Decisions, Recommendations and other agreements adopted under those Conventions, which continue to be applicable within the framework of the OSPAR Convention.

Finland, Luxembourg and Switzerland stated that their national legislation now contains more stringent provisions than those in some of the measures previously adopted under the former Paris Convention. For this reason, Finland considered it inappropriate now to accept measures which are, or have become, outdated by reference to its current legislation. Furthermore, Luxembourg is still in the process of examining whether or not it can accept certain Decisions and Recommendations adopted under the former Paris Convention. Until this examination is completed, Luxembourg has indicated, on a provisional basis, its non-acceptance of certain PARCOM Decisions and Recommendations.

Finland, Luxembourg and Switzerland also stated that these Contracting Parties could accept OSCOM, PARCOM and OSPAR measures related to sea-based activities. However, because Finland, Luxembourg and Switzerland do not border the maritime area, any OSCOM, PARCOM and OSPAR measures related to sea-based activities are not applicable for Finland, Luxembourg and Switzerland.