

TO: Rick Coronado, Sarah Miller, Jack Manno, Bruce Walker, Dick Kubiak, Paul Muldoon, Terry Yonker

FROM: John Jackson

DATE: 1 January 1992

RE: Canada's Pollution Prevention Programmes

At our last board meeting, you volunteered to form a committee to work with me in making decisions on Canada's pollution prevention initiatives. We now need to make two decisions:

- 1) Whether to accept the Federal Government's proposal on ARET, and
- 2) Whether to participate in Ontario's consultation on its Pollution Prevention Pledge Program.

I will ask the office to set up a conference call as soon as possible to decide on these two questions.

Accelerated Reduction and Elimination Of Toxics (ARET)

I have been attending meetings of this multi-stakeholder committee on behalf of GLU for the past year. Paul has also been attending as a representative of Pollution Probe. Industry and the federal government have been pushing to have this a purely voluntary programme. We have been stressing that a legislative framework for sunsetting and toxics use reduction must be part of this. The ARET meetings have been bogged down in the differences over whether only voluntary actions should be discussed at ARET.

In an effort to break the stalemate that has developed, the Federal Government is now proposing to set up a separate initiative to look at the legislative framework. The attached memo from H.A. Clarke details this proposal.

We must decide whether to accept this offer. If we do, we must then decide whether to participate in both initiatives.

Ontario's Pollution Prevention Pledge Program

Ontario has recently announced a program whereby companies will pledge to eliminate or reduce the production of pollutants. A one-page description of this programme is attached. They have asked me on behalf of GLU to attend three half-day consultations on this programme in January. I must admit that I do not have great interest in doing so. Paul and Rick have also been invited.

We must decide what our view of this programme is and whether someone from GLU should attend these consultations.

SENT BY: POLLUTION PREVENTION : 12-23-92 : 14:01 : Pollution Prevention

John Jackson: # 3



Environment
Canada

Environnement
Canada

Conservation and
Protection

Conservation et
Protection

Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0K3

DEC 23 1992

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

TO: ARET Stakeholders

Re: Federal Proposal for ARET

The purpose of this letter is to address concerns expressed by a number of stakeholders and to propose a course of action to advance the ARET agenda. First, let me restate my full commitment and support for the ARET process. I feel progress has been made, though perhaps not as much or as fast as many would like. It is time now, therefore, to take a fresh look at our approach and propose a revised course of action. It will be critical to have the continued commitment and involvement of all stakeholder groups at the ARET table if this consensus process is to be successful.

Several discussions have taken place on the matter of a legislative framework for pollution prevention. It is an area of high interest for a number of ARET Stakeholders and the energy already invested in defining such a framework is acknowledged. However, the successful realization of the ARET agenda will require our full attention and dedication. I offer, therefore, to strike a federal government-led Task Force, early in 1993, to build on the work already achieved by ARET. The representation on this new Task Force would be the subject of a discussion amongst ARET members and its purpose would be to flesh out the construct of a legislative framework for Pollution Prevention. I will guarantee that the work that would emerge from this group will be considered during our CEPA legislative review which was recently initiated. In order to provide broad input to this Task Force and to benefit from related initiatives, such as the development of the National Pollution Prevention Framework, I would suggest that the group operate under theegis of the Advisory Committee on Environmental Protection (ACEP).

Separating out the focus on the legislative framework task in this way will allow the ARET committee to continue to remain focused on the total of its original mandate. On that point, I recognise that the tools ARET can propose to expedite action on targetted substances and schedules are not limited to voluntary action and could indeed include regulatory initiatives should this be the consensus of the ARET members.

Canada

SENT BY: POLLUTION PREVENTION 112-23-82 14:02 Pollution Prevention

John Jackson# 5

- 3 -

On behalf of the stakeholders and Environment Canada, I want to express my sincere apologies to Mr. Philippe Guerrier who was preparing to host the January meeting in Montréal. I appreciate Philippe making the offer again for the meeting in February.

I wish each of you an enjoyable festive season and a successful and happy 1993.

Sincerely,



H.A. Clarke
Assistant Deputy Minister

SENT BY: POLLUTION PREVENTION ; 12-23-92 ; 14:02 ; Pollution Prevention

John Jackson# 4

- 2 -

Building on the above, I feel the time has come for the federal government to be more proactive in supporting the operation and deliberation of the ARET process. I therefore would like to propose the following measures.

First, more federal resources will be applied to ARET, allowing greater input to sub-committees and more stakeholder discussions between meetings to ensure smoother, more productive meeting sessions. In return, I expect that other stakeholders will also reaffirm their commitment and increase, where possible, their efforts to make this process work.

Second, we will augment preparatory work to ensure ARET makes solid decisions and substantial gains at the next and subsequent meetings. As part of the upcoming meeting preparation, stakeholders will be contacted by the facilitators, my staff and sub-committee members to discuss and finalize specific proposals with you on various ARET work plan items. These include: communications description pieces and draft plan, criteria dry run findings and issues, industry sector action plans on START recommendations, and a proposed process for developing ARET targets and schedules from the Decision-making sub-committee.

In view of the intervening holiday season and following discussions with several ARET members, and taking into account the need to conduct the liaison noted above, the Secretariat and facilitator recommend we postpone the January meeting. I agree with this assessment and therefore the next meeting is now scheduled for February 22 and 23, 1993. Sub-committee meetings will proceed during the January-February period and the agenda for our meeting will be discussed between the facilitators and the sub-committee chairs well in advance of the meeting.

The revised meeting dates were found to be the earliest dates possible for the majority of the committee. I apologize for any inconvenience this may cause. I believe, however, that the additional time spent on the important preparatory work will translate into improved output at our next meeting.

These ideas were discussed with several stakeholders and I have been encouraged to proceed in this direction. I hope all stakeholders will support this approach, which will be discussed at the next ARET meeting.



Pollution Prevention Pledge Program

P⁴ Program Concept

Progressive Levels of Participation

progressively builds

- p¹ Registration/Planning Level**
- Company registers intent to participate (files commitment within 1 year)
- p² Reduction Commitment Level**
- company commits to specific reductions, demonstrated progress in 2 years
- p³ Reduction Achievement Level**
- company achieves significant reductions (any means)
- p⁴ Pollution Prevention Achievement Level**
- company achieves significant reductions by pollution prevention measures

