Statement from Dr. Khashashneh in contact group 3

We are also aligning ourselves with just the mention by our neighbors from Japan and we are stressing that the ambivalent should be simple and reflected the articles.

In the definition, we believe that it should be clear using international terms and languages and should also include new terms that doesn't exist in other instruments and in the international practices. In principles, we believe we are flexible on this, but maybe we can prioritize the principles and we can just share your principles. Plus, if we are adding new or specific principles, it is only related to waste, like prevention, proximity, professional and EPR. In the scope, also we believe that in this stage we can live with the language that was mentioned in the decision 5/14 and at least we can but only based on life cycle approach. Other details on this can come later because it is independent of the progress that we are achieving in another contact group. Thank you.