

**North American Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR)
Project (P.3.3.1.02.02)**

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

**The Development of a Comparative Report Analyzing Publicly
Available 2002 North American Pollutant Release and Transfer Data
(*Taking Stock 2002*)**

(original: English)



Commission for Environmental Cooperation of North America

July 2003

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms.....	iv
I. Overview of the North American PRTR Project	1
A. Objectives.....	1
B. Background	1
C. Rationale	2
D. Progress to Date	3
II. Request for Proposals.....	4
A. Mandatory Requirements	4
1. In-Country Ability.....	4
2. Qualified and Competent Key Personnel	4
3. Proposal Submittal	4
B. Other Information to be Provided	5
C. Type of Contract to be Used for These Services	5
D. Selection Procedure to be Used	5
E. Estimated Level of Resources Required	6
F. Basis of Payment Required	6
G. Financial and Other Confidential Information.....	6
H. Deadlines for Proposal Submission and Decision	7
III. Terms of reference	9
A. Description of Project	9
B. Description of Services.....	9
1. Overview of activities and tasks	9
2. Description of the <i>Taking Stock 2002</i> Report.....	11
3. Timing of the Activity and Outputs Required	13
C. Reporting Requirements	14
Annex: Contacts	16

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
CEC	Commission for Environmental Cooperation
COA	<i>Cedula de Operación Anual</i> (Annual Certificate of Operation)
EPA	US Environmental Protection Agency
INE	<i>Instituto Nacional de Ecología</i> (National Institute of Ecology)
NGO	Nongovernmental organization
NPRI	National Pollutant Release Inventory (PRTR for Canada)
PRTR	Pollutant Release and Transfer Register
RETC	<i>Registro de Emisiones y Transferencia de Contaminantes</i> (PRTR for Mexico)
RFP	Request for Proposal
TRI	Toxics Release Inventory (PRTR for US)
US	United States

I. Overview of the North American PRTR Project

A. Objectives

The CEC's North American Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) project was initiated in 1995. The primary aim of the project is to promote public access to information on pollutant releases and transfers in North America in order to:

- enhance understanding of sources and handling of toxic substances,
- promote the use of PRTRs by citizens, communities, industry, government and other interested parties,
- provide an informed basis for stakeholder dialogue and priority-setting, and
- foster pollution reduction efforts.

The publication of the annual *Taking Stock* report on North American pollutant releases and transfers is the cornerstone of the project.

Other objectives of the North American PRTR project are to:

- to facilitate access/use of PRTR data through development of a North American PRTR web site;
- gain further insight into pollution-related issues of particular interest in North America by undertaking special analyses of PRTR data and other relevant information;
- enhance comparability among the North American PRTR systems;
- provide support for the further development of the PRTR program in Mexico; and
- facilitate coordination of North American PRTR-related activities with similar international activities.

B. Background

At the Fourth Annual Regular Session of the CEC in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (June 1997), the Ministers adopted Council Resolution 97-04, "Promoting Comparability of Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs)." This resolution commits the three governments to produce annually a report on North American pollutant releases and transfers, to work toward adopting more comparable PRTRs, to collaborate on the development of an Internet site to present a matched subset of data from the three North American PRTRs, and to promote regional cooperation to enhance North American PRTRs and improve the usefulness of the information by allowing better comparison and use of the data.

At the Sixth Annual Regular Session of the CEC in Banff (June 1999), the Council reaffirmed "its commitment to assure that the peoples of North America have access to accurate information about the release and transfer of toxic chemicals from specific facilities into and through their communities. The Council supports the continued development and improvement of the North American PRTR system, with a goal of mandatory reporting for all nations."

In June 2000, at its Seventh Annual Regular Session in Dallas, Texas, the CEC Council issued Resolution 00-07 on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers. In this Resolution, the Council recognized a set of basic elements that are central to the effectiveness of PRTR systems;

reaffirmed its commitment to publish an annual report on pollutant releases and transfers in North America; and agreed to continue their individual and collective efforts to promote PRTRs—including public access to and use of PRTR data—domestically, regionally and internationally.

In June 2002, the Council passed Resolution 02-05, through which it adopted the Action Plan to Enhance Comparability Among PRTRs in North America. Council also recognized the progress that has been achieved through cooperation among the three national PRTR programs in North America, and noted the important step taken by Mexico in passing enabling legislation for a mandatory and publicly accessible PRTR system.

In 2002, Canada's NPRI included information on criteria air contaminants adding a new dimension to the registry.

C. Rationale

PRTRs, like the Canadian National Pollutant Release Inventory (NPRI), the US Toxics Release Inventory (TRI), and the evolving Mexican *Registro de Emisiones y Transferencia de Contaminantes* (RETC), provide data on the types, locations, and amounts of substances of concern released on-site and transferred off-site by industrial facilities. Many corporations also use the data to report to the public on their environmental performance. By tracking data on substances of concern and making that information available, PRTRs serve to: increase public and industry understanding of the types and quantities of hazardous chemicals released into the environment and transferred off-site for further management; encourage industry to prevent pollution, decrease releases and transfers and assume responsibility for chemical use; and assist government in identifying priorities and tracking progress.

Concerns may arise about chemicals in any environmental medium. In addition, releases to one environmental medium may be transported to others. Volatile chemicals in water releases, for example, may vaporize into the air. Therefore, the reporting of chemical releases and transfers to all environmental media is important.

Many of the benefits of a PRTR stem from the public disclosure of its data. Active dissemination is important, as it encourages public participation.

The utility of PRTRs has been recognized by other international organizations. Chapter 19 of Agenda 21 states that governments and relevant international organizations with the cooperation of industry should “improve databases and information systems on toxic chemicals” and that “the broadest possible awareness of chemical risks is a prerequisite for achieving chemical safety.” In 1996, the Council of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) recommended that “[member] countries should consider sharing periodically the results of the implementation of such systems among themselves and with non-member countries with particular emphasis upon sharing of data from border areas among relevant neighboring countries,” and that member countries, in establishing PRTR systems, should take into account the set of principles contained in the Annex to the OECD Recommendation, including that “PRTR systems should allow as far as possible comparison and cooperation with other national PRTR systems and possible harmonization with similar international databases.” The Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) has also focused on the topic of PRTRs, including a special session on PRTRs in October 2000. In addition, a working group on PRTRs has been recently formed in the context of the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to

Justice in Environmental Matters.

D. Progress to Date

In November 1996, the CEC published a report entitled *Putting the Pieces Together*, which provided an overview of the status and compatibility of the pollutant release and transfer register programs in Canada, the United States of America, and Mexico, so that appropriate and effective data comparisons can be made. In July 1997, the CEC produced the first annual report on pollutant releases and transfers, entitled *Taking Stock: North American Pollutant Releases and Transfers - 1994*. That report analyzed the 1994 publicly available PRTR data reported to Canada and the United States, and profiled the pilot project in Mexico. It assisted in leading the way for other countries to share and compare their data. It was the first time that subsets of the full national databases were compared and analyzed, and it spotlighted the national PRTRs. Some of the important differences between the NPRI and the TRI—differences that were of interest to the national governments—were highlighted.

The second annual report on pollutant releases and transfers, entitled *Taking Stock: North American Pollutant Releases and Transfers - 1995* was published October 1998; the third such report, *Taking Stock: North American Pollutant Releases and Transfer - 1996* was published in August 1999, the fourth report, presenting 1997 data, was published in May 2000, the fifth report, presenting 1998 data and 1995–98 data trends, was published in July 2001, and the sixth presenting 1999 data and 1995–99 data trends in May 2002. The most recent *Taking Stock* report, based on 2000 data and presenting six-year trends from 1995–2000, was published in April 2003. Since the 1998 report, *Taking Stock* has featured a new two-volume format, as well as an updated methodology for presenting and analyzing the data. Further information on these and other improvements to the report can be found in the report (available on the CEC web site <www.cec.org> or in hard copy upon request). In developing these reports, the CEC used an extensive consultative review process, including public meetings of the multi-stakeholder Consultative Group and the preparation of Response to Comments documents.

In July 2001, the CEC launched a trilingual Internet site that provides users with flexible access to the matched set of North American PRTR data that is used in the *Taking Stock* reports. The web site serves as a complement to the hard copy reports.

Through the PRTR project, the CEC has provided support for the development of the Mexican RETC program. In December 2001, the government of Mexico passed legislation that calls for a mandatory and publicly accessible PRTR systems at the federal, state and municipal levels. Regulations are currently being developed to implement this new system.

The CEC has also sponsored efforts aimed at improving access to and understanding of PRTR information, including work with community groups and other interested parties. In 2001, an Ad Hoc PRTR Group was formed under the auspices of the Consultative Group to look at innovative uses and ways of promoting access to and understanding of PRTR data. The group has published a brochure on the benefits of PRTR reporting, and is working on its second project.

In the fall of 2003, a special feature on Toxic Chemicals and Children's Health in North America will be released.

II. Request for Proposals

A. Mandatory Requirements

To be eligible for further consideration, all consultants must fulfill the following basic requirements.

1. In-Country Ability

The consultant must be able to work within all three North American countries. A consortium with other consultants may be formed to fulfill this requirement. For the purposes of this RFP, the term "consultant" will refer to either a consortium or a single consultant.

If a proposal is submitted by a consortium of consultants, a "lead" consultant should be designated to take responsibility for ensuring the cohesiveness of activity outputs, the overall coordination of the consortium, and the integration of information and ideas.

2. Qualified and Competent Key Personnel

Key support personnel must be qualified, competent and experienced in the subject area. The consultant must demonstrate that they have knowledge of Canadian / US / Mexican PRTRs. The CEC is interested in an *analytical*, not just descriptive, study. Prospective consultants must be able to compare and contrast materials generated in all three North American countries as appropriate. References must be supplied upon request.

3. Proposal Submittal

It is the intention of the CEC to include the **Terms of Reference** that appear as **Section III** of this document in the contract negotiated with the successful Consultant. Therefore, prospective consultants should refer to the Terms of Reference for more detailed information on the project and the services to be provided. Prospective consultants are requested not to reiterate the Terms of Reference in their submissions, but are invited to suggest modifications.

The submittal should include the following:

- A brief, analytical discussion paper of current PRTR issues in North America, especially focusing on suggestions for new analyses (for example the opportunities provided by the inclusion of criteria air contaminants in the NPRI), special feature topics and/or approaches to the presentation of information in the annual *Taking Stock* report series, including opportunities and barriers for implementing those suggestions. The paper, not to exceed six pages, should be based upon and serve to demonstrate the consultant's experience and subject knowledge. The discussion paper should address desired results; guidelines (parameters within which results are to be accomplished); resources (human, financial, technical, or organizational support available to help accomplish the results); and other aspects deemed applicable by the consultant. The purpose of this discussion is to demonstrate not only the consultant's familiarity with the area, but also to highlight writing skills. This document will be evaluated by the Evaluation Committee and will serve as the basis for contract award;
- Any suggested modifications to the Terms of Reference and Schedule noted below, and the reasons for such modifications;
- Resumes of the Key Personnel who would be involved in the project;
- Detailed cost breakdown, including labor hours of Key Personnel and other personnel, direct and indirect costs, travel costs and applicable taxes; and
- Description of relevant experience and any other relevant information.

B. Other Information to be Provided

Potential consultants are encouraged to submit any additional information that they believe will assist the CEC Secretariat in the evaluation of their proposal. However, the proposal should not exceed 15 pages. (This 15-page limit does not include CVs of individuals or corporate brochures.)

C. Type of Contract to be Used for These Services

The CEC Secretariat intends to use its standard time-based contract for these services. A sample is available upon request. If the contract is negotiated with a consortium, the CEC will offer the consultants the option to have separate contracts between each consultant and the CEC.

Pursuant to Council Resolution 98-10 "Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) Budget," all work within the contract must be completed by the end of February 2005.

D. Selection Procedure to be Used

The Consultant will be selected in accordance with the *CEC Consultant Services Procurement Manual (Provisional, October 1996)*, Section 2.3: Basis of Selecting Consultants. The CEC Secretariat has determined that the approach entitled "Competitive" is applicable to this activity, which is defined as:

The "standard" CEC approach to be used for contracts expected to cost no more than US\$100,000 for professional fees plus 25% for total expenses, used when there are no significant time pressures to undertake the work, and for when there is reason to believe that there are a number of suitably qualified consultants available to conduct the work.

Proposals that the CEC Secretariat determines to be complete will be evaluated according to the procedure described here. Prospective consultants who submit proposals determined by the CEC Secretariat to be incomplete (non-responsive) will be so notified in writing. Incomplete proposals will not receive further consideration.

Each complete proposal that is submitted will be evaluated by the CEC Secretariat according to the following criteria, with a point rating assigned for each:

Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Point Rating
Understanding of project requirements	20
Suitability and innovation in approach and adequacy of workplan	20
Consultant's experience in subject	20
Qualifications and competence of Key Personnel	20
Consultant's ability to analytically approach subject, and writing ability	20
<i>Total</i>	100

A minimum score of 80 will be required for the prospective consultant's proposal to be eligible for further consideration. Prospective consultants whose proposals score less than 80 will be so notified in writing, together with the reasons for the score.

The proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the *CEC Consultant Services Procurement Manual*, Appendix B—"Proposal Evaluation Criteria and Consultant Selection Process: Guidelines and Standard Evaluation Format" available through the CEC web site <www.cec.org>. A summary of the process is given below.

An Evaluation Committee will be selected by the CEC Project Manager. Each member of the Evaluation Committee shall receive a copy of the proposals and will be asked to rate each proposal using the evaluation criteria and maximum point ratings given above.

The CEC Project Manager will arrange for a conference call/meeting among the members of the Evaluation Committee to discuss the ratings, arrive at final scores, and, subsequently, a ranking of all proposals. The strengths and weaknesses of each proposal, in terms of the evaluation criteria, will be noted and summarized. Feedback will be provided to each prospective consultant once the selection has been made. The prospective consultant's ranking will be provided to them if requested, however, neither the evaluations nor the scores of other bidders will be provided.

E. Estimated Level of Resources Required

The maximum budget for this activity is US\$95,000.00 for professional fees, plus not more than 25% for total expenses.

The CEC Secretariat will prepare a contract utilizing 2003 funds in the amount of approximately US\$40,000. Once the CEC 2004 project budget is approved, the CEC Secretariat will prepare a contract for the remaining amount. To facilitate the contracting process, the consultant should divide the proposed budget breakdown into two phases: one for activities from September-December 2003, and the second for activities from January-December 2004.

The Consultant may prepare the estimate in either C\$, P\$ or US\$. If a currency other than US\$ is used, the Consultant should indicate the total cost of the professional services in US\$ as well as the currency of choice, for comparison purposes.

F. Basis of Payment Required

Payment shall be made only for *bona fide* consultant fees and legitimate expenses incurred in accordance with the contract for professional services, and only upon receipt and documented acceptance by the Secretariat of statement(s) of account/invoice(s) from the Consultant. Settlement of invoices that are acceptable for payment will normally be made 30 days from the date of receipt by the Commission.

G. Financial and Other Confidential Information

For this proposal, the CEC Secretariat will not require the submission of any confidential information nor will the CEC Secretariat require information regarding insurance, financial status, or company ownership.

H. Deadlines for Proposal Submission and Decision

The proposal, including all relevant attachments, must be received by the CEC Secretariat offices by **17:00 on 22 August 2003**. Proposals submitted after this deadline will not be considered.

The CEC Secretariat intends to select the Consultant within five (5) working days following the date of proposal submission.

Five copies of the proposal should be sent by **overnight courier** to:

Lorraine Brooke
Acting Program Manager
Commission for Environmental Cooperation
393, rue St-Jacques Ouest Bureau 200
Montreal, QC
Canada H2Y 1N9
tel: 514-350-4323
fax: 514-350-4314
lbrooke@ccemtl.org

III. Terms of reference

A. Description of Project

The purpose of the project is to develop a two-part report (*Taking Stock 2002*) that presents an overview and analysis of North American PRTR data for the 2002 reporting year as well as trends from 1995 to 2002, based upon publicly available data from the national PRTR programs and other information sources, as appropriate. The content of the report, and the manner in which the information is presented, should serve to assist interested members of the public and other concerned parties to better understand sources and handling of industrial pollution in North America. The report is also intended to facilitate the efforts of national, state, provincial governments, industry and citizens to set priorities for pollution reduction, and to invite reductions in North American pollutant releases and transfers through information comparisons.

B. Description of Services

The Consultant will prepare a report, based on the 2002 publicly available North American PRTR data as well as existing reports and documents related to North American PRTRs, and undertake related activities, as outlined below. All activities are to be carried out in close consultation with the CEC.

1. Overview of activities and tasks

- Plan for, and participate in, an initial planning meeting (via teleconference) with the CEC.
- Plan for, and participate in, a series of consultative meetings, including a two-day public meeting of the Consultative Group and a 1-day meeting with the national PRTR representatives.¹ The meetings are tentatively scheduled for 28–30 October 2003, in Washington, DC.

The public meeting will comprise two parts. One day will be focused on obtaining input from the Consultative Group on the content of the *Taking Stock 2002* report, including proposed topics for special analyses and others topics of interest. A second part of the meeting will be joint discussions with the CEC's Sound Management of Chemicals (SMOC) program, to further explore linkages between PRTRs and SMOC activities

On the third day, the Consultant will participate in a meeting with the CEC and the national PRTR representatives to review the outcomes of the public meeting, discuss proposed approach(es) for developing the *Taking Stock* report, and to plan for next steps in the implementation of the Action Plan to Enhance Comparability Among North American PRTRs (adopted in June 2002 through Council Resolution 02-05).

- Review the existing Consultative Group list and suggest revisions, as appropriate, as part of the planning for the public consultative meeting;

¹ Prospective consultants may receive copies of previous meeting summaries and Response to Comments documents upon request to the CEC Program Manager. All travel by the Consultant must be handled in accordance with the *CEC Travel Policy*, a copy of which is available upon request.

- Prepare a discussion paper, to be distributed in advance of the public consultative meeting, outlining various options for consideration for the development of *Taking Stock 2002*, including the opportunities presented by the inclusion of criteria air contaminants in the NPRI;
- Prepare a memo on the proposed data methodology for *Taking Stock 2002* to be used as a basis for discussion during the meeting of the CEC and national PRTR representatives;
- Prepare a summary of the public meeting, including comments received during the meeting. The CEC will finalize and distribute the summary to all persons on the Consultative Group list, inviting further written comment;
- Prepare a summary of the meeting with the CEC and the national PRTR representatives.
- Prepare a formal “Response to Comments” document, in consultation with the CEC, that summarizes and responds to oral comments received during the public consultative meeting as well as written comments received following distribution of the summary of the public meeting, and which outlines the CEC's intended approach for preparing the report;
- Prepare a detailed outline for both volumes of the report, the *Summary* and the *Sourcebook*, to be discussed and agreed upon with the CEC Program Manager, along with related issues such as presentation style, use of graphics, and level of detail.
- Compile a matched North America PRTR data set for 2002, as well as updated matched data sets for 1995 to 2002, for the chemicals and industries that are comparable between the NPRI and TRI (and the RETC, to the extent feasible);
- Prepare a two-part report (*Taking Stock 2002 Summary* and *Sourcebook*) that compares and analyzes the publicly available PRTR data for 2002 as well as the 1995 to 2002 matched data sets and subsets thereof (e.g., 1998–2002); and discusses changes and trends in the data. The report will take into account the preceding *Taking Stock* reports, particularly the data methodology. The report will include graphics, maps and tables, all of which will be prepared by the Consultant. More detail on the required analyses is presented below.
- Include analyses in the report of one or two topics of particular interest to stakeholders, drawing on the matched North America PRTR data set and other information sources, as appropriate. The topics will be determined based on input received during the Consultative Group meeting and the follow-up governmental meeting, and taking into account resource constraints.

One topic will be selected, based on input received during the consultative process, as the focus of a separate special feature report, to be prepared under a separate contract and published as part of the *Taking Stock* series. References to and linkages with this special feature will be included in the *Taking Stock 2002* report, if possible.

- Respond to and incorporate comments from the CEC on the draft report;
- Submit a final report (*Summary* and *Sourcebook* volumes), including all tables, maps and figures, in electronic format to the CEC Exact format and software(s) to be agreed in advance with CEC.

- Participate in the publication of the report in English, Spanish and French, as necessary. Although the CEC uses an outside consultant for the publication process, questions on the report will arise during the editing and translation tasks;
- Participate in the planning strategy for the release of the report, as necessary. This may include participation in conference calls, preparing background materials, and providing comments on communication strategy documents;
- Work with the CEC consultant and staff who are involved in the further development and maintenance of the CEC PRTR web site to ensure good integration between the hard copy report and the web site, and to assist in verifying the quality of the data sets and reports presented on the web site.

Throughout the development of the report, the Consultant may consult directly with government officials and other experts as needed. However, the Consultant shall report only to the CEC Project Manager (or designate) and shall receive direction only from the CEC Project Manager (or designate).

Officers of the Consultant will work in their own offices.

2. Description of the *Taking Stock 2002* Report

Taking Stock 2002 will be issued in two volumes. The first will be a high-level summary document presenting data highlights and key observations gleaned from the analyses and other information of relevance/interest. The second volume will present more detailed information and analyses, including the majority of the data tables.

The *Summary* volume will be approximately 50 pages in length and the *Sourcebook* volume will be approximately 200 pages, including appendices. The report should contain many graphics, maps and tables to enhance data presentation and facilitate user understanding of the information.

Following is an overview of the information to be included in the *Taking Stock 2002* report.

- Key findings and highlights of the data and analyses.
- Users' guide aimed at assisting readers in interpreting the information in the report and understanding the nature, limitations and potential applications of PRTR data
- Summary and comparison of current PRTR programs (2002 reporting year) in the US, Canada, and Mexico, including changes in reporting requirements from the previous year, if any, current activities and recent developments.
- 2002 summary data tables and figures for TRI and NPRI (and RETC to the extent possible) based on the subset of data that contains comparable chemicals and industries.
- Totals for reporting for each PRTR, with discussion of differences in reporting requirements
- Data analyses, to be determined, that include Mexican data as available and appropriate.
- Information to provide context for the PRTR data (e.g., summary information on other sources of the listed chemicals)
- Information on linkages with other CEC initiatives, as appropriate, in particular the air quality, sound management of chemicals, and children's health and the environment projects

- Additional discussion, summary data tables and figures based on interesting features in the data, including but not limited to: US-Canada border regions; US-Mexico border regions; known or suspected carcinogens; heavy metals (UNECE proposed protocol), and reproductive and developmental toxins;
- Updated versions of the appendices that have been included in earlier *Taking Stock* reports on the major uses and human health effects of chemicals on the "Top 25" lists for releases, transfers, or both, revised to reflect currently available information and with the addition of information on environmental effects, to the extent possible.

The precise tables and figures to be included in the report will be driven by the data content as well as the methodology used for data analysis. The data analysis methodologies used for prior reports will serve as a guide for the development of the *Taking Stock 2002* report and it is expected that the report will contain similar types of analyses and data presentation (tables, figures, maps). In this regard, the 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 data reports will be of greatest relevance, given the recent changes in the scope of the matched data set (i.e., addition of new sectors and recycling data), the updated method of presenting the data categories, and the two-volume report format described above. At the same time, the CEC encourages prospective consultants to propose additional or alternative approaches, including opportunities for streamlining the *Sourcebook* volume. All issues of data methodology and presentation will be discussed by the Consultant and Program Manager during the development of the report outline, with CEC having responsibility for final approval of the approach to be used. The report should include the following elements/chapters:

Summary volume:

Preface

1. Introduction
2. Users' guide/information on data sets, methodology
- 3– 7. Key themes/findings
8. Trends
9. Summary of special feature analysis(es), as appropriate
10. Frequently asked questions

Sourcebook volume:

Preface

List of acronyms/List of definitions

1. Introduction, Overview of existing programs in North America
2. Users' Guide
3. Releases On- and Off-Site, 2002
4. Transfers to Recycling and Other Transfers for Further Management, 2002
5. Total reported amounts (releases and transfers), 2002
6. Trends, 1995–2002, 1998–2002, 1999–2002
8. Cross-border analyses
9. Special analyses, if applicable (or may be incorporated in data chapters)

Appendices:

Comparison of chemicals listed under 2002 TRI, NPRI and RETC

Matched chemicals

List of facilities mentioned in the report (Appendix)

Human health effects of the chemicals on the "top 25" lists

Uses of the chemicals on the " top 25" lists

North American PRTR reporting forms

3. Timing of the Activity and Outputs Required

The development of this report depends on the receipt of the final data from the US EPA and from Environment Canada. The timetable presented below is therefore approximate, and may change. The CEC invites prospective consultants to modify the schedule suggested below, based on their evaluation of this proposal.

The proposal should include the following actions within the following general timeframe:

Approximate date	Actions – Phase I
3 September 2003	Initial planning teleconference
12 September 2003	Preparations for consultative meetings: Preparation of draft discussion paper, in consultation with CEC Develop proposed data methodology, in consultation with CEC List of consultative group reviewed and revisions suggested
19 September 2003	Finalization of meeting documents
28-30 October 2003	Public consultative meeting; meeting with CEC and national PRTR representatives
21 November 2003	Prepare draft summaries of meetings
28 November 2003	Prepare draft Response to Comments document
5 December 2003	Final meeting summaries and Response to Comments document submitted to CEC
12 December 2003	Preparation of draft report outline, submittal to CEC
19 December 2003	Receipt and incorporation of comments from CEC on drafts
22 December 2003	Begin preparation of sections of report for which data not required
<i>Work days below are noted from time of data receipt</i>	
Approximate days following data receipt	Actions – Phase II
0 <i>(Jan./Feb. 2004 approximately)</i>	Data received from US TRI and Canada NPRI programs Data analysis begins
60	Draft report sent to CEC for review
70	Comments due back from CEC
82	Revised draft sent to CEC
96	Comments due back from CEC
110	Report finalized, sent to CEC
220	Report published

C. Reporting Requirements

The Consultant will prepare monthly status reports that summarize the following:

- progress in previous month;

- current status;
- anticipated progress in upcoming month;
- potential problems, with description of, and reasons for, any delays; and
- actions that should be taken by CEC Secretariat to facilitate the project.

These reports are to be sent to the CEC Secretariat by the 10th of the following month, either by telefax or e-mail. The CEC Secretariat will arrange teleconferences with the Consultant on an as-needed basis at mutually agreeable times. The CEC Secretariat is responsible for technical editing, translation, printing, publication and distribution of products of this activity.

Annex: Contacts

CEC Project Manager:

Lorraine Brooke

Acting Program Manager
 Commission for Environmental Cooperation
 393, rue St-Jacques Ouest, Bureau 200
 Montréal, Québec
 Canada H2Y 1N9
 tel: 514-350-4323
 fax: 514-350-4314
 lbrooke@ccemtl.org

Government Contacts:

Canada	USA	Mexico
<p>Alain Chung Director Pollution Data Branch Environment Canada 351 St- Joseph Blvd., Hull, Québec K1A 0H3 T: 819-997-3127 F: 819-994-9542 E: chung@ec.gc.ca</p>	<p>Maria Doa Director, TRI Program Division (2844) US EPA Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Washington, DC 20460 USA T: 202-260-9592 F: 202-401-8142 E: doa.maria@epamail.epa.gov</p>	<p>Ing. Sergio Sánchez Martínez Director General de Registros Contaminantes y Calidad del Aire SEMARNAT Av. Revolución 1425, Col Tlacopac México DF 01040, México Nivel 36 T: 011-525-55-624-3634/ 24/ 04 E: sesanchez@semarnat.gob.mx</p>
<p>François Lavallée Chief, NPRI Environment Canada 351 St- Joseph Blvd., 10th Floor, Hull, Québec K1A 0H3 T: 819-994-4073 F: 819-953-9542 E: francois.lavallee@ec.gc.ca</p>	<p>John Harman TRI Program Division (2844) US EPA Ariel Rios Building 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Washington, DC 20460 USA T: 202-260-6395 F: 202-401-8142 E: harman.john@epamail.epa.gov</p>	<p>M. en C. MariCruz Rodriguez Gallegos Directora de Gestión Ambiental SEMARNAT Dirección General de Manejo Integral de Contaminantes Av. Revolución 1425 Col. Tlacopac México D.F. 01040, México Nivel 29 T: 011-525-55-624-3398 F: 011-525-55-662-4790 (?) E : mrgallegos@semarnat.gob.mx</p>