



Template for the review of the draft standards and guidelines associated with the Draft regulations on exploitation of mineral resources in the Area

I. Background

1. The Draft regulations on exploitation of mineral resources in the Area ([ISBA/25/C/WP.1](#)) require that certain issues are addressed in accordance with, or taking into account, standards and guidelines to be developed by the organs of the Authority. The standards will be adopted by the Council and will be legally binding on Contractors and the Authority, whereas the guidelines will be issued by the Legal and Technical Commission or the Secretary-General and will be recommendatory in nature.
2. Stakeholders consultations are an integral part of the process decided upon by the Commission for the development of the standards and guidelines ([ISBA/25/C/19/Add.1](#)).
3. The Legal and Technical Commission will consider the comments received through the stakeholders consultation at its next session.
4. The drafts include a cover page containing substantive background and contextual information on the approach taken by the Commission in developing each standard and guidelines. Review comments are not being sought on this background information.
5. Issues of format and consistency across the standards and guidelines will be reviewed by the secretariat and Commission once the content of the various standards and guidelines is finalized following stakeholders consultations.

II. Submitting Comments

6. To ensure that your comments are given due consideration, please send them by e-mail to ola@isa.org.jm, at your earliest convenience but **no later than the date announced on the ISA website for the relevant draft standards and guidelines**.
7. When submitting comments, please adhere to the following guidance as much as possible:
 - a. Please provide all comments in writing and in an MS Word .doc or .docx format using the table provided below.
 - b. The table format allows for an unlimited number of comments to be added. To add more comments, you may add more rows.

- c. Please provide full contact information for the individual/Government/organization submitting the comments.
 - d. Please avoid commenting on issues related to format, grammar, spelling or punctuation, unless it affects the overall meaning of the text, as the document will be formatted and edited when the final draft is prepared.
 - e. To facilitate the revision process please be as specific as possible in your comments. In areas where you feel additional or alternative text or information is required, please suggest what this text may look like or what information should be included.
 - f. Text may be copied from the draft into the table if stakeholders wish to use "track changes" in editing text (this is encouraged to ensure accuracy and avoid numbering errors).
 - g. If you refer to additional sources of information, please include these with your comments when possible or provide a complete reference or hyperlink.
 - h. All review comments will be posted on the ISA website, unless otherwise requested by the submitting entity.
8. Should you have any questions regarding the review process, please contact ola@isa.org.jm.

III. Template for Comments

- 9. Please use the review template below when providing comments.
- 10. Line and page numbers have been provided in the drafts. Please use these as a reference as illustrated in the table below.

TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS

<i>Document reviewed</i>	
Title of the draft being reviewed:	Draft standard and guidelines on the form and calculation of an environmental performance guarantee
<i>Contact information</i>	
Surname:	Jantzen
Given Name:	Peter
Government (if applicable):	
Organization (if applicable):	Blue Minerals Jamaica Limited
Country:	Jamaica
E-mail:	Peter.jantzen@blue-minerals.com

General Comments		
We recommend that the Environmental Performance Guarantee (EPG) Standard ensures that that there is no functional and costly overlap between Contractor Insurance and the Environmental Compensation Fund		
The EPG Standard must be in line with Regulation 26(2) which refers to costs as reasonable and without use of weighted words such as highest/greatest cost.		
Specific Comments		
Page	Line	Comment
	72	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”
	96	Please delete the word “highest”
	115	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible third-party costs” with “reasonable third-party costs”
	130	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”
	132	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”
	134	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”
	136	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”
	137	Please delete “worst case scenario basis”
	143	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”
	430	Please replace “greatest reasonably credible costs” with “reasonable costs”

Comments should be sent by e-mail to ola@isa.org.jm