

General comments on the guidance:

- The source - transfer - target principle deserves to be introduced.
- Differences between exhaustive approach and individual one for the identification of the sites are not applicable enough.
 - Example of implementation in some countries (and references to some documents may be of use and /or case studies if proposed by some countries),
 - Explain means to select priority sites (example of criteria).
- The level of detail is heterogeneous in the document.
 - Possibly the more detailed parts should appear in the form of inserts or in appendices (ex of list of remediation technologies). Often they present: i) good practices according to feedback of non-compliances or omissions that led in the past to errors or ii) they are important points. However, they are not exhaustive and do not cover all points.
- Organize references by themes for easy access, and include main useful standards.
- Eased the read by adding figures and illustrations, we also proposed some boxes with "practical feedback", we let you decide if you keep them.
- Put section C after the section G

NB: we have introduced some references in French (in some African countries English is not always well understood by the environmental inspectors). We let you decide to keep them or.

Additional comments:

- There is a need to support the exit from mercury use by artisanal miners (is there one action in the COP dedicated to this issue), some links here, but it is not exhaustive:
 - https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/11524/UNEP_Tech_Doc_APRIL_2012_120619_with_links_web.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eNwILvwDWGI>
- One comment also from a recent workshop in Peru, it was quite surprising to meet some local authorities who doubt of the risk for human health poses by Mercury....