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Conference of the Parties to the
Minamata Convention on Mercury

Third meeting

Geneva, 25–29 November 2019

Decision adopted by the third Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury

 MC-3/10: Arrangements for the first effectiveness evaluation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury

 *The Conference of the Parties,*

*Welcoming* the report on the proposed framework for the effectiveness evaluation and monitoring arrangements under the Minamata Convention,[[1]](#footnote-2) and the complementing information developed by the ad hoc technical expert group on the basis of the mandates set out in decisions MC1/9 and MC-2/10,[[2]](#footnote-3)

*Recognizing* the efforts to advance the work on the effectiveness evaluation at the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties,

1. *Invites* parties to submit views on the indicators set out in annex I to the present decision and requests the secretariat to compile those views in advance of the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
2. *Requests* the secretariat to advance the work by securing services for drafting:
3. Guidance on monitoring to maintain harmonized, comparable information on mercury levels in the environment, taking into consideration the draft structure set out in the note on background information on mercury monitoring;[[3]](#footnote-4)
4. Reports set out in the framework in annex II to the present decision with the exception of the emissions and releases report, the monitoring report, and the modelling report.

 Annex I to decision MC-3/10

 Proposed indicators for evaluating the effectiveness of the Minamata Convention, by article

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *A: Article 1 (objective)*(The indicator for article 1 is to be read with the relevant monitoring indicator set out in table 4 in document UNEP/MC/COP.3/14) | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| A1. Cross-cutting monitoring indicator | Levels of mercury in the environment and in humans due to anthropogenic emissions and releases | Attributive modelling | Amount in the first evaluation (if models are available) |
| **Notes** | * Attribution is to be estimated using models yet to be developed; thus, information for this indicator may or may not be available for the first effectiveness evaluation cycle.
* Estimates from modelling are to be accompanied by relevant notes on modelling uncertainties.
* In case of non-availability of information from models, levels of mercury and trends in mercury levels (changes over time) could be used for attribution purposes.
 |

| *B: Supply cluster* *Article 3 (mercury supply sources and trade); article 10 (environmentally sound interim storage of mercury, other than waste mercury); article 11 (mercury wastes)*  | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Overall process indicator for articles 3, 10 and 11 | Proportion of parties that have implemented key provisions under this cluster (encompassing all process indicators below, i.e., B5, B6, B7, B8, B9 and B13) | - Article 21 reporting | Amount in the first evaluation |
| B2. Additional cross-cutting outcome indicator for articles 3, 10 and 11 | Estimated global supply of mercury, in tonnes per year | - Synthesized information from individual indicators for articles 3, 10 and 11 | Amount in the first evaluation |
| **Article 3** |  |  |  |
| B3. Outcome indicator for article 3 | Total amount of mercury mined from primary mercury mines | - 2017 report on global mercury supply, trade and demand- Article 21 reporting- ASGM national action plan reports | Amount in the first evaluation |
| B4. Outcome indicator for article 3 | Amount of mercury traded, broken down by specific purpose | - Article 3 forms | Amount in the first evaluation |
| B5. Process indicator for article 3 | Number of parties that have endeavoured to identify stocks and sources of supply | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| B6. Process indicator for article 3 |  For those parties that have determined they have excess Hg, whether they have taken measures called for in article 3 para. 5 (b), and amount of Hg disposed of in accordance with those measure, if available  | - Article 21 reporting - World Chlorine Council reports | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| B7. Process indicator for article 3 | Number and proportion of parties trading in mercury | - Article 21 reporting - Article 3 forms | Number and percentage in the first evaluation |
| B8. Process indicator for article 3 | Volume of mercury being traded | - Article 21 reporting  | Amount in the first evaluation |
| **Article 10** |  |  |  |
| B9. Process indicator for article 10 | Number and proportion of parties that have taken measures to ensure sound interim storage | - Article 21 reporting | Number and percentage in the first evaluation |
| B10. Outcome indicator for article 10 | Amount of mercury stored in an environmentally sound way (as identified in the inventory of stocks) | - Article 21 reporting | Amount in the first evaluation |
| **Article 11** |  |  |  |
| B11. Outcome indicator for article 11 | Amount of waste containing mercury or mercury compounds subject to final disposal | - Article 21 reporting | Amount in the first evaluation |
| B12. Outcome indicator for article 11 | Number of parties with facilities for final disposal of waste containing mercury or mercury compounds | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| B13. Process indicator for article 11 | Number of parties that have measures in place to manage mercury waste in an environmentally sound manner | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * Data from non-parties could also be important in some instances.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *C: Demand cluster* *Article 4 (mercury-added products); article 5 (manufacturing processes in which mercury or mercury compounds are used); article 7 (artisanal and small‑scale gold mining)*  | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| C1. Cross-cutting process indicator for articles 4, 5 and 7 | Proportion of parties that have implemented key provisions under this cluster | - Synthesized information from individual indicators for articles 4, 5 and 7 | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| C2. Cross-cutting outcome indicator for articles 4, 5 and 7 | Global use of mercury in the manufacturing of products or processes, in tonnes per application  | - Information from industry sources | Amount in the first evaluation |
| **Article 4** |  |  |  |
| C3. Process indicator for article 4 | Number of parties having appropriate measures to prevent the manufacture, export or import of mercury-added products listed in part I of annex A | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| C4. Process indicator for article 4 | Number of exemptions per product category that are still valid | - Registry of exemptions | Number in the first evaluation |
| C5. Process indicator for article 4 | Number of parties that have taken two or more measures for the mercury-added products listed in part II of annex A | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| C6. Additional outcome indicator for article 4 | Volume, in tonnes of mercury-added products (a) imported and (b) exported, in units per year, for each product category in part I of annex A. | - Trade and customs data | Amount in the first evaluation |
| **Article 5** |  |  |  |
| C7. Process indicator for article 5 | Number of parties with exemptions for annex B, part I, processes that are still valid | - Registry of exemptions | Number in the first evaluation |
| C8. Process indicator for article 5 | Number of parties having measures in place to not allow the use of mercury or mercury compounds in manufacturing processes listed in part I of annex B | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| C9. Process indicator for article 5 | Proportion of parties that have processes subject to article 5, para. 3, that have taken all measures for the respective processes listed in annex B, part II | - Article 21 reporting | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| **Article 7** |  |  |  |
| C10. Outcome indicator for article 7 | Total amount of mercury used in ASGM globally, in tonnes per year  | - Article 21 reporting- ASGM national action plans and reviews thereof- Notifications | Amount in the first evaluation |
| C11. Process indicator for article 7 | Proportion of parties declaring more than insignificant ASGM that have submitted a national action plan | - Notifications | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| C12. Process indicator for article 7 | Proportion of parties that have submitted a national action plan and have reviewed it | - Article 7 reviews | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * Some data on products may not be easily obtainable.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *D: Pressure cluster* *Article 8 (emissions); article 9 (releases); article 12 (contaminated sites)*  | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| D1. Overall process indicator for articles 8, 9 and 12 | Share of parties that have implemented key provisions under this cluster | - Article 21 reporting | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| D2. Crosscutting outcome indicator for articles 8, 9 and 12 | Total amount of mercury emitted and released  | - Global Mercury Assessment 2018- Inventories- Minamata Convention initial assessments | Amount in the first evaluation |
| **Article 8** (The indicators for article 8 are to be read with the relevant monitoring indicators in table 4.) |
| D3. Outcome indicator for article 8 | Total amount of mercury emitted for each point source category in annex D  | - Article 21 reporting- Inventories | Number in the first evaluation |
| D4. Process indicator for article 8 | Number of parties that require BAT/BEP or emission limit values consistent with the application of BAT | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| D5. Process indicator for article 8 | Number of parties that have put in place control measures for existing sources (per each of the measures set out in article 8, para. 5) | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| D6. Process indicator for article 8 | Number of parties that have established and maintained an inventory of emissions  | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Article 9** (The indicators for article 9 are to be read with the relevant monitoring indicators in table 4.) |
| D7. Outcome indicator for article 9 | Total amount of mercury releases in the inventory from relevant sources  | - Article 21 reporting- Inventories | Amount in the first evaluation |
| D8. Process indicator for article 9 | Number of parties that have identified relevant sources | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| D9. Process indicator for article 9 | Number of parties that have established and maintained an inventory of releases from relevant sources | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Article 12** |  |  |  |
| D10. Process indicator for article 12 | Number of parties that have developed strategies for identifying and assessing sites contaminated by mercury or mercury compounds | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| D11. Process indicator for article 12 | Number of parties that have developed an inventory of contaminated sites | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * There may be some data gaps, as parties are not obliged to share the information collected as part of their inventory.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *E: Support cluster* *Article 13 (financial resources and mechanism); article 14 (capacity‑building, technical assistance and technology transfer)*  | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| **Article 13**  |  |  |  |
| E1. Process indicator for article 13 | Number of parties that have: * Contributed to the financial mechanism referred to in article 13, para. 5
* Received Global Environment Facility resources
* Received SIP resources
* Mobilized national resources for implementing the Convention within the reporting period
 | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| E2. Process indicator for article 13 | Amount of resources provided by: * Global Environment Facility
* SIP
* Bilateral support within the reporting period
 | - Article 21 reporting- Other public sources | Amount in the first evaluation |
| E3. Additional process indicator for article 13 | Number of recommendations from the financial review reflected in the Global Environment Facility/SIP policy documents | - Information from policy documents | Zero |
| **Article 14** |  |  |  |
| E4. Process indicator for article 14 | Number of parties that have:1. Cooperated in providing capacity‑building and technical assistance to another party
2. Requested technical assistance
3. Received capacity‑building or technical assistance
4. Promoted or facilitated technology transfer
 | - Article 21 reporting- Other public sources | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * The cycle of review of the financial mechanism may well not align with the effectiveness evaluation cycle.
* As the reporting format does not request dollar values for resources provided, other public sources may need to be consulted.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *F: Article 15 (Implementation and Compliance Committee)* | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| F1. Process indicator | Proportion of issues that the Implementation and Compliance Committee was able to resolve, including indications of systemic issues, if any | - Implementation and Compliance Committee report, as referred to in article 21 | Percentage in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * The Conference of the Parties is to consider the terms of reference of the Implementation and Compliance Committee at its third meeting.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *G: Article 16 (Health aspects)* (The indicator for article 16 is to be read with the relevant monitoring indicators indicated in table 4) | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| G1. Monitoring indicator | Mercury levels in selected human populations (as defined by the monitoring arrangements) | - Existing monitoring data and activities | Number in the first evaluation |
| G2. Process indicator | Number of parties that have taken measures, such as fish advisories, to provide information to the public on exposure to mercury, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 16 | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| G3. Process indicator | Number of parties that have taken measures to protect human health, in accordance with article 16 | - Article 21 reporting- Submissions to the secretariat | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * Mercury levels in biota are also to be considered.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *H: Information and research cluster* *Article 17 (information exchange); article 18 (public information, awareness and education); article 19 (research, development and monitoring)* | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| **Article 17** |  |  |  |
| H1. Process indicator for article 17 | Number of parties with designated national focal points | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| H2. Process indicator for article 17 | Number of parties that have facilitated the exchange of information related to mercury  | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Article 18** |  |  |  |
| H3. Process indicator for article 18 | Number of parties that have taken measures to implement article 18 | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| H4. Process indicator for article 18 | Average number of measures under paragraph 1 of article 18 that are being implemented by parties | - Derived from article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| H5. Process indicator for article 18 | Number of parties that have public information on mercury levels in air, humans and biota within their territory | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| H6. Process indicator for article 18 | Number of parties undertaking risk communication relating to mercury intake through food and water consumption within their territory | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Article 19** |  |  |  |
| H7. Process indicator for article 19 | Number of parties that have undertaken research, development and monitoring, in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 19  | - Article 21 reporting | Number in the first evaluation |
| H8. Process indicator for article 19 | Number of parties contributing data and knowledge to integrated assessments | - Existing monitoring networks, databases, scientific data and literature | Number in the first evaluation |
| H9. Additional process indicator for article 19  | Number of regions contributing to a regional dataset | - Existing monitoring networks, databases, scientific data and literature | Number in the first evaluation |
| **Notes** | * Submissions to the secretariat that supplement article 21 reporting
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *I: Article 20 (implementation plans)* | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| I1. Process indicator | Number of parties submitting implementation plans | - Secretariat report to the Conference of the Parties on implementation plan submissions | Zero |
| **Notes** | * Parties are not obliged to prepare an implementation plan. Some parties have nevertheless found it useful to prepare such a plan and submit it to the secretariat.
 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *J: Article 21 (reporting)* | *Source of information on the indicator* | *Baseline for the indicator* |
| J1. Process indicator | Proportion of parties reporting on time | - Article 21 reporting | Percentage of the first submission on time |
| J2. Process indicator | Proportion of reports received on time | - Article 21 reporting | Percentage not available in the first reports |
| J3. Process indicator | Proportion of parties indicating that information is not available for specific questions | - Article 21 reporting | Percentage not available in the first reports |
| **Notes** | * Parties are to report every two years.
 |

*Abbreviations:* ASGM, artisanal and small‑scale gold mining; BAT/BEP, best available techniques/best environmental practices; SIP, Specific International Programme to Support Capacity‑building and Technical Assistance.

 Annex II to decision MC-3/10

 Framework for the effectiveness evaluation of the Minamata Convention

Figure 1
Information and analysis flow



Figure 2 **Framework institutional arrangements**



*Abbreviations*: COP, Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury; ICC, Implementation and Compliance Committee; MIA, Minamata initial assessment; NAP, national action plan; NIP, national implementation plan; SIP, Specific International Programme to Support Capacity‑building and Technical Assistance.
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