

Comments on the Report on the Work of the Ad hoc Group of Experts on Effectiveness Evaluation

I . General comments

Considering that effectiveness evaluation is a vital measure to reflect the effectiveness of the efforts towards the implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury (hereinafter as Minamata Convention), the data or information on which the effectiveness evaluation is based should be recognized by the Parties or should be subject to the reports and information submitted to the Secretariat by the Parties. The baseline of the effectiveness evaluation should be subject to the data presented in the first mercury monitoring report of effectiveness evaluation submitted by the Parties.

Drawing from the effectiveness evaluation experience of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, compiling the global mercury monitoring technical guide will contribute to clarifying the monitoring objects, monitoring methods, monitoring quality control requirements and compiling requirements of the effectiveness evaluation report, and it will also provide technical support for the smooth implementation of the effectiveness evaluation.

II . Specific comments

No.	Page No.	Paragraph	Content	Suggestion
1.	Page 1	Part 2	“2.Consideration of Monitoring arrangements”	Drawing from monitoring technical guidelines for the global persistent organic pollutants, it is recommended to add a paragraph describing the content relating data policy to make clear the mercury monitoring data report procedure.
2.	Page 2	Human bio monitoring	“...maternal scalp hair...”	It is suggested to use the hair of ordinary people as sample. Rationale: there exists difficulties and uncertainties in obtaining sample of pregnant women’s hair.
3.	Page 4	Biota	Biota	It is recommended to cancel bird as a monitoring object, and change to “fish / mussels”, namely “fish or mussels”. Rationale: In regard to biota monitoring, the monitoring objects including bird, fish and shellfish are numerous, and the data acquired is not comparable.
4.	Page 13	Paragraph f	“The baseline can be considered as the state of knowledge.”	It is recommended to change from “The baseline can be considered as the state of knowledge” to “The monitoring value of the first global mercury monitoring report is regarded as the baseline for the effectiveness evaluation of the Minamata Convention”.

5.	Page 16		“Recommendations from the expert group in relation to monitoring”	<p>It is recommended to add the "Global Mercury Monitoring Technical Guide", because the current report isn't conducive to obtaining "comparable data". For example, the difference in air monitoring sites (background point, city point, and rural point) results in not comparable monitoring data. In addition, different methods of air sampling of TSP, PM10 and PM2.5 also produce different results. Similarly, adsorption materials choosing, sample processing and detection means (AFS, AAS, etc.) also directly affect the comparability of the test results.</p>
6.	Page 18	Paragraph a	“The effectiveness evaluation under Article 22 is at the global level. In addition to national reporting, international reports and other information gathered at a global level, information at local, national and regional levels can also inform the evaluation at the global level.”	<p>It is recommended that the basis for the document of the effectiveness evaluation work be subject to what the Parties submit to the Secretariat in accordance with the requirements of the Minamata Convention.</p> <p>Rationale: Considering the authority of the data, the basis for the document of the effectiveness evaluation work include the national report, the ASGM national plan, mercury emission and release inventory and so on as required by the Minamata Convention, and should be submitted to the Secretariat by the focal points of the</p>

				Parties under the Minamata Convention.
7.	Page 19	Table 4	“Potential indicators for individual articles of the Convention”	Delete all the reports and information not required to be submitted by the Minamata Convention in the column of “Potential source of information” in the table, because these reports and information are not officially recognized or submitted by the Parties.
8.	Page 25	Paragraph c	“Global monitoring report”	Delete. It is a work conducted under non-conventional mechanism.
9.			“GEF report”, “SIP report”, “Special Programme report”	Add the remark: The project result supported by these funds cannot be used as sources of information for effectiveness evaluation if they are not submitted by the focal points of the Parties.
10.			“Other relevant information including the Global Mercury Assessment, UNEP Supply and Trade Report, voluntary submissions, reports from IGOs (WHO, ILO, UNDP, AMAP etc.), Minamata Initial Assessments, Global Mercury Partnership, project reports, UN trade data, scientific literature, etc.”	Delete. These reports and information are not officially recognized by the Parties.
11.	Page 27	Table 5	“All Stage 1 reports to be submitted to the Secretariat (except for global monitoring report)”	It is recommended to clarify the time for the Parties to submit the first mercury monitoring report of effectiveness

				<p>evaluation.</p> <p>Rationale: There is no mention of the time regarding the submission of the first effectiveness evaluation report by the Parties.</p>
12.	Page 28	B	“The effectiveness evaluation committee shall consist of twelve experts, ...”	Make clear the difference and relationship between the ad hoc group of experts established and the effectiveness evaluation committee to form in the report.
13.	Page 29	Paragraph F	“the global monitoring reports”	Delete. It is a work conducted under non-conventional mechanism. Related data are not officially recognized by the Parties.
14.			“and on other available information”	It is recommended to make clear that all the information is submitted to the Secretariat by the Parties in accordance with the requirements of the Minamata Convention. That is to add “submitted to secretariat by the Parties according to the Convention” after “information”.
15.			Paragraph G	“...four months...”