



---

**Conference of the Parties to the  
Minamata Convention on Mercury  
Fourth meeting**

Online, 1–5 November 2021\*\*

Item 4 (h) of the provisional agenda\*\*\*

**Matters for consideration or action by the  
Conference of the Parties: national reporting****National reporting****Note by the secretariat****I. Introduction**

1. Paragraph 1 of article 21 of the Minamata Convention on Mercury provides that each party shall report to the Conference of the Parties, through the secretariat, on the measures taken to implement the provisions of the Convention and on the effectiveness of such measures and the possible challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention.

2. The Conference of the Parties, in decision MC-1/8, agreed on the timing and format of national reporting by parties. The full format contains 43 questions to be answered by all parties every four years, while the short report contains four questions (indicated by an asterisk in the full format) that are to be answered every two years. In addition to part A, which requests information about the party and respondent, and part B, which contains the questions, the reporting format includes part C, which provides an opportunity for parties to comment on possible challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention, part D, which provides an opportunity for parties to comment on the reporting format and possible improvements, and part E, which provides an opportunity to provide additional comment on each of the articles in free text if the party chooses to do so. According to the same decision, the first short reports (hereafter referred to as the “short reports”) were due for submission by 31 December 2019, using the information available.

3. The four questions from the full reporting format to which parties were required to respond as part of their short reports relate to the supply, trade and disposal of mercury, and in particular to article 3 (Mercury supply sources and trade) and article 11 (Mercury wastes) of the Convention, as follows:

- (a) Question 3.1 (c) on primary mercury mines operating at the time of entry into force of the Convention for the party;
- (b) Question 3.3 (a) on individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year;
- (c) Question 3.5 on the export of mercury from the party’s territory in the reporting period;

---

\* Reissued for technical reasons on 13 October 2021.

\*\* The resumed fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury is to convene in person in Bali, Indonesia, and is tentatively scheduled for the first quarter of 2022.

\*\*\* UNEP/MC/COP.4/1.

(d) Question 11.2 on facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury and mercury compounds in the party's territory.

4. The fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties provides the first opportunity: (a) to review the performance of parties in meeting their article 21 reporting obligations; (b) to review and evaluate the implementation of the Convention as per article 23, subparagraph 5 (c); and (c) to assess, on the basis of the parties' experience of using the reporting format, as adopted in decision MC-1/8, whether it is sufficiently clear or whether improvements could be made to ensure that national reporting provides the information needed for the Conference of the Parties to fulfil its obligation to keep the implementation of the Convention under continuous review and evaluation.

## II. Reporting performance in the first short reports covering the reporting period 16 August 2017 to 31 December 2019

5. Of the 114 parties to the Convention that were party during the first reporting period, ending on 31 December 2019,<sup>1</sup> 63 parties submitted their complete reports by the deadline, while an additional 39 parties submitted their reports by 30 June 2021.<sup>2</sup> By 30 June 2021, therefore, 102 of the 114 parties had submitted their reports to the secretariat. In total, this is an 89 per cent reporting rate for the first reporting period running from 16 August 2017 to 31 December 2019.

6. The parties that submitted their complete reports for the first reporting period are: Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, Chile, China (including Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region), Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam and Zambia.

7. By region, reports were submitted by 28 of the 31 parties from the group of African States (90 per cent); by 20 of the 26 parties from the Asia-Pacific States (77 per cent); by all 13 of the parties from the Central and Eastern European States (100 per cent); by 21 of the 23 parties from the Latin American and the Caribbean States (91 per cent); and by 20 of the 21 parties from the Western European and other States (95 per cent). All the complete reports received by the secretariat are available on the website of the Convention.

8. In addition, the secretariat received four incomplete reports (from Afghanistan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malta and Togo) and is awaiting additional feedback from the respective national focal points to allow the reports to be filed as complete.

9. This means that of the 114 parties that were to report on the first reporting period, eight parties are still to submit their reports to the secretariat, namely Antigua and Barbuda, Cuba, Eswatini, Ghana, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, Palau and the State of Palestine.

10. Two parties (Greece and the United Republic of Tanzania) submitted to the secretariat short reports on the first reporting period even though they became parties to the Convention in June and October 2020, respectively, after the period had ended. Although the secretariat reviewed both the incomplete reports and these two additional reports, the responses contained therein are not included in the secretariat's report on the first reporting period.

<sup>1</sup> By 31 December 2019, 116 States or regional economic integration organizations had deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Convention. The Republic of Korea deposited its instrument on 22 November 2019 and Equatorial Guinea did so on 24 December 2019. As the Convention comes into force 90 days after the deposit of an instrument, the Republic of Korea and Equatorial Guinea were not yet parties on 31 December 2019 and thus not required to submit short reports by that date.

<sup>2</sup> In the online electronic reporting platform, the submission dates were generated automatically. When a report was submitted by email, the date stamp on the email was taken as the submission date. These submission dates were confirmed by the secretariat once the reports had been checked and verified for completeness.

11. In April 2019, the Executive Secretary alerted parties to the 31 December 2019 deadline for the first short reports. In November 2019, parties were invited to make use of the online reporting platform to submit their reports; the national focal points were provided with password-secured access to the platform. A total of 87 parties (85 per cent) used the online reporting platform and 15 parties submitted their reports by email.

12. In 2019, to support parties in the preparation of information for the first short reports the secretariat prepared a set of frequently asked questions about the four questions to be answered in the short reports. The secretariat also engaged in dedicated, regular outreach and follow-up with parties from October 2019 onwards, including through briefings, web-based training sessions and direct help, to support them in submitting their short reports.

### III. Information contained in the first short reports

13. The secretariat conducted a review of the information contained in the responses to the four questions in the short reports. The tally of responses and the overall findings per question are set out below. More details on the responses are provided in annex II to the present document.

#### A. Article 3: Mercury supply sources and trade

14. Question 3.1, on primary mercury mines operating at the time of entry into force of the Convention for the party, reads as follows:

**Question 3.1:** Does the party have any primary mercury mines that were operating within its territory at the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party? (Para. 3.)

Yes

No

If yes, please indicate:

(c) \*Total amount mined \_\_\_\_\_ metric tons per year

15. In terms of parties' responses to question 3.1:

(a) Two parties responded "yes", i.e., that they had primary mercury mines that were operating within their territory at the date of entry into force of the Convention for them.

(b) One hundred parties replied "no", i.e., that they did not have primary mercury mines that were operating within their territory at the date of entry into force of the Convention for them.

16. The secretariat has a number of comments on the responses to question 3.1, as follows:

(a) It notes that four parties initially misunderstood the term "primary mines", thinking that it included mines that produced primary metals other than mercury, or mines that might produce mercury as a by-product in addition to the primary product. After follow-up with those parties by the secretariat, the entries were corrected. Furthermore, one party misunderstood the question, taking it to mean that artisanal and small-scale gold mining needed to be reported. Again, after follow-up with the party by the secretariat, the entry was corrected.

(b) After reviewing the responses regarding active primary mines, the secretariat notes that it is not possible to deduce the total amount of mercury mined per year during the reporting period, as one party reported the amount of ore containing mercury that had been mined. The variation in the unit of measurement used in the reports prevents the secretariat from providing the Conference of the Parties with analysis of the data on mercury produced from active primary mines.

17. In conclusion, during the reporting period, only two parties reported that they had had primary mercury mines operating at the time of entry into force of the Convention for them. Although several parties experienced difficulty in answering this question in relation to the definition of "primary mining" (defined in article 2, subparagraph 2 (i), of the Convention), the major issue was the uncertainty as to whether the reference to the "total amount mined" referred to the amount of mercury obtained or the amount of ore excavated. There is therefore a need to clarify the units to be used in reporting the "total amount mined" to enable meaningful analysis of the amounts reported.

18. Question 3.3, on stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year, reads as follows:

**Question 3.3:** Has the party endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year that are located within its territory? (Para. 5.)

- Yes
- No

(a) \*If the Party answered yes to question 3.3 above:

- (i) Please attach the results of your endeavour or indicate where it is available on the Internet, unless unchanged from a previous reporting round.
- (ii) Supplemental: Please provide any related information, for example on the use or disposal of mercury from such stocks and sources.

19. In terms of parties' responses to question 3.3:

(a) A total of 45 parties responded "yes", i.e., that they had endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury and mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year located within their territory.

(b) Parties that answered "yes" were further requested to attach the results of their endeavour or to indicate where the results were available on the Internet. Of the 45 parties that answered "yes" to question 3.3, 33 parties attached the results of their endeavour, eight parties attached or provided other information and five parties did not submit any information on the results of their endeavour.

(c) Fifty-seven parties responded "no", i.e., that they had not endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury and mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year located within their territory.

20. The secretariat has a number of comments on the responses to question 3.3, as follows:

(a) It notes that, although 45 parties reported that they had endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year located within their territories, and 33 parties submitted the results of their endeavour, eight parties submitted other information of their endeavour rather than results, while five parties submitted no results. It is not clear what the status of the remainder of the endeavours are. Are they ongoing and the party has yet to report on the results? Did the endeavours conclude without any results? Or did the endeavour result in finding no stocks and sources exceeding the respective thresholds within parties' territories? The reporting format does not prompt the party to provide more detail in this regard.

(b) Furthermore, even though 45 parties reported that they had endeavoured to identify stocks and sources and 33 parties attached their results, the secretariat notes that, overall, the results submitted give an uneven overview of the outcome of parties' individual endeavours and an incomplete status of the stocks and sources globally. While it is possible for the secretariat to aggregate the results submitted in the first short reports, the resulting total cannot be taken as providing a meaningful overview of current global stocks.

(c) In reviewing the attached results of parties' endeavours, the secretariat noted several elements. Seven parties reported stocks or sources exceeding the thresholds. The stocks of one of those parties were held by the government and not available for commerce. Two parties indicated that they had no national reporting requirement that would enable a determination of whether there were stocks or sources exceeding the thresholds. Several parties indicated that the Minamata initial assessments that would provide information in that regard had not been finalized at the time of reporting.

(d) Parties that answered "yes" to question 3.3 were further requested, in supplemental question (a) (ii), to provide any related information, for example, on the use or disposal of mercury from such stocks and sources. The responses to the supplemental question provided a mix of additional information, including that stocks of mercury and mercury compounds located within one party's territory could temporarily exceed 50 metric tons. These stocks of mercury and mercury compounds were reported to originate from objects or substances containing mercury or mercury compounds. Another party reported mercury recovery by an oil and gas company. Some parties reported that the excess mercury and mercury waste generated was destined for disposal, including mercury waste from upgrading lighting technology in lighthouses.

(e) It is to be noted that, on the basis of some of the responses, there may be uncertainty among parties as to whether the endeavour to identify stocks and sources is a one-time obligation, a continuing commitment or a time-bound commitment. The lack of clarity on the issue may negate the ability of the secretariat over time to adequately track and aggregate information on stocks and sources in a meaningful way in order to share that information with the Conference of Parties.

(f) Furthermore, regarding the response “no”, i.e., that parties had not endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury and mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year located within their territory, it is not clear whether this “no” is an answer that relates to both stocks and sources, only to stocks or only to sources.

21. In conclusion, seventy per cent of the parties that responded “yes” to having endeavoured to identify stocks and sources above the respective thresholds provided results of their endeavours in varied formats. Even with results forthcoming, the secretariat notes that aggregating the information would not necessarily provide an estimate of the total stocks held by parties and the sources of mercury supply located in their territories. While there was no requirement for a party to explain why it had not taken measures under article 3, paragraph 5 (a), it is clear from the responses received that some parties lack domestic reporting arrangements to facilitate such measures. Although the Conference of the Parties, in its decision MC-1/2 on guidance in relation to mercury supply sources and trade, gave clear guidance on how to determine whether a party held stocks of mercury or mercury compound exceeding 50 metric tons and on how to determine whether the party had sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons, there may be a gap in understanding and application of this guidance in collecting this information at the national level. It could thus be beneficial to have further clarification in the reporting format.

22. Question 3.5, on the export of mercury from the party’s territory in the reporting period, reads as follows:

**Question 3.5:** \*Has the party received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3, including any required certification from importing non-parties, for all exports of mercury from the party’s territory in the reporting period. (Para. 6, para. 7.)

- Yes, exports to parties
- Yes, exports to non-parties
- No

**If yes,**

(a) and the party has submitted copies of the consent forms to the secretariat, then no further information is needed.

If the party has not previously provided such copies, it is recommended that it do so.

Otherwise, please provide other suitable information showing that the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of article 3 have been met.

Supplemental: Please provide information on the use of the exported mercury.

(b) If exports were based on a general notification in accordance with article 3, paragraph 7, please indicate, if available, the total amount exported and any relevant terms or conditions in the general notification related to use.

23. In terms of parties’ responses to question 3.5:

(a) Ninety-four parties responded “no”, i.e., that they had not received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3, including any required certification from importing non-parties, for all exports of mercury from the party’s territory in the reporting period.

(b) Eight parties answered “yes, exports to parties” and/or “yes, exports to non-parties”.

(c) Of these eight parties, seven responded “yes, exports to parties”, i.e., that they had received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3 for all exports of mercury from the party’s territory to another party to the Convention in the reporting period.

(d) Of the same eight parties, five responded “yes, exports to non-parties”, i.e., that they had received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3,

including any required certification from importing non-parties, for all exports of mercury from the party's territory to a non-party in the reporting period.

(e) It is to be noted that none of the eight parties that responded "yes, exports to parties" and/or "yes, exports to non-parties", i.e., that they had received consent or relied on a general notification of consent for exports from their territory, had sent copies of the consent forms<sup>3</sup> to the secretariat as recommended by the Conference of the Parties in decision MC-1/2. It was only at the time of national reporting, when the reporting format prompted parties to forward to the secretariat copies of the forms by which they had received consent, if not already done so, that one party forwarded copies of form A and another party forwarded a copy of form B.

(f) Furthermore, one party indicated that it was preparing to submit copies of consent forms to the secretariat, but expressed concern over the subsequent use of confidential commercial data. Another party indicated it was in possession of all the consent forms for each country to which it had exported. One party reported that it had received all the consent forms and had prepared a separate document listing the countries to which it exported, the date on which the written consent had been received, the quantity of the mercury, its uses, and other data. Another party indicated in a separate document the countries to which it exported mercury and the use of that mercury.

(g) Lastly, if parties answered "yes", and exports were based on a general notification in accordance with article 3, paragraph 7, they were requested to indicate, if available, the total amount exported and any relevant terms or conditions in the general notification related to use. Of the eight parties that answered "yes, exports to parties" or "yes, exports to non-parties", only one party reported that its export was based on a general notification. That party provided the total amount exported and information related to the use of the mercury.

24. The secretariat has a number of comments on the responses to question 3.5, as follows:

(a) The question relates to the export of mercury, which includes mixtures of mercury with other substances, including alloys of mercury, with a mercury concentration of at least 95 per cent by weight. It does not relate to the export of mercury compounds, mercury-added products or mercury wastes. If the party does not export mercury from its territory, it therefore follows that it would have no need to seek consent to export mercury and it would move to the next question.

(b) While the responses provided to question 3.5 for the reporting period suggest that the trade in mercury is limited, it is not clear whether all relevant information is adequately captured to permit the tracking of implementation of the obligations of the provisions of paragraphs 6 and 7 of article 3.

(c) Although eight Parties indicated "yes, exports to parties" and/or "yes, exports to non-parties", as only one party provided the secretariat with copies of form A and only one party provided a copy of form B, strictly speaking only two of the eight parties complied with the provisions relating to export of mercury as set out in article 3.

(d) While three parties, in separate documents, submitted supplementary information on the consent received, the information provided in the documents is not equivalent to that in forms A and B. It is therefore not clear to the secretariat whether the information provided satisfies the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of article 3.

(e) The secretariat notes that, in the absence of copies of form A or form B and/or other suitable information showing that the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of article 3 have been met, its ability to track information on mercury flows (destination, quantity, use) is limited. This affects the quality of the information that can be shared with the Conference of Parties.

(f) It is not clear from the short reports why parties have not provided the secretariat with the information requested both in the guidance adopted by the Conference of the Parties in decision MC-1/2 and in the reporting format.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Conference of the Parties, at its first meeting, by decision MC-1/2, adopted guidance in regard to article 3, particularly paragraphs 5 (a), 6 and 8 on stocks of mercury and mercury compounds, sources of supply of mercury and the export of mercury from parties and non-parties. The guidance, as set out in annexes II to IV of document UNEP/MC/COP.1/5, contains four forms for providing consent for trade in mercury under article 3: form A, for the provision of written consent by a party to the import of mercury; form B, for the provision of written consent by a non-party to the import of mercury; form C, for non-party certification of the source of mercury to be exported to a party (to be used in conjunction with form A and form D, when required); and form D, for general notification of consent to import mercury.

(g) It is possible that parties have been reluctant to provide copies of the consent forms because of concerns about commercial confidentiality. The secretariat, however, building on lessons learned under other instruments, can review, evaluate and propose ways for parties to provide the secretariat with the information required that allow commercial-in-confidence references to be removed before the information is made publicly available.

(h) The secretariat notes, on the basis of some of the parties' comments in the short reports, that they do not export mercury from their territory and thus have no need to seek consent. They should be able to answer "no" to the question and move to the next one. The addition of another possible answer, and box to tick, to differentiate between those parties that had not exported mercury during the reporting period and those (if any) that may have exported mercury, but did not receive consent to do so, would improve the clarity the form and allow tracking of the latter.

(i) Finally, one party reported its export of mercury for final disposal. This in fact should be reported under article 11, not under article 3.

25. In conclusion, the responses suggest that trade in mercury is limited, with only eight parties reporting that they received consent for exports in accordance with article 3. Nevertheless, without access to the consent forms or suitable information to confirm that the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of article 3 have been met, it is not possible to ascertain the volume of trade, nor the purposes for which the mercury was traded. Finally, the reporting format could be improved by the inclusion of an option that allows a party to answer "no" to any exports.

## B. Article 11: Mercury wastes

26. Question 11.2, on facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury and mercury compounds in the party's territory, reads as follows:

**Question 11.2:** \*Are there facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in the party's territory?

Yes

No

Do not know (*please explain*)

**If yes,** if the information is available, how much waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds has been subjected to final disposal under the reporting period?  
Please specify the method of the final disposal operation/operations.

27. In terms of responses to question 11.2:

(a) Twenty-one parties responded "yes", i.e., that they had facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in their territory.

(b) Seventy-nine parties responded "no", i.e., that they did not have facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in their territory.

(c) Two parties responded that they "did not know" if they had facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in their territory.

(d) Some parties pointed out that the Minamata Convention did not specify final disposal requirements.

(e) The parties that responded "yes" were asked to report, if available, how much waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds had been subjected to final disposal in the reporting period and to specify the method of the final disposal operation/operations. Four parties provided responses in this regard in terms of the quantities and methods of final disposal.

28. The secretariat has a number of comments on the responses to question 11.2, as follows:

(a) Question 11.2 relates only to facilities for the final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds, yet several responses referred to waste containing mercury or mercury compounds or contaminated with mercury or mercury compounds. The Conference of the Parties, in its decision MC-3/5, decided that the waste listed in table 1 of the annex to that decision should be regarded as mercury waste falling under subparagraph 2 (b) of article 11.

(b) From the answers provided, it cannot be said with certainty that all the parties that responded "yes" did in fact have facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in their territory.

(c) The term “final disposal” was interpreted in various ways by parties. Some acknowledged that their method of disposal was not sustainable. While, as noted above, the term “final disposal” is not contained in the text of the Convention, paragraph 3 of article 11 refers to the technical guidelines on the environmentally sound management of mercury waste developed under the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Waste and their Disposal.<sup>4</sup> For a facility to be considered a facility for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds, it is expected that the facility use the techniques outlined in those guidelines. They describe physico-chemical treatment, using stabilization and solidification processes, to meet the acceptance criteria of disposal facilities. In relation to final disposal operations, the technical guidelines describe the methods for disposal in specially engineered landfills and disposal in permanent storage (underground facilities) together with the measures to be taken to prevent releases and methylation of stabilized compounds, prevent fire and conduct long-term monitoring.

29. In conclusion, it is clear from the responses that some parties reported on disposal of wastes containing mercury or mercury compounds or wastes contaminated with mercury or mercury compounds rather than waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds. Furthermore, parties reported disposal methods that were unlikely to be considered as appropriate under the Basel Convention technical guidelines. On the basis of the responses, it is apparent that there are a limited number of facilities for final disposal.

### **C. Responses to part C, part D and part E of the reporting format**

30. Annex II to the present document provides an overview of the responses in the remaining parts of the reporting format. In part C, 50 parties provided comments on possible challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention; in part D, 24 parties provided comments on the reporting format and possible improvements; and, in part E, 24 parties took the opportunity to provide additional comment on the articles in free text.

31. In part C, respondents reported challenges related to the lack of human, financial and technical resources, along with the need to strengthen legal and institutional capacities. Other issues identified included the need to manage illegal trade in mercury; the trade of mercury as it relates to artisanal and small-scale gold mining; and the lack of alternatives to mercury. Respondents also noted the lack of information on and availability of mercury-free alternatives to mercury-added products as a challenge to their meeting the objectives of the Convention. Respondents also noted as a challenge the lack of a final disposal facility within their territories.

32. In part D, parties commented that they found the reporting format suitable, sufficient and user-friendly. Several of them suggested additional features to enable reports to be saved. In addition, an issue with the format in Arabic was identified and corrected in the meantime by the secretariat.

33. In part E, several parties provided clarification of their responses elsewhere in the format, in particular in relation to question 3.5 regarding consent for exports of mercury.

## **IV. Overall comments by the secretariat on the responses in the first short reports**

34. While the reporting rate for the reporting period is high and parties are to be congratulated for their efforts, review of the responses in the reports indicates that parties experienced some difficulties in responding to the four questions.

35. The wording of some questions resulted in a lack of clarity in the responses. As a consequence, possibilities for longer-term tracking and meaningful analysis of the responses are limited. It would be desirable for these issues to be addressed by the Conference of the Parties to enable clearer reporting on subsequent reporting periods. Issues for clarification include:

(a) In relation to question 3.1, the basis for reporting the “total amount” and whether it is total amount of mercury obtained or the total amount of ore containing mercury that is extracted;

(b) In relation to question 3.3, whether the obligation to endeavour to identify stocks and sources as set out in paragraph 5 of article 3 is a one-time effort or an ongoing effort that should also be reported in future reporting cycles;

<sup>4</sup> See document UNEP/CHW.15/6/Add.6 containing the draft updated technical guidelines on the environmentally sound management of wastes consisting of, containing or contaminated with mercury or mercury compounds as at 1 February 2021.

(c) In relation to question 3.5, the need to give Parties the possibility to indicate in the format that they did not export mercury;

(d) In relation to question 11.2, the need for greater clarity regarding the term “final disposal”.

36. With regard to question 3.3, a number of parties indicated that they could not yet report on their endeavour as they were awaiting the completion of their Minamata initial assessments. It appears that currently the status and availability of such assessments vary and, therefore, so does their potential usefulness in supporting reporting on this obligation. Given that the full reports are due soon, it would be helpful for the remaining Minamata initial assessments to be completed as soon as possible.

37. The responses to question 3.5 do not allow the Conference of the Parties to obtain an overview of the amount of mercury being traded between parties and non-parties or to ascertain whether the provisions of article 3 are being met. The lack of access to the consent forms by the Conference of the Parties inhibits its ability both to confirm that trade is taking place in accordance with the provisions of the Convention and to track and understand the flows and quantities of mercury being traded.

38. With regard to another aspect of trade, some parties noted challenges in tracing and managing consent for the transit of mercury through their territory, in cases of the re-export of mercury and in cases of the functioning of free-trade zones.

39. It was also noted that, in part A of the reporting format, where parties are to note the date of entry into force of the Convention for them, four parties omitted to report the date for them and 11 parties reported a date that was incorrect. In the short reports, the only reporting based on the date of entry into force is question 1 (c) under article 3, namely the requirement for a party to report on the amount of mercury produced by primary mines that existed at the date of entry into force of the Convention for it. For the full reports, however, the issue of the date of entry into force is more important. There are 17 provisions in the Convention that are tied to the date of entry into force of the Convention for a party and 13 related questions in the reporting format. It is therefore important that parties are aware of the correct date of entry into force of the Convention for them.

40. The Conference of the Parties, in its decision MC-3/13, requested the secretariat to prepare draft guidance for the full reporting format in order to clarify the information sought. This draft guidance is being made available to parties (in document UNEP/MC/COP.4/17) for use on a provisional basis to assist them in preparing their full national reports, due by 31 December 2021. (The reporting period for these reports is 16 August 2017 to 31 December 2020.) The draft guidance is also being submitted for consideration and possible adoption by the Conference of the Parties at its fourth meeting.

## V. Proposed action

41. The Conference of the Parties may wish to note the overview, provided by the secretariat, of the short reports submitted for the first reporting period, as set out in the present note, and to consider (a) clarifying the issues set out in paragraph 34; (b) identifying ways of improving the provision of the consent forms and supporting information requested under question 3.5; and (c) adopting a decision along the lines set out in annex I to the present document.

## Annex I

### Draft decision MC-4/[--]: National reporting pursuant to article 21 of the Minamata Convention on Mercury

The Conference of the Parties,

*Welcoming* the high rate of submission, the timeliness and the completeness of the short reports prepared by parties for the first reporting period,

*Noting* the efforts by the secretariat to support parties in fulfilling their obligation to report, including through use of the online reporting platform,

*Noting also* the many Minamata initial assessments that have been completed and provided to the secretariat for upload to the website,

*Recognizing* the importance of clarity in the information transmitted in national reports,

1. *Encourages* parties again to achieve a high rate of reporting for the next reporting period;
2. *Provides* clarification of the reporting format, as set out in the appendix to the present decision, and requests the secretariat to reflect that clarification in the reporting format and in the online reporting platform;
3. *Requests* parties to continue their ongoing efforts to endeavour to identify individual stocks and sources of mercury in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 3 of the Convention;
4. *Recalls* the obligation of parties that have received consent to export mercury to parties and/or non-parties to submit copies of the consent forms to the secretariat or to provide other suitable information showing that the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of article 3 of the Convention have been met;
5. *Encourages* parties that are developing Minamata initial assessments to complete them as soon as possible in order that they may be of support to implementation measures and national reporting efforts;
6. *Requests* the secretariat:
  - (a) On the basis of parties' experience of completing the first full reports, which are due by 31 December 2021, to identify any questions in the reporting format that may pose challenges to parties in responding and to propose to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting related clarifications, as appropriate;
  - (b) To report to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting on the implementation of the present decision.

#### Appendix

1. Regarding question 3.1, the basis for reporting the "total amount" is the total amount of **mercury** mined. For clarity, the words "of mercury" are to be inserted between "amount" and "mined" in subparagraph (c).

**Question 3.1:** Does the party have any primary mercury mines that were operating within its territory at the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party? (Para. 3.)

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please indicate:

(c) \*Total amount mined \_\_\_\_\_ metric tons per year

2. Regarding question 3.5, to allow parties to indicate that they did not export mercury, an additional box is to be added below the existing “No” to allow parties to indicate “No, no export”.

**Question 3.5:** \*Has the party received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3, including any required certification from importing non-parties, for all exports of mercury from the party’s territory in the reporting period? (para. 6, para. 7)

- Yes, exports to parties
- Yes, exports to non-parties
- No

**If yes...**

3. Regarding question 11.2, in the absence of a definition of “final disposal” under the Minamata Convention, parties may wish to refer to the definition provided in the technical guidelines on the environmentally sound management of wastes consisting of, containing or contaminated with mercury or mercury compounds under the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal.

## Annex II

**Details of the responses to each of the four questions of the first short national reports received for the first reporting period (16 August 2017 to 31 December 2019)**

**A. Article 3: Mercury supply sources and trade**

**Question 3.1 on primary mercury mines operating at the time of entry into force of the Convention for the party**

<p><b>Question 3.1:</b> Does the party have any primary mercury mines that were operating within its territory at the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party? (para. 3)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><b>If yes, please indicate:</b></p> <p>(c) *Total amount mined _____ metric tons per year</p>
---

Responses to question 3.1	
Two parties responded "yes"	100 parties responded "no"
China and Mexico	Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, Chile, China (Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region), Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia
Party	Total amount mined ____ metric tons per year
China	85,000 metric tons of ore extracted in 2017 144,500 metric tons of ore extracted in 2018 No amount entered for 2019
Mexico	805 metric tons of mercury mined in 2017 No amount entered for 2018 and 2019

Additional information supplied or comments made by parties on question 3.1 (c)	
Indonesia	Indonesia indicated that it had no mercury mines operating within its territory, but that there were mining sites in the country that could be sources of mercury and that required close supervision in order to not be used for illegal mining and other activities.
Mexico	Mexico reported that four mines were active and that they had been authorized before the entry into force of the Convention for the country. The mining concessions were granted until the end of 2020.

**Question 3.3 on stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year**

**Question 3.3:** Has the party endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year that are located within its territory? (para. 5)

- Yes  
 No

(a) \*If the party answered yes to question 3.3 above:

(i) Please attach the results of your endeavour or indicate where it is available on the internet, unless unchanged from a previous reporting round.

(ii) Supplemental: Please provide any related information – for example, on the use or disposal of mercury from such stocks and sources.

<b>Responses to question 3.3</b>	
45 parties responded “yes”	57 parties responded “no”
Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, China (including Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region), Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechia, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Finland, France, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Singapore, Slovenia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States	Armenia, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Jamaica, Jordan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia
Regarding question 3.3 (a) (i), of the 45 parties that responded “yes”, 33 parties attached the results of their endeavour or indicated where it was available on the Internet	Regarding question 3.3 (a) (i), for the 45 parties that responded “yes”, 5 parties did not submit any information on the results of their endeavour
Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chad, Chile, China (Macao Special Administrative Region), Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Finland, Germany, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Kuwait, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Slovenia, Saint Lucia, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United States	Botswana, Czechia, France, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom
Regarding question 3.3 (a) (i), of the 45 parties that responded “yes”, 8 parties attached other information such as laws or updates on their endeavour	
China, Colombia, Hungary, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Rwanda, Singapore and South Africa	

<b>Some responses to question 3.3 (a) (i): Results of parties' endeavour to identify stocks and sources</b>	
Argentina	Argentina reported 400 metric tons and 2.7 metric tons of mercury as a by-product from two precious metal mines in its jurisdiction in 2018.
Germany	Germany identified two individual stocks of mercury exceeding 50 metric tons in recycling facilities. One facility had a stock of 135 metric tons and the second facility a stock of 751 metric tons in 2018.
Netherlands	The Netherlands reported that an installation using mercury had ceased to operate in 2019. All mercury and mercury waste from the installation had been considered waste and sent to Germany for permanent storage.
Norway	Norway conducted a systematic endeavour utilizing the guidance document. Norway determined that it did not have any of the supply sources that could generate stocks exceeding 10 metric tons within its territory (including mercury mining and manufacturing processes in which mercury or mercury compounds were used).

United States	The United States reported on two individual stocks of mercury, both of which belonged to the Government and both of which, given the export ban in force in the country, are not able to be placed on sale in the United States or globally. The United States also reported on its efforts to begin operating a long-term storage facility in this regard. The United States also reported on its inventory tool and reporting mechanism that enables it regularly to ascertain all relevant information on mercury.
---------------	--

<b>Some responses to question 3.3 (a) (ii): Supplemental: Related information, for example on the use or disposal of mercury from such stocks and sources</b>	
Argentina	Argentina produces elemental mercury as a by-product. This mercury has to be exported for disposal. In this regard, elemental mercury has been exported to Switzerland for stabilization and to be transformed into mercury sulphide and thereafter sent to Germany for final disposal.
European Union	<p>According to article 12, paragraph 1, of Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council on mercury, economic operators within the industry sectors referred to in points (a), chlor-alkali industry, (b), cleaning of natural gas, and (c), non-ferrous mining and smelting operations, of article 11 shall send, each year, the following to the competent authorities of the Member States concerned:</p> <p>(a) Data on the total amount of mercury waste stored in each of their installations;</p> <p>(b) Data on the total amount of mercury waste sent to individual facilities undertaking the temporary storage, the conversion and, if applicable, solidification of mercury waste, or the permanent storage of mercury waste that underwent conversion and, if applicable, solidification;</p> <p>(c) The location and contact details of each facility referred to in point (b);</p> <p>(d) A copy of the certificate provided by the operator of the facility undertaking the temporary storage of mercury waste, in accordance with article 14, paragraph 1, of the Regulation;</p> <p>(e) A copy of the certificate provided by the operator of the facility undertaking the conversion and, if applicable, solidification of mercury waste, in accordance with article 14, paragraph 2, of the Regulation;</p> <p>(f) A copy of the certificate provided by the operator of the facility undertaking permanent storage of mercury waste that underwent conversion and, if applicable, solidification in accordance with article 14, paragraph 3, of the Regulation.</p>
Finland	<p>During the reporting period, there was one chlor-alkali facility using the mercury electrolysis process in Finland. That process was shut down in December 2017. Mercury from the facility is considered to be waste, and most of it has already been sent for disposal (stabilization followed by underground disposal) in Germany.</p> <p>There was also one zinc smelter that generated mercury. The amount of mercury generated annually varies. In 2017 and 2018 it exceeded 10 metric tons. This mercury is also considered to be waste and sent for disposal (stabilization followed by underground disposal).</p>
Ireland	<p>1. While there is one natural gas cleaning facility within the State, its operation does not require mercury purification owing to the quality of the gas. It is a licensed facility and Ireland will monitor the situation regularly.</p> <p>2. The Commissioners of Irish Lights are upgrading the lighting technology in lighthouses, resulting in the generation of elemental mercury, but in quantities below reporting thresholds. The waste elemental mercury generated during the reporting period was sent to another European Union Member State for environmentally sound management.</p> <p>3. Ireland employs a comprehensive licensing regime that would assist in the identification of any such stocks of mercury.</p>
Switzerland	<p>Stocks of mercury or mercury compounds located within the territory of Switzerland could temporarily exceed 50 metric tons. The stored mercury and mercury sulphide originate exclusively from the treatment of mercury wastes according to paragraph 2 of article 11 of the Convention.</p> <p>Switzerland has measures in place to ensure that all mercury and mercury sulphide is managed in an environmentally sound manner and is either reused as permitted by the Minamata Convention or exported for environmentally sound disposal according to the provisions of paragraph 3 of article 11 of the Minamata Convention and the Basel Convention. Each export of mercury for reuse must be authorized by the Federal Office for the Environment. Authorizations are granted only if the mercury is not excess mercury from the decommissioning of chlor-alkali facilities and if the importing country has provided its written consent to the import of the mercury for a use allowed under the Minamata Convention and the national legislation of the importing country. On the basis of the Swiss legislation, an authorization for the export of mercury shall be granted, on application, only for the following uses:</p> <p>(a) Analysis and research purposes;</p> <p>(b) Manufacture of discharge lamps;</p>

	(c) Maintenance of rolling seam welding machines that work with roller heads containing mercury; (d) Manufacture of dental amalgam capsules.
--	---

### **Question 3.5 on the export of mercury from the party's territory in the reporting period**

**Question 3.5:** \*Has the party received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3, including any required certification from importing non-parties, for all exports of mercury from the party's territory in the reporting period? (para. 6, para. 7)

- Yes, exports to parties  
 Yes, exports to non-parties  
 No

If yes,

(a) and the party has submitted copies of the consent forms to the secretariat, then no further information is needed.

If the party has not previously provided such copies, it is recommended that it do so.

Otherwise, please provide other suitable information showing that the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of article 3 have been met.

Supplemental: Please provide information on the use of the exported mercury.

(b) If exports were based on a general notification in accordance with article 3, paragraph 7, please indicate, if available, the total amount exported and any relevant terms or conditions in the general notification related to use.

Responses to question 3.5	
Seven parties responded "yes, exports to parties"	Five parties responded "yes, exports to non-parties"
Japan, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland and Thailand	Japan, Mexico, Singapore, Switzerland and Thailand
94 parties responded "no"	
Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, Chile, China (including Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region), Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tonga, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Zambia	

In terms of mercury export destinations:	
Japan listed:	Thailand
Mexico listed:	Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Chad, El Salvador, Egypt, Georgia, Guatemala, Guyana, China (Hong Kong Special Administrative Region), India, Kenya, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, South Africa, Togo, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam
Peru listed:	Bolivia (Plurinational State of), India, Japan, Mexico
Switzerland listed:	Germany, Israel, Mexico, Norway, Spain, Turkey

Thailand listed:	India and Singapore before Thailand became a party to the Convention, and listed India after Thailand, and later India, became party to the Convention
Note: Slovakia reported that it exported mercury to Germany for final disposal.	

<b>In terms of the information submitted:</b>	
Two parties submitted to the secretariat copies of the consent forms for their exports	Four parties submitted other information
Peru, Singapore	Canada, Japan, Switzerland, Thailand
Four parties provided information on the use or disposal of the exported mercury	Four parties indicated that they had received (all) consent from the importing countries, but the forms have yet to reach the secretariat
Peru, Slovakia, Switzerland, Thailand	Japan, Mexico, Switzerland, Thailand
Note: Parties indicated the following uses for the exported mercury: manufacturing of mercury salts; chlor-alkali production; manufacture of pre-dosed capsules for dental amalgam fillings; research and analysis: porosimetry; polyvinyl chloride pipe production; fluorescent lamp production; medical devices and sphygmomanometers; and final disposal. In some cases, no use was stated in the documentation submitted to the secretariat.	
Note: South Africa initially submitted a Rotterdam consent notification.	

<b>Exports based on a general notification pursuant to paragraph 7 of article 3</b>	
One party relied on a general notification	Amount exported and use
Japan, for export to Thailand	1.8 metric tons, use not stated
Note: Only the following four parties have notified the secretariat of there being a general notification of consent in place to import as per article 3, paragraphs 6 and 7: Canada, Japan, Thailand, United States.	

<b>Additional information supplied or comments made by parties on question 3.5</b>	
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	The Plurinational State of Bolivia raised its concern that the information contained in a consent form A (provision of written consent by a party to the import of mercury) could be incomplete or false.
Peru	Peru provided recommendations to optimize the written consent procedure for the import of mercury, including the provision of information on transit countries, re-export points and the role of free-trade zones and the establishment of a deadline for receipt of a response from the party concerned. Peru also proposed making it easier to identify clearly the intended uses of the traded mercury. The importance of strengthening the capacities of border control personnel was emphasized, along with the development of protocols to identify, seize, transport, handle and label mercury. Peru also noted that there were obstacles associated with all of those actions to control the illegal trade in mercury, which in turn impeded efforts to reduce and eliminate mercury. Peru also noted that it needed to build its national capacities to manage the temporary storage of mercury, especially seized mercury.

## B. Article 11: Mercury wastes

### Question 11.2 on facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury and mercury compounds in the party's territory

<p><b>Question 11.2:</b> *Are there facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in the party's territory?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Do not know (<i>please explain</i>)</p> <p>If <b>yes</b>, if the information is available, how much waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds has been subjected to final disposal under the reporting period? Please specify the method of the final disposal operation/operations.</p>
--

Responses to question 11.2	
21 parties responded “yes”	80 parties responded “no”
Botswana, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Ecuador, European Union, Germany, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Mexico, Norway, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, South Africa, Thailand, Tonga, Uganda, Uruguay, United States, Viet Nam	Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Chad, China (Hong Kong Special Administrative Region), Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d’Ivoire, Croatia, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tuvalu, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, Vanuatu, Zambia
Two parties responded “do not know”	
China (including Macao Special Administrative Region) and Iceland	

Parties that reported how much waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds was subject to final disposal under the reporting period (in metric tons)	
Canada	Amount: 56.2 (2017), 56.4 (2018) Method: Sulfur stabilization
Germany	Amount: 443.2 (2018) Method: Solidification
Norway	Amount: 1,172 (2017–2019) Method: Mercury sulphide method
Thailand	Amount: 852 (2017), 1,721 (2018), 1,090 (2019) Method: Various

Additional information supplied, or comments made by parties with regard to question 11.2	
Peru	Peru noted the importance of adopting a mechanism to encourage the development of technology to stabilize mercury and for its final disposal, as Peru did not yet have a facility for the definite disposal of mercury, requiring it to export the mercury.

### C. Responses to part C, part D and part E of the reporting format

49 parties responded to part C, providing their comments on possible challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention	
27 parties	raised concerns about the lack of technical resources. In the responses received, technical resources covered a broad range of topics, including, but were not limited to, data-gathering capacity, research, the monitoring of mercury emissions, capacity-building and training.
22 parties	mentioned the lack of access to financial resources as a major challenge in meeting the objectives of the Convention.
14 parties	saw the lack of a final disposal facility within their territories as a challenge. The responses on final disposal of mercury wastes, at times, also included reference to the need for the environmentally sound management of mercury waste and interim storage of mercury.
9 parties	pointed to the need to strengthen legal and institutional capacity.
6 parties	viewed the lack of alternatives and the lack of information about the availability of mercury-free alternatives for mercury-added products as challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention.
7 parties	considered the lack of awareness-raising and the lack of capacity to share information as challenges for parties in meeting the objectives of the Convention and stressed the need to mainstream mercury issues.
6 parties	raised illegal trade or the smuggling of mercury and mercury compounds as challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention.
5 parties	viewed artisanal and small-scale gold mining as a challenge in meeting the objectives of the Convention. Some parties cited the remoteness of the areas concerned, data gaps, difficulties in changing the behaviour of miners and the lack of alternatives and awareness of the mercury-free alternatives.
3 parties	cited the lack of human resources to implement the Convention as a challenge in meeting its objectives.
3 parties	responded that they were in the middle of carrying out their Minamata initial assessments or that they had just become a party to the Convention, which prevented them from providing input into part C. Their inputs would, however, be shared once the Minamata initial assessment had been completed or once adoption of the Convention in the country had been completed.
2 parties	viewed primary mercury mining as a challenge.
1 party	mentioned that the importation to its territory of mercury for indigenous and medicinal purposes posed a challenge for the party in meeting the objectives of the Convention.
1 party	cited the lack of incentives for the use of mercury-free or low-mercury products and alternatives as a challenge in meeting the objectives of the Convention.

24 parties responded to part D, providing their comments on the reporting format and possible improvements	
8 parties	found the reporting format suitable, sufficient and user-friendly.
5 parties	suggested additional technical options in the online format, including to allow parties to save their reports before sending them, to save them in PDF format and to enable parties to show that activities or measures were "in progress".
2 parties	suggested that, in question 3.5, parties should be given the option of answering "not applicable" and that parties should be allowed to choose two of the three options.
1 party	suggested that there be a dedicated format for the short reports.
1 party	encountered translation issues in the Arabic version.

24 parties responded to part E, providing additional comments on articles 3 and 11 in free text.	
13 parties	provided additional comments on Article 3.
1 party	pointed out that the problem with form A was that countries wishing to import mercury might provide incomplete or false information.
1 party	confirmed the existence of a comprehensive restriction on exports of mercury from its territory.
4 parties	named the country that provided consent for the export of mercury.
2 parties	reiterated that they had either not received any requests for export or that they did not export mercury.
3 parties provided additional comments on article 11.	
acknowledged the lack of a final disposal facility for mercury and mercury compounds but noted the existence of facilities for other hazardous wastes in their jurisdictions.	