Giving effect to article 22 of the Minamata Convention on Mercury: effectiveness evaluation

Addendum

Indicators

Note by the secretariat

I. Introduction

1. In decision MC-3/10, the Conference of the Parties recognized the efforts to advance the work on the effectiveness evaluation at its third meeting, invited parties to submit views on the indicators set out in annex I to the decision and requested the secretariat to compile those views in advance of the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

2. To support parties in submitting their views on the indicators, the secretariat developed a plan of work in consultation with the Bureau and then notified the parties of the plan. The plan of work is outlined in paragraph 12 of UNEP/MC/COP.4/18. The present note outlines the outcome of that work and describes the resultant compilation of views set out in UNEP/MC/COP.4/INF/11, for use by the Conference of the Parties at its fourth meeting.

II. Outcome of the intersessional work on indicators

3. The intersessional period saw active engagement by parties on the matter of submitting their views on the indicators in advance of the fourth meeting.

4. Following an information session held on 17 September 2020, initial views were prepared and shared by Canada, the European Union, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Kuwait, Mexico, Norway, Oman, Qatar, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United States of America. Thereafter, parties participated in an exchange session in two parts over three days in February 2021 (on 2 and 4 February

---

* 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.
1 Information related to intersessional work on indicators, including all documents, meeting and other supporting information, along with access to a dedicated online workspace, is available on the Minamata Convention website, in the “Effectiveness evaluation” section of the “Intersessional work” web page, accessible under the “Meetings” tab of the main menu.
2021) to discuss their submissions with one another. Following that exchange session, the secretariat was requested to further support parties by preparing a compilation of the initial views and facilitating an additional exchange session.

5. The compilation of initial views prepared for the additional exchange session focused on specific comments on each of the proposed indicators.

6. The additional exchange session took place on 4 March 2021. Noting that the effectiveness evaluation was to assess the overall ability of the Convention at the global level to achieve the objectives of the Convention, the secretariat focused the additional exchange session on specific comments on certain proposed indicators.

7. Following these exchange sessions parties were invited to submit their views on the proposed indicators by 31 March 2021 to enable the secretariat to compile them in advance of the fourth meeting. Ten parties submitted views (Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia, European Union, Japan, Norway, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States).

8. Parties’ comments with regard to indicators included the following:

(a) A well-defined set of various indicators is an important tool for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Convention;

(b) Describing indicators in terms of their relevance to the effectiveness evaluation can be useful;

(c) In some instances, indicators need to be adjusted to be consistent with the Convention text;

(d) In some instances, indicators need to be adjusted to be consistent with the format for article 22 reporting, which is a source of information for the effectiveness evaluation;

(e) Indicators sometimes overlap or are duplicative and would benefit from simplification;

(f) The proposed indicators may need to be refined based on the experience of their use;

(g) There will be different levels of information completeness, uncertainty in some of the estimates and possibly different understandings on data sources;

(h) Control measures are to make direct progress on the Convention’s objective (outlined in article 1) and are supported to that end by enabling measures;

(i) The effectiveness evaluation and its indicators are not a compliance check;

(j) Further work is needed on baselines.

III. Compilation

9. The compilation of the views of parties is set out in document UNEP/MC/COP.4/INF/11 and is set out as follows:

(a) Annex I contains the views submitted after the exchange sessions in 2021, compiled in alphabetical order by party, and comprising the views of the following parties: Argentina, Canada, China, Colombia, European Union, Japan, Norway, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States;

(b) Annex II contains the views contributed by parties that decided not to add to or update the initial views they submitted following the information session in September 2020, compiled in alphabetical order by party, comprising the views of the following parties: Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kuwait, Mexico, Oman, Qatar, United Republic of Tanzania.