

Submitting party or organization: Canada

Contact person: National Focal Point, Alison Dickson Alison.Dickson@canada.ca

Comments on Draft Report on the work of the ad hoc technical group on effectiveness evaluation

Line number	Comments
47	Replace “promoting” human health and the environment with “protecting”, as per Art 1.
68-69	This is incorrect. Art 22(3) does not limit the evaluation to any particular number of information streams. While four types of information streams are listed in Art 22(3)(a) to (d) as examples, the chapeau of paragraph 3 contains the word “including”, which means that other types of information can also be used.
70-71	The wording used to describe item (ii), “information and knowledge... publicly available” is not at all in Art 22(3). Please do not reinterpret the treaty text.
83-86	For clarity, indicate that the levels are explained in section III. Also, it would be helpful to the reader to show the pyramid of levels in the Executive Summary right away.
91	List proposed entities and their names.
384	Section 1. Information and Analysis flow – please clarify who will be responsible for undertaking the work for each level. The secretariat, expert groups, consultants, etc?
407	Clear criteria for this [scientific, environmental, technical, financial, economic] data collection should be established. Who will develop this criteria for these non-monitoring resources?
414	Clarify who will undertake the quality control of monitoring data at level 2, which is a critical function of the work to develop a global monitoring report for use by the effectiveness evaluation committee.
436 650 668 1490 1498	It appears as though a specific Integrated Assessment group will produce the Integrated Assessment Report at level 4 (ie. collecting additional non-mercury information for further analysis and modelling of future trends, BAU before/after scenarios, assessing 4 th policy question, undertaking ground studies to provide the basis of the effectiveness evaluation). There is also a need to clarify the number of experts intended for this group as well as the expertise that will be required for this integrating function, for example in a TOR.
496-497	Add the definition of “monitoring indicators” and clarify how it differs from “outcome indicators”?
521, 524, 528	Define what the double asterisks (**) under the Minamata Convention objective, Articles 8, 9 and 16 refer to.
522	B5. Process indicator for Article 3: Number of parties that have developed an inventory of stocks and sources of supply. The obligation in the treaty is that <i>each party shall endeavour to identify individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 MT as well as sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 MT/yr. As there is no obligation to develop an inventory, this indicator should be updated to reflect the treaty text as follows: “Number of parties that have endeavoured to identify stocks and sources of supply”.</i>
522	B6. Also consider Article 21 reports as an indicator. Parties’ answers to Article 3 question 4 of the reporting format should be the primary source for this information.

522	B7. Also consider Article 21 reports as an indicator. Some parties have issued general notifications of consent. Therefore, no Article 3 forms will be issued for imports to these countries. However, parties must report in Article 3 question 5 on the national reporting format on if “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.”
522	B10. Outcome indicator for Article 10: The amount of mercury storage in an environmentally sound way as identified in the inventory of stocks. As indicated above, there is neither an obligation on Parties to develop an inventory nor to identify the amount of mercury being stored. Remove this outcome indicator.
522	Notes: “Data from non-Parties is important too”. How would non-party data be collected? What is the relevance of non-party data to the effectiveness of the Convention? Is it important for modelling? If so, further explanation is needed on how non-party data is relevant to the article-by-article indicator process or if non-party data is more relevant to the overall effectiveness of the Convention.
523	C1. Please add more detail to the indicator and its source of information. Which key provisions? Which individual indicators will be used? What are the sources of information for this indicator? Article 21 reports?
523	C2. Information source is industry stakeholders. Industry is not subject to the treaty, therefore not required to provide this information, so how can you ensure that the information will be complete? What if some industries are cooperative, but others are not?
523	C6. Information source is trade and customs data. This data will be challenging to obtain for parties who do not have customs codes to distinguish mercury-added products from non-mercury-added products.
523	Re “Notes that some data on products may not be obtainable from public sources”. Which data on products may not be available? What are the implications of this? How can this data be obtained from private sources?
524	D4. Process indicator for Article 4: Number of parties that have enacted “appropriate” laws and regulations to require BAT/BEP for new sources. The word “appropriate” highlights an element of judgement that should inherently be applied to all of the measures taken by Parties to meet the obligations of the treaty; as such it is redundant. Remove the word appropriate. Furthermore, Parties have the option of meeting this requirement through the use of emission limit values that are consistent with the application of BAT/BEP. Add text to reflect this option. Suggested text: Number of parties that require BAT/BEP or emission limit values consistent with the application of best available techniques
524	D2 Cross-cutting outcome: total amount of Hg emitted and released and D3 & D6 Outcome indicator for Articles 8 and 9: Total amount of Hg emitted or released. There will be many uncertainties associated with these output for these indicators as Parties are not obligated to share the information collected within their inventory publically.
524	D8: The indicator should be the number of parties who have established “and maintained” an inventory. The maintenance of the inventory is a treaty requirement.

	An equivalent indicator for parties who have established and maintained an emissions inventory is missing and should be added.
524	D10. The treaty does not require parties to develop an inventory of contaminated sites. Likewise, the Art 21 reporting format does not contain any questions on whether a party has developed such an inventory. This indicator should be removed.
525	E2. Process indicator for Article 13. Neither the treaty nor the reporting format specifically request the dollar amount of the resources provided to the GEF, the SIP or for bilateral support. Other sources of publically available information to collect this information could be included (beyond the reporting format).
526	F1. The indicator is: "Proportion of issues that the Committee was able to resolve, including indications of systematic issues". It is beyond the mandate of the ICC to resolve issues. Rather, their role is to examine compliance issues and make recommendations on how they can be resolved. Suggested text: Number of issues that that Committee identified, including indications of systemic issues, if any.
528	G1. Monitoring indicator for Article 16: Mercury levels in selected human populations. This monitoring indicator is already taken into consideration under Section A: Minamata Convention Article 1: Objective, therefore should be removed from Section G.
527	H2. Process indicator for Article 17: number of parties that have established information exchange mechanisms related to mercury. The treaty neither obligates that an information exchange mechanism be established nor that it must occur through the Secretariat. Further, the reporting format simply asks whether the party has facilitated the exchange of information. Therefore, this indicator should be revised to align with treaty text and the reporting format as follows: Number of parties that have facilitated the exchange of information. The source of information on the indicator should be from Article 21 reporting.
528	H5 and H6: should specify the "number of parties within their territory". Otherwise, a party could just share general information on mercury that is not specific to their own population and environment. The aim of Art 18 is to promote transparency.
528	H7 should be "number of parties that have cooperated to develop and improve...", as per the treaty text.
528	H8. What is the rationale for this process indicator for Article 19? Number of Parties contributing data and knowledge to integrated assessments.
528	H8 and H9: why is their focus on only two types of activities, while there are five listed in Article 19?
530	J1. Process indicator on Article 21, reporting should be specified as: The proportion of parties reporting, proportion of reports received on time, and proportion of reports with complete information.
548	Art 3, para 4: it is not correct to put in an implementation date of 2035. The party has 15 years to implement after entry into force of the Convention FOR IT. If you want to put in the first possible date, then it would actually be 2017+15 = 2032.
548	Art 8 and 9, 2022: again, the date of implementation depends on when the Convention entered into force for that party. If you want to show the first possible date, clarify that point.
548	Art 8, 2017. This is incorrect. A party has up to ten years after entry into force FOR IT to implement controls for existing facilities. The earliest possible date would be 2027.

591	Paragraph 54: Suggest adding underlined text ,“Another critical use of models in effectiveness evaluation is to attribute changes to levels in mercury to <u>the implementation of Convention measures.</u> ”
621	Paragraph 58. Who is actually going to develop, test and run these models for the benefit of the treaty effectiveness evaluation? Academia? Consultants?
629	Scientific and technical functions - Clarify the relationship between the monitoring and modelling group and the integrated assessment group. Are they subgroups of a scientific and technical group?
633-637	Please see same comment for lines 68-69.
642	Identify the name of the expert group and use the same terminology throughout the document for consistency and clarity.
657	Identify the name of the expert group and use the same terminology throughout the document for consistency and clarity.
681	Diagram 2 - It is unclear whether the (1) monitoring and modelling group and the (2) integrated assessment groups form two parts of one large scientific and technical group or whether there are they are their own separate groups. What is the most efficient way to undertake the work given the breadth of the work that is required?
790-796	Clarify if there is intended to be one overarching scientific and technical function group with sub-groups for (1) monitoring and modelling and (2) integration assessment. Ensure consistency and consistent language throughout the text.
805	Decision 4 – Clarify the square brackets as per input above.
695	The development of the emissions and releases report will need the involvement of experts beyond the expertise of the Secretariat. If there are other reports that will need assistance beyond the Secretariat, please identify them and the potential source of expertise.
708-726	Clarify if these groups are stand alone or are subgroups of a scientific and technical group.
742	Move this section up above line 727 so that all options for the delivery of scientific and expert functions are presented together.
751	As stated in Article 22, para 1 of the treaty, the word beginning is missing from para 69: “the COP shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Convention “ <u>beginning</u> ” no later than six years”.
756	Paragraph 70. As per the comment above for paragraph 69, the treaty indicates that “the COP shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Convention “ <u>beginning</u> ” no later than six years”. Therefore, the outcome of the first effectiveness evaluation may be available by 2023.
759	There are both two and four year cycles of the reports under Article 21. Please add text to reflect this.
770	The diagram shows the integrated monitoring and modelling report will be produced between the first and second meeting of the EE committee. Please explain the rationale for this. It seems that it would be most useful for the EE committee if both reports were available for their review at the same time. Or does the implementation assessment report rely in any way on the outcomes of the first EE committee meeting?
797-799	List the options stated in above paragraphs. i.e. Secretariat vs contractor

922	While each Party may choose to conduct their own biomonitoring, only information at the regional level is required for effectiveness evaluation. Not every party must do their own biomonitoring.
972	What do short, medium, and long term mean in years?
1070	Clarify whether it is 30 monitoring sites per large geographical area or 30 monitoring sites globally?
1094	“an oversight body should be kept informed of the studies planned and carried out” is this oversight body another group set out by the COP or EE committee, or is this intended to mean the WHO? Please clarify what oversight body is being referred to. What, if any oversight body would be required for other media?
1132	Clarify who will conduct further evaluation work on existing biotic data, including assessing what data are relevant, comparable and able to be harmonized.
1203	Clarify which group the representative from the monitoring arrangement is from. Is this a representative from the scientific and technical group or the modelling and monitoring group?
1259	Draft terms of reference of the global monitoring arrangements: the draft TOR need to be strengthened by re-writing with action statements not as a proposal, for example, on filling gaps. Much of the information in the TOR is technical and should be included elsewhere in the EE report. The TOR should clearly lay out the terms under which the GMA will be conducted.
1264-66	[to carry out the scientific and technical functions identified in section III]
1378	Identify the name of the expert group and use the same terminology throughout the document for consistency and clarity (e.g. the monitoring and modelling group).
1383-85	Is this referring to the integrated assessment report?
1393	Identify the name of the expert group and use the same terminology throughout the document for consistency and clarity (e.g. the monitoring and modelling group).
1448	How will the group coordinate monitoring activities on mercury? This needs explanation in an earlier section of the document.
1497	What is the definition of a ground study? This concept needs to be explained.

Comments on Draft Information Document: Background information on mercury monitoring

Line number	Comments
24	The title of this section indicates that approaches for filling gaps in monitoring data will be discussed. This is not the case for the air or the biota sections. To a certain extent, some of these gaps have been described in the main document in Annex 1 (Technical information on monitoring, 1026-1140).
297	Explain who undertakes or what steps are taken to ensure that data coming from regional and global monitoring networks is quality controlled before it is linked to the GOS4M database.
309-312	The number/type of groups working with the data that is contained within the GOS4M is unclear. Clarify what work will be done by the “monitoring and modelling” group in order to generate the monitoring report.
315	The section on available networks for human biomonitoring needs to be expanded to provide more information, similar to the other sections. For example, clearly identify which regional and national programmes summarized within the air section include human biomonitoring (line 317).
323	Insert the following information after line 323: “There are a number of human biomonitoring initiatives in Canada. In particular, the Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS) is an on-going national survey which collects information from Canadians about their general health. Since 2007, the CHMS has collected biomonitoring data, including mercury in blood. Publically available reports provide the results of biomonitoring from each two-year cycle as well as provide a comparison between datasets from multiple cycles. On a regional level, there are regular Inuit Health Surveys taking place....”
346	The “why is it important to monitor Hg in biota?” title and content is helpful. Adding a similar section to the air and human biomonitoring sections would help improve understanding of why monitoring in each medium is necessary. Another important reason to conduct monitoring in all media is modelling. Explaining where additional sampling is needed to improve modelling capabilities could be explored further in this document.
395-1002	The biotic monitoring approach is well defined. However, it is expected that finite resources will be an issue to undertake this monitoring approach. What 1 or 2 species that are found across the world can be used as comparable global indicators for biota?
589-591	There are other indicators of effectiveness for Article 7. It would be challenging to know if the mercury levels in biota from tropical areas can be attributed to ASGM.
854	Canada also monitors biota in freshwater under the Chemicals Management Plan (CMP).
887	North America – Terrestrial box: Is “NMP” supposed to be referring to the Northern Contaminants Programme (NCP)? Or is NMP a different program?
977-1001	There are other countries with substantive fisheries other than the US, Japan, and the EU who could participate in sampling. Is there a reason why the US, Japan, and the EU were singled out?
977-1001	Would national or regional food agencies be a source of information for commercial fishing since many regularly test food at processing plants and food that is imported/exported? Could these then be traced back to the fishing areas that fish were harvested from?

1290	Human Health: Identify where additional biomonitoring data is needed, if any. Identify where there are regional gaps.
------	---