



---

**Implementation and Compliance Committee**  
**Minamata Convention on Mercury**  
**Fourth meeting**  
Online, 13–14 September 2022

## **Report on the fourth meeting of the Implementation and Compliance Committee of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, held online on 13 and 14 September June 2022**

### **Item 1**

#### **Opening of the meeting**

1. The fourth meeting of the Implementation and Compliance Committee of the Minamata Convention on Mercury (hereinafter referred to as “the Committee”) was held online on 13 and 14 September 2022.
2. Ms. Paulina Riquelme (Chile), Chair of the Committee, opened the meeting at 1 p.m. (Geneva time) on Tuesday 13 September 2022. She greeted Ms. Itsuki Kuroda (Japan), Vice-Chair and Rapporteur for the meeting, and welcomed Committee members thanking them for their interest in the work of the Committee and noted that she looked forward to productive discussions.
3. In her opening remarks, Ms. Monika Stankiewicz, Executive Secretary of the Minamata Convention, welcomed members of the Committee to the fourth meeting, congratulated new members for being elected by COP-4 to serve in the Committee and highlighted the important role of the Committee work in the intersessional period until COP-5 in late 2023 to advance implementation of the Minamata Convention. She further noted that during the present meeting the Committee would for the first time consider and respond to the preliminary report of the secretariat on the full national reports – submitted for the 16 August 2017 to 31 December 2020 reporting period in accordance with article 21 – focusing on the four recurrent questions as well as the remainder of the questions in Articles 3 and 11, as well as the responses received to questions on Articles 13 and 14.
4. Following the opening statement and introductory remarks by Committee members, the Chair noted that three members of the Committee, Mr. Mve Beh Jean Hervé (Gabon), Mr. Mohammed Khashashneh (Jordan), and Ms. Meredith Henry-Cumberbatch (Suriname), were unable to attend the meeting.
5. The following members were present at the fourth meeting:  
From the African States:  
Mr. Musa Kuzumila Ngunila (Tanzania)  
Mr. Christopher Kanema (Zambia)  
From the Asia-Pacific States:  
Mr. Abbas Torabi (Iran)  
Ms. Itsuki Kuroda (Japan)

From the Eastern European States:

Ms. Dubravka Marija Krekovic (Croatia)

Mr. Atanas Stoyanov Dishkelov (Bulgaria)

Ms. Jelena Kovačević (Montenegro)

From the Latin American and Caribbean States:

Ms. Paulina Riquelme (Chile)

Ms. Jimena Nieto Carrasco (Colombia)

From the Western European and other States:

Ms. Anik Beaudoin (Canada)

Ms. Helga Schrott (Austria)

Ms. Karoliina Anttonen (Finland)

## **Item 2**

### **Organizational matters**

#### **(a) Adoption of the agenda**

6. The Committee adopted the agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (UNEP/MC/ICC.3/1):

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
  - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
  - (b) Organization of work.
3. Notifications submitted by parties pursuant to paragraph 9 of article 3.
4. National reporting pursuant to Article 21 of the Convention
5. Venue and date of the in-person meeting of the Implementation and Compliance Committee in 2023.
6. Other matters
7. Adoption of the report
8. Closure of the meeting.

#### **(b) Organization of work**

7. The Committee agreed to meet online over two days on Tuesday 13 September and Wednesday 14 September 2022 from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. (Geneva time) each day, as set out in the annotations to the provisional agenda.

8. The secretariat presented document UNEP/MC/ICC/4/INF/1 on background on the Implementation and Compliance Committee.

## **Item 3**

### **Notifications submitted by parties pursuant to paragraph 9 of article 3**

9. The Committee turned to the consideration of document UNEP/MC/ICC.4/2/Rev.1 prepared by secretariat.

10. Introducing the item, a representative of the secretariat noted that, at its second meeting, the Committee advised the secretariat to request the national focal point of Thailand to clarify its notification with respect to information on the quantities and countries of origin of mercury imported from non-parties. The secretariat informed the members of the Committee that it requested the national focal point of Thailand to provide the above-mentioned information and worked closely with Thailand to further clarify the request of the Committee on several occasions between 2019 and 2022. As a result of this exchange, on 11 July 2022 Thailand submitted to the secretariat an updated notification incorporating the required information on “Mercury imports from non-parties” in the last part of its notification pursuant to paragraph 9 of article 3.

11. The Committee took note of the content of the document presented by the secretariat, reviewed the updated notification submitted by Thailand, and concluded that the notification met the requirements set in paragraph 9 of article 3 of the Convention.

#### Item 4

#### National reporting pursuant to article 21 of the Convention

12. The Chair opened the agenda item of considering the first full national reports submitted pursuant to Article 21 of the Convention for the reporting period 16 August 2017 to 31 December 2020. According to paragraph 1 of Article 21, parties report to the Conference of the Parties through the secretariat, on 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. According to paragraph 2 of Article 15 the Committee shall promote implementation of, and review compliance with, all provisions of the Convention, and shall examine both individual and systemic issues of implementation and compliance and make recommendations, as appropriate, to the Conference of the Parties. As the Committee may consider issues on the basis of national reports according to paragraph 4(b) of Article 15, the Chair invited the secretariat to present the content of the preliminary report on the first full national reports and to introduce the observations and comments of its preliminary review for the consideration of the Committee.

13. The representative of the secretariat recalled that in Decision MC-1/8, the Conference agreed on the timing and format of national reporting by parties. The full format covers 43 questions to be reported by all parties every four years, while the short report covers four questions (as marked by \* in the full format) and is to be reported on every two years. It is to be noted that, in addition to the questions, the reporting format also includes Part C which gives parties the opportunity to comment on possible challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention, Part D which gives parties the opportunity to comment on the reporting format and possible improvements, and Part E which provides parties the opportunity to provide additional comment on each of the articles in free text if the party wishes to do so. According to the same decision, the first full national reports using available information were due by 31 December 2021.

14. The secretariat's representative explained that the secretariat initiated its review of the submitted national reports and prepared a preliminary report to inform the Committee of the following: (a) parties' reporting performance; (b) findings on responses to the eight questions posed on Article 3 on "Mercury supply sources and trade" and Article 11 on "Mercury waste", which include the four recurrent questions of the short national reports; and (c) findings on parties' responses to Article 13 on "Financial resources and financial mechanism" and Article 14 on "Capacity-building, technical assistance and technology transfer".

15. The secretariat's representative added that the preliminary report was based on the secretariat's initial review of the submitted national reports received as of 15 June 2022. The submitted reports were checked for completeness and clarity of the responses contained in the reports. She pointed out that the full report submissions provided information for the second time on the four recurrent questions in Article 3 and Article 11. She informed the Committee that submitted national reports that were deemed complete by the party and the secretariat were made available on the [Convention website](#).

16. The representative of the secretariat was invited by the Chair to introduce the preliminary report contained in UNEP/MC/ICC.4/3, section-by-section, noting that in accordance with paragraph 25(b) of the Terms of Reference of the Committee the secretariat's report was to include, but not be limited to, information about parties' reporting performances and the identification of particular considerations that emerged from the reports and might be of interest to the Committee.

#### Reporting Performance

17. On the *reporting performance of parties*, the representative of the secretariat reported that of the 123 parties<sup>1</sup> that had to report for the reporting period (16 August 2017 to 31 December 2020), 87 parties submitted their complete reports by the deadline of 31 December 2021, while an additional 19

<sup>1</sup> By 31 December 2021, 137 States or regional economic integration organizations deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession to the Convention with the Depositary. As the Convention comes into force 90 days after the deposit of an instrument, Australia, Bahrain, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Iraq, Italy, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Spain, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe were not obliged to submit the full reports due by 31 December 2020, as they became parties after the reporting period of the full report.

parties submitted their complete reports by 15 June 2022. Therefore, by 15 June 2022, a total of 106<sup>2</sup> of 123 parties had submitted their reports, which represented an 86 per cent reporting rate. She further informed the Committee that an additional six incomplete reports<sup>3</sup> were received, and that the secretariat was awaiting additional information from the respective national focal points in this regard, to allow these reports to be filed as complete. Therefore, of the 123 parties that were obliged to report, 17 reports<sup>4</sup> remained to be received by 15 June 2022. The secretariat further explained that since the completion of the report to the Committee an additional three reports were received, namely from Ghana, Iran and Eswatini. Fourteen reports from parties were still outstanding as of 13 September 2022. Overall, she concluded that this represented a robust and commendable reporting performance by parties.<sup>5</sup>

18. The Committee expressed appreciation for the high reporting performance by parties. It also acknowledged the secretariat's efforts to reach out and support the submission of the remaining 14 reports and expressed the hope to continue seeing high reporting rates in the future.

### Responses to Article 3 and Article 11 questions

19. The Chair then invited the secretariat to continue presenting the content of the preliminary report on the first full national reports, beginning with the responses to questions on Articles 3 and 11. The representative of the secretariat outlined that the preliminary report focused on the six questions related to Article 3 (Mercury supply, sources and trade) and two questions related to Article 11 (Mercury wastes), which allowed the secretariat to develop and present a comparison of the short national report (2019) and full national report (2021) results to the Committee. She further explained that the four recurrent questions provided biennial responses by parties on the core of the lifecycle of mercury approach set out in the Convention.

20. On *primary mining of mercury at the time of entry into force* (Question 3.1), the representative of the secretariat reported that two parties responded "yes" to having primary mercury mines operating within their territory, and 105 parties responded "no".

21. On *primary mercury mining after entry into force* (Question 3.2), the representative of the secretariat reported that two parties responded "yes" to having primary mercury mines that were currently in operation that were not in operation at the time of entry into force of the Convention for them, and 103 parties responded "no".

22. The representative of the secretariat recalled the key obligation of the Convention that mercury from primary mining should only be used for manufacturing mercury-added products in accordance with Article 4, in manufacturing processes in accordance with Article 5, or disposed in accordance with Article 11. The representative further shared the secretariat's observations on the responses to the two questions noting the clarification made by the COP in its decision MC-4/8 that the amount to be reported should be "mined mercury "and not "ore", and the expected improvement in standardizing the quantities reported by parties in the succeeding reporting cycles. She also noted the recurring concern on the reported presence of so-called "informal" primary mercury mining by some parties and that some parties appear to draw a difference between formal and informal primary mercury mining and in turn not reporting on the latter.

<sup>2</sup> 2021 full national reports were submitted by: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Canada, Chad, Chile, China (including Hong Kong SAR and Macao SAR), Colombia, Congo (Republic of the), Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, European Union, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Montenegro, Namibia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, North Macedonia, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, and Zambia.

<sup>3</sup> Incomplete reports not yet tallied: Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Jamaica, Philippines, Rwanda, and Viet Nam.

<sup>4</sup> Reports not yet submitted by: Afghanistan, Antigua and Barbuda, Benin, Comoros, Eswatini (Kingdom of), Ghana, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kiribati, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mauritania, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Seychelles, State of Palestine, Syrian Arab Republic, and Tonga.

<sup>5</sup> The reporting rates by region were as follows: 26 of 32 parties from Africa (81%), 21 of 30 parties from the Asia Pacific (70%), 14 of 15 parties from Eastern Europe (93%), 23 of 24 parties from Latin America and the Caribbean (88%), and 22 of 22 parties from Western Europe and Others (100%).

23. The representative of the secretariat also recalled the guidance in responding to question 3.2, provided in UNEP/MC/COP.4/17 that parties are to provide relevant information about mines and indicate whether the mine(s) was formal or informal. Lastly, she noted that there was a continued misunderstanding of the term “primary mercury mining” and that this may be the reason for the presumably erroneous responses to the question. The secretariat was following this up with the respective parties.
24. The committee welcomed the preliminary review of the secretariat on the responses to the two questions and expressed concern regarding the reported informal primary mercury mining. The Committee agreed that it would be useful to encourage parties to provide more information on the matter. The Committee requested the secretariat to follow up with the specific parties who reported informal mining to provide more information on the nature of the reported informal mining, including whether the informal mining activities were considered illegal, and on whether the use or disposal of the mined mercury was compliant with the Convention. The Committee also noted the importance of a common understanding of “primary mercury mining” and of reporting “informal mining”. The Committee agreed to come back to this matter at its next meeting, including to consider whether it would be appropriate to introduce additional text in the reporting format and/or reporting guidance to invite parties to report on informal mining and provide as much information as possible. Accordingly, the Committee requested the secretariat to prepare possible draft text to be discussed at its next meeting in 2023.
25. On the *stocks and sources of mercury and mercury compounds* (Question 3.3), the representative of the secretariat reported that 56 parties responded “yes”, i.e., they had endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury and mercury compound exceeding 50 metric tons, and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year that are located within their territory, while 50 parties responded “no”. Of the 56 parties that responded “yes”, 51 parties attached results of their endeavour, 14 parties attached other information and updates, while 4 parties did not submit any information on the result of their endeavour.
26. The representative further shared the secretariat’s observations on the responses to the questions on stocks and sources of mercury, noting the improvement in reporting under question 3.3, as more parties reported on their endeavours and attached results (91%, 51 of 56 parties) compared to the results of the short national report. However, in spite of this improvement, from the received responses it is clear that the term “endeavour” continued to be unclear to many parties, and the overall results still gave an uneven overview of the outcome of parties’ individual endeavours and an incomplete understanding of the status of the stocks and sources globally.
27. The Committee concluded that a uniform understanding of “endeavour” – as a continuous effort by parties and not just a one-off effort – was important, and further clarification on how to approach the “yes” was needed either in the reporting format and/or in the reporting guidance. The Committee requested the secretariat to prepare possible draft text to be discussed further at its next meeting in 2023. The Committee also noted with some concern that 50 parties responded “no” and requested the secretariat to look into the responses to understand the reasons for this, including if it necessitated information clarification and/or was due to resource constraints.
28. On the *presence of excess mercury from the decommissioning of chlor-alkali facilities* (Question 3.4), the representative of the secretariat reported that 9 parties responded “yes” to having excess mercury available from the decommissioning of chlor-alkali facilities, while 97 responded “no”. Of the nine parties that responded “yes”, all nine parties provided explanations on the measures taken, four of the nine parties provided amounts of excess mercury, and five did not provide any amounts of excess mercury.
29. The representative of the secretariat observed that, in providing their responses to question 3.4 on the state of excess mercury available from the decommissioning of chlor-alkali facilities, some parties reported the amounts of mercury at different stages while others did not provide an amount.
30. The Committee requested the secretariat to clarify whether there was an obligation to report such amounts of mercury and the secretariat referred to the COP1-adopted “Guidance on the identification of individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons and sources of mercury supply generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year”.
31. On the *consent received for export of mercury from a party’s territory* (Question 3.5), the representative of the secretariat reported that 98 parties responded “no”, i.e., they had not received consent, nor 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. Seven parties responded “yes”, i.e., 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 another party in the reporting period.

32. Five parties responded "yes", i.e., 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.

33. The representative of the secretariat further pointed out, that if a party answered "yes, exports to parties" and/or "yes, exports to non-parties", and it had not submitted copies of the consent forms to the secretariat, it is recommended to do so. Otherwise, the reporting format requests the party answering "yes, exports to parties" and/or "yes, exports to non-parties" to provide other suitable information showing that the relevant requirements of paragraph 6 of Article 3 have been met. Of the parties that answered "yes" to exporting mercury, two parties (Mexico and Peru) provided copies of Form A, and one party (Singapore) provided a copy of Form B to the secretariat. It is to be noted that again none of the parties that responded "yes, exports to parties" (Form A) and/or "yes, exports to non-parties" (Form B), had sent copies of the consent forms to the secretariat, as recommended by the Conference of the Parties in decision MC-1/2, at the time of the export. 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 the two parties forwarded copies of Form A, and one party forwarded a copy of Form B. The secretariat notes a marginal improvement regarding the submission of the trade forms to the secretariat between the two reporting periods. However, the secretariat also notes that all trade forms must be signed by the competent authority to be considered valid. On reviewing the forms received the secretariat noted that some forms were not signed by the competent authority as outlined in the COP-1 guidance, namely the listed national focal points of the importing and exporting countries. The secretariat informed the Committee that it is also following up with one party on its consent forms for its export/s. Moreover, the representative of the secretariat noted that some parties had sent other information, in lieu of the forms, and sought clarification on how the secretariat was to consider it suitable.

34. The Committee expressed concern about the low submission rate of trade consent forms, or other suitable information, and requested the secretariat to follow-up with parties who had not submitted them and clarify that commercially confidential information contained in the forms could be blacked out to ease confidentiality concerns when forms were to be made available on the Convention's website.

35. The Committee agreed to come back to this matter at its next meeting and to consider whether it would be appropriate to strengthen the text in the reporting guidance to further encourage parties to submit the trade consent forms and better define what "other suitable information" would consist of.

36. The representative of the secretariat also highlighted the matter of unreported, informal or "illegal" trade of mercury as some parties had raised this issue in Parts C or E in the short (2019) and full (2021) national reports. The secretariat noted the efforts of the parties to share their concerns and report on measures taken to address such unreported, informal or "illegal" trade. The secretariat also noted that the current reporting format did not have a direct question on such unreported, informal or "illegal" trade, and that it might be helpful to consider how to best utilize the space provided in question 3.5 to facilitate sharing information by parties on challenges and measures to manage and/or curtail such trade.

37. The Committee expressed concern about the matter of unreported, informal or "illegal" trade of mercury and welcomed the information provided by parties who reported on measures taken to address such informal or "illegal" trade. The Committee agreed to come back to this matter at its next meeting and to consider whether it would be appropriate to strengthen the reporting format and/or guidance to encourage parties to report on informal or "illegal" trade of mercury and related response measures.

38. On *allowing the import of mercury from a non-party* (Question 3.6), the secretariat reported that 103 parties responded "no", i.e., they had not allowed the import of mercury from a non-party; while two parties responded "yes"; and one party relied on para. 7 of Article 3.

39. On *measures for mercury wastes outlined in Article 11, paragraph 3* (Question 11.1) the secretariat reported that 72 parties responded "yes", i.e., the measures outlined in Article 11, paragraph 3, have been implemented for the party's mercury waste, while 34 parties responded "no". Of the 72 parties that responded "yes", all 72 parties described the measures implemented in their territories.

40. The representative of the secretariat pointed out that the responses provided by the 72 parties to question 11.1 often related to existing national legislation. As the Basel Convention technical

guidelines outlined specific environmentally sound measures for managing mercury wastes, the representative from the secretariat noted that the secretariat would need time to review the responses in detail and assess the responses also in light of the Basel Convention's technical guidelines. The secretariat was in the process of reviewing and analysing the information provided and would provide the Committee with a more detailed review of the measures reported and their reported effectiveness at the next meeting of the Committee.

41. The representative of the secretariat further noted with some concern that 34 parties (32%, 34 of 106 parties) had responded "no" and that it was not clear if the "no" response meant that there was no mercury waste in the party's territory, thus, there was no need take any measures, or if the "no" response meant that the party had not taken any measures related to its obligation under paragraph 3 of Article 11 of the Minamata Convention.

42. The Committee agreed that there was a need to gain more clarity on the rationale for responding "no" to the question, noting that the current reporting format does not prompt parties to give more details for responding "no". The Committee decided to come back to this issue at its next meeting, and requested the secretariat to follow up with specific parties, on understanding the reasons for answering "no", and prepare possible draft text for the reporting format and the reporting guidance as needed. The secretariat was also requested to provide more clarity for the Committee's consideration of Article 11 paragraphs 3 and 4 regarding the guidelines developed under the Basel Convention, and in circumstances where the Basel Convention does not apply, the relevant international rules, standards and guidelines.

43. *On the facilities for final disposal* (Question 11.2) the representative of the secretariat reported that 22 parties responded "yes", i.e., they had facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in the party's territory, while 80 parties responded "no". Five parties responded they "do not know" if they had facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in their territory. Of those that answered "yes", only three reported on how much waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds has been subjected to final disposal, and the specific method of disposal.

44. The representative of the secretariat observed that the term "final disposal" continued to be interpreted in various ways by parties, noting that at the time of reporting, the COP-4 clarification in this regard was not yet available to parties. Explaining further, she noted that of the 22 parties who responded "yes" to having final disposal facilities, some have responded to the secretariat's follow-up questions to confirm to have misunderstood the term "final disposal". It is expected that the COP-4 clarification would help on future responses to this question.

45. The Committee requested the secretariat to continue: (i) following up with parties who had not yet provided information on amounts of waste subject to final disposal and method of final disposal operations, (ii) reviewing in more detail the responses from other parties who included other and general information on mercury waste (mostly not on amounts or methods), and (iii) understanding better why parties responded "no", including if information had to be made clearer or if there were resources constraints. The Committee decided to come back to this matter at its next meeting in 2023.

### **Responses to Article 13 and Article 14 questions**

46. The Chair then invited the secretariat to continue presenting the content of the preliminary report on the first full national reports. The representative of the secretariat presented responses to Article 13 and Article 14 questions.

47. *On providing resources, within a party's capability, in respect of those national activities that are intended to implement the Convention* (Question 13.1), the representative of the secretariat reported that 77 parties responded "yes", i.e., resources have been provided in respect of those national activities that are intended to implement the Convention in accordance with its national policies, priorities, plans and programmes, while 29 parties responded "no".

48. *On a party's contribution, within its capabilities, to the mechanism referred to in paragraph 5 of article 13* (Question 13.2), the representative of the secretariat noted that this is a supplemental question and reported that 38 parties responded "yes", i.e., a contribution has been made to the mechanism referred to in paragraph 5 of Article 13, while 68 parties responded "no".

49. *On providing financial resources to assist developing-country parties and/or parties with economies in transition in the implementation of the Convention through other bilateral, regional and multilateral sources or channels* (Question 13.3), the representative of the secretariat noted that this is

a supplemental question and reported that 17 parties responded “yes”, i.e., that financial resources have been made to assist developing-country parties and/or parties with economies in transition in the implementation of the Convention through other bilateral, regional and multilateral sources or channels, while 89 parties responded “no”.

50. The representative of the secretariat noted that it was encouraging to see the high number of positive responses to question 13.1., as well as contributors to the financial mechanism. She noted though that 28 parties reported not to have raised national resources, that more seemed possible to be done at the bilateral, regional and multilateral levels, and lastly, that some parties mistook payment of assessed contributions as raising funding for national implementation.

51. On questions 13.1 the Committee agreed that undertaking to mobilize national resources within a party’s respective capability was a party’s obligation under the Convention and encouraged each party to continue to support implementation at the national level. The Committee agreed to return to Article 13 at its next meeting, and also to request to the secretariat to see how it could further support highlighting good practices in mobilization of resources, including south-south cooperation.

52. *On cooperating to provide capacity-building or technical assistance, pursuant to Article 14, to another party to the Convention* (Question 14.1), the representative of the secretariat reported that 26 parties responded “yes”, i.e., that a party has cooperated with another party to the Convention to provide capacity-building or technical assistance, pursuant to Article 14, while 80 parties responded “no”.

53. *On receiving capacity-building or technical assistance pursuant to Article 14* (Question 14.2), the representative of the secretariat noted that this is a supplemental question and reported that 50 parties responded “yes”, i.e., the party received capacity-building or technical assistance pursuant to Article 14, while 56 parties responded “no”.

54. *On promoting and facilitating the development, transfer and diffusion of, and access to, up-to-date environmentally sound alternative technologies* (Question 14.3), the representative of the secretariat reported that 42 parties responded “yes”, i.e., that a party has promoted and facilitated the development, transfer and diffusion of, and access to, up-to-date environmentally sound alternative technologies, while 57 parties responded no.

55. The representative of the secretariat noted that in general parties did not follow the suggested approaches in the reporting guidance. She also noted the high number of “no” responses without specificities provided that would allow the secretariat to better understand the parties’ respective needs.

56. The Committee decided to come back to Article 14 at its next meeting. The Committee wanted to discuss further options to allow parties to express their capacity building and technical assistance needs. The Committee also noted it would like to encourage parties that offer international cooperation and international technical assistance programme to continue to submit and update such information to the secretariat, so that the information can be made available online for developing countries that may wish to utilise it.

### **Committee considerations of the secretariat’s preliminary report on the first full national reports**

57. The Chair highlighted the following key conclusions of the Committee on the secretariat’s preliminary report on the first full national reports. The Committee:

- Appreciated the high reporting rate of parties;
- Decided to come back to certain issues at the next meeting, in particular with respect to Articles 3 and 11;
- Requested the secretariat to follow up with parties to seek additional clarification and information in particular on “informal” primary mercury mining, as well as the trade consent forms and other suitable information;
- Requested some work from the secretariat on the reporting format and reporting guidance in a number of areas for consideration of the Committee at the meeting in 2023;
- Expressed concern on reported “illegal” primary mercury mining, the low submission rate of trade consent forms, and reported “illegal” trade of mercury;
- Encouraged each party to continue mobilizing national resources within a party’s respective capability to support implementation at the national level;

- Highlighted the importance of capacity building and national reporting for the effective implementation of the Convention.

**Item 5****Venue and date of the in-person meeting of the Implementation and Compliance Committee in 2023**

58. The Committee decided that its fifth meeting would be held in-person in Geneva from 7 to 9 March 2023.

**Item 6****Other matters**

59. No other matters were raised.

**Item 7****Adoption of the report**

60. The Committee agreed to adopt the full report of the meeting by electronic means, on the basis of a draft prepared by the Rapporteur with the support of the secretariat.

**Item 8****Closure of the meeting**

61. Following closing remarks by the Chair and the Executive Secretary, the Chair thanked the members of the Committee and the secretariat for their work and declared the meeting closed at 4:15 p.m. (Geneva time) on Wednesday 14 September 2022.

---