

COP5 - ZMWG Statement on Effectiveness Evaluation- 31/10/2023

Thank you, Madam President,

I am speaking on behalf of the Zero Mercury Working Group.

We welcome the proposed draft list of indicators, but while it considers the comments made by the Effectiveness Evaluation Group and has made satisfactory revisions, ZMWG believes that some of them could be improved.

We consider that it is important to know when and why indicators take into account the number and /or proportion of parties when evaluating the effectiveness of the treaty, sharing the rationale would increase transparency. Also, we believe that including the trading and supplying data by purpose, would allow to better understand flows and would help measuring the progress in phasing down mercury in various uses under Articles 4 and 5 (Indicator 6.a). Moreover, collecting detailed information about the volume of mercury added products that are imported and exported each year is key to evaluating the effectiveness of article 4(1), but this indicator (n.6) has been removed and we encourage the Conference of Parties to reintroduce it.

In addition, evaluating the number of countries that “endeavoured to develop strategies” gives a measure of the attempts done, but doesn’t clarify if the strategies have been developed and applied (Indicator 23). To evaluate the Convention’s effectiveness, information is needed on how many Parties have succeeded to develop strategies. Therefore, we suggest adapting the wording.

Finally (indicator 28), we think that the measures taken to provide information to the public on the effects of exposure to mercury should be reported “in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 16.” to avoid overrating the effectiveness of the Convention because every single measure taken has the aim of protecting human health, which is the main objective of the Convention as stated in Article 1.

Thank you.