



Environment and Social Development Organization

Thank You Mr. Co-Chair.

While the proposed draft list of indicators considers the comments made by the Effectiveness Evaluation Group and has revised most of the indicators in a satisfactory manner, ESDO and ZMWG believe that some of them could be improved.

In particular, we have specific input on the following indicators:

Indicator 6a. Reporting mercury “traded” or “supplied” without mentioning for which allowable use sounds vague. The indicator would be more effective including the trading and supplying data by purpose which would allow to understand flows and measure the progress. ESDO and ZMWG strongly support the comments of NRDC.

Indicator C6 – removed. We support Canada’s comment pointing out that indicator C6 “Volume, in tonnes, of mercury-added products (a) imported and (b) exported, in units per year, for each products category Therefore, we ask to reintroduce it.

Indicator 23. The proposed wording would evaluate a Party’s compliance efforts through its development and implementation of strategies. To evaluate the Convention’s effectiveness, information is needed on how many Parties have succeeded. Therefore, we suggest to keep the previous wording.

Indicator 27. Adding examples of measures taken to provide information to the public (warning about fish consumption, about the risk to sensitive populations of dental amalgam, detention lists for mercury SLPs, etc.) could be helpful in evaluating the effectiveness of the information provided.

Indicator 28. we would recommend reverting to the original language which referenced Article 16, i.e., “in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 16.”

Siddika Sultana

Executive Director

Environment and Social Development Organization- ESDO

Member of

