



**Stockholm Convention
on Persistent Organic
Pollutants**

**Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
Eighth meeting**

Geneva, 24 April–5 May 2017

Item 5 (i) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters related to the implementation of the
Convention: effectiveness evaluation**

**Experience in using the effectiveness evaluation
framework and recommendations for future
development**

Note by the Secretariat

As referred to in the note by the Secretariat on the effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants pursuant to Article 16 (UNEP/POPS/COP.8/22), the report on the experience in using the effectiveness evaluation framework¹ and recommendations for future development prepared by the effectiveness evaluation committee is set out in the annex to the present note. The present note, including its annex, has not been formally edited.

* UNEP/POPS/COP.8/1.

¹ UNEP/POPS/COP.6/27/Add.1/Rev.1.

Annex

Experience in using the effectiveness evaluation framework (UNEP/POPS/COP.6/27/Add.1/Rev.1) and recommendations for future development

I. Introduction (mandate, relevant COP decisions and development of the framework)

1. The objective of the Stockholm Convention is to protect human health and the environment from persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The Convention entered into force on 17 May 2004, 90 days after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. As at 1 October 2016, there were 180 Parties to the Convention.
2. The Convention requires Parties to adopt and implement measures aimed at reducing or eliminating the release of POPs into the environment with a view to protecting human health and the environment from those substances. The measures adopted by individual Parties will vary, reflecting their differing situations. It is expected, however, that in combination they will reduce overall releases with consequent benefits for human health and the environment across the globe.
3. Paragraph 1 of Article 16 of the Convention states that, commencing four years after the date of entry into force of the Convention, and periodically thereafter at intervals to be decided by the Conference of the Parties, the Conference shall evaluate the effectiveness of the Convention. Paragraph 3 of Article 16 states that the evaluation shall be conducted on the basis of available scientific, environmental, technical and economic information. Beyond that it may be observed that, as the Convention's impact will be the result of individual and collaborative measures by Parties, any evaluation of that impact must as a practical matter include an assessment of whether the combination of measures adopted by Parties provides, at the aggregate level, a timely improvement in the situation prevailing before the Convention entered into force.
4. By its decision SC-4/32, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention established an ad hoc working group to prepare a report on possible procedures for evaluating the effectiveness of the Convention, including indicators, data requirements and arrangements to prepare for and undertake future effectiveness evaluations, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting, in 2011. The terms of reference for the ad hoc working group called for it to propose procedures for carrying out the evaluation that were cost-effective, streamlined and pragmatic. This guiding principle was used by the ad hoc working group in agreeing on the proposed framework and scope of the evaluation.
5. In decision SC-4/32, the Conference of the Parties recognized that the work required for each effectiveness evaluation would be conducted in two stages, with the first consisting of the compiling of information and the second its evaluation.
6. At its sixth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted the framework for effectiveness evaluation of Stockholm Convention pursuant to Article 16. The framework encompasses issues such as the purpose of the effectiveness evaluation, arrangements for conducting the effectiveness evaluation, elements and indicators for the effectiveness evaluation, limitations of the effectiveness evaluation, and terms of reference for an effectiveness evaluation committee. By decision SC-7/24, the COP established at its seventh meeting the effectiveness evaluation committee and requested the committee to perform its tasks in accordance with the framework for effectiveness evaluation and to report to the Conference of the Parties at its eighth meeting. The framework sets the basis of a two-stage evaluation process, namely a compilation by the Secretariat of information from the existing arrangements under the Convention, followed by the assessment of the available information by the Committee to undertake the evaluation, draw conclusions and make recommendations.
7. This document is in response to the mandate given by the Conference of Parties to the effectiveness evaluation committee that at the end of its first evaluation, the committee is to make recommendations on future evaluations, including on the arrangements, schedules and experience using the framework for effectiveness evaluation. The review and recommendations are made under the premise that any development of the framework should remain coherent with the Convention tools being used to collect the data needed for the effectiveness evaluation. It provides recommendation for streamlining and increasing the efficiency of the framework for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the Stockholm Convention.

II. Experience in using the framework during the two-stage evaluation process

A. Arrangements for conducting the effectiveness evaluation

8. As requested in decision SC-4/32, the effectiveness evaluation was conducted in two stages according to Table 1 of document UNEP/POPS/COP.6/27/Add.1/Rev.1. The first stage consisted of compilation of information gathered through existing arrangements under the Convention, including the reports from the global monitoring plan, the compilation of national reports, technical assistance reports by the Secretariat and reports from the entity entrusted with administering the financial mechanism. As the Conference of the Parties has not yet adopted compliance procedures, no reports were available for use to support the effectiveness evaluation.

9. For the second stage of the process, the committee established by the Conference of Parties at its seventh session evaluated the available information and developed an assessment report on the effectiveness of the Convention. In combination with intense intersessional work, the committee held two meetings during the current effectiveness evaluation cycle, the first from 15 to 17 February 2016 and the second from 4 to 7 October 2016 to review the information available and to develop a report for the Conference of the Parties. The effectiveness evaluation report is presented to the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in UNEP/POPS/COP.8/INF/40.

10. The arrangements described above functioned adequately. The Secretariat and the committee worked in a complementary manner keeping open and active communication, hence ensuring that committee members had all needed information available to them in a timely manner. For work between meetings, the Bureau of the committee, composed of the chair and the vice-chair, guided the Secretariat's activities and reviewed drafts in advance of their submission to the entire Committee in order to facilitate its work.

11. The committee members were able to carry out the assessment work and to reach agreement by consensus.

B. Terms of reference and membership for the effectiveness evaluation committee

12. The committee worked under the terms of reference set out in document UNEP/POPS/COP.6/27/Add.1/Rev.1. The committee found that the range of activities specified in the framework for the execution of the evaluation were justified and necessary to produce a robust outcome; the representation of regions, as well as the member of the Global Monitoring Plan and the two internationally recognized experts, ensured adequate coverage of the views and expertise required for a balanced evaluation. It should be noted however that only two Parties nominated experts to the roster of experts, established by the Secretariat in response to paragraph C of the terms of reference. While the committee did not call on the roster of experts during the current evaluation, given the range of expertise of the committee members and within the Secretariat this could be a limitation if the committee faces a need for expertise in particular domains in the future.

13. In view of the abundance of information to analyze, the seven days of meeting time, divided over two meetings, did not allow for discussion of all sections of the preliminary report at the first meeting and written comments had to be provided by members on those sections of the preliminary report which could not be covered in the first face-to-face meeting. Taking into account the insufficient time, and anticipating that considerably more information will be available for the next evaluation, two meetings of one week each are deemed necessary for the next evaluation cycle.

C. Strength and limitations of the elements of the framework

14. During its operations the Committee welcomed the thoroughness and comprehensiveness of the framework coverage, the value of the selected indicators as well as the availability of information through the Convention reporting procedures and expert group reports. By focusing on the stated goals in specific Convention's articles as criteria for judging performance and assessing the effectiveness of actions, the framework has been firmly grounded in the Convention, which was negotiated by governments, and is in coherence with the actions they committed to undertake in response to their obligations. It is hence an appropriate guidebook for the assessment of the effectiveness of the Convention implementation activities. The approach used in the framework is the evaluation of each Convention article, which ensures that all listed POPs and the range of obligations to regulate them, along with available tools, stretching from legal, administrative, technical and formative domains are all accounted for in the evaluation. A limitation linked to this article-by-article approach has been that the framework does not address the examination of the possible links between performances in different areas and regions and hence it was difficult to develop this time a comprehensive and

integrated picture of the Convention's effectiveness from a global perspective. The committee conducted its assessment of the Convention's overall objectives stated in Article 1 using the outcome of the Global Monitoring Plan for POPs as directed by the framework. While the framework contains a discussion of general issues, it would be useful to develop a series of indicators for general and cross-cutting issues to support the overall assessment of the Convention.

15. The use of a combination of both process and outcome indicators in the framework ensures that the quantitative goals as well as the Convention support mechanisms and processes are all analyzed and considered; thus, the framework in general supports adequately the evaluation process. However the shortcomings in the information provided through national reports, and the non-existence of a compliance mechanism to provide compliance information makes it difficult to attribute changes observed to measures undertaken and hinders the assessment of direct cause-effect relationships in the current exercise.

D. Relevance and limitations of the indicators

16. The framework defined a high number of metrics for evaluating the outcomes of Convention implementation activities (output and process indicators) and these have been based on the Convention information tools such as the national reports, the global monitoring reports and specialized expert groups outputs. A total of 57 indicators were generated to support the assessment of all substantive articles² with the exception of Article 17 on compliance. In most cases the sources of information and data have been clearly identified and are available to the Secretariat through Convention instruments. In its assessment the committee however encountered at times difficulties with the use of some of the indicators, particularly with regards to the number of indicators related to a specific Article or by the limited fit between the indicator, the evaluation questions and the data available for use.

17. Many of the proposed indicators are qualitative and/or process oriented as compared to quantitative outcome indicators. This is understandable for such a complex undertaking with many administrative and legal processes whose outcomes can be difficult to quantify in the short term, while supporting the protection of human health and the environment. In many countries the existence of the Convention led to increased awareness of the issues of sound chemical management at public, political and parliamentary levels and also to the development of legislative frameworks with outcomes that will only be appreciated in the long-term. Consecutive evaluations may allow the assessment of these long-term outcomes and the information generated during the first effectiveness evaluation cycle will provide a useful baseline for these evaluations.

18. The evaluation committee was mindful of the stated purpose of the effectiveness evaluation, which is to assess whether the Convention has succeeded in achieving its objective of protecting human health and the environment from POPs; to determine the effectiveness of the specific measures taken to implement the Convention in achieving this objective; and to identify ways to improve the effectiveness of the Convention. The assessment considers that any change towards establishment of control mechanisms and reduction of levels of POPs in humans and the environment can be considered a success in protecting human health and the environment from POPs.

19. On the downside, the lack of performance criteria or benchmarks to judge the level of changes and prepare the ground for trends analysis during future assessments is seen as a drawback. Additionally, in the reporting forms, some of the questions informing qualitative indicators have not been precise enough to generate unambiguous results and they do not indicate whether administrative or legislative tools developed towards Convention implementation were used or not. The combination of these limitations made it challenging to determine the effectiveness of the specific measures taken to implement the Convention. To support the assessment of the levels of changes in a quantitative manner during future evaluations, Parties should enhance the quality and precision of data provided in their national reports.

² Article 2 on definitions and Articles 18-30 on Convention support process have not been included in the framework.

Specific examples:

20. Process indicator 1 for Article 3: the date on which each Party has implemented measures, including legal and administrative measures, to control the production, import, export and use of POPs listed in Annexes A and B that meet or exceed the Convention's requirements. The analysis showed that the date on which individual Parties implemented a measure does not provide a measure of success under the Convention; rather the number of Parties that have implemented measures at a particular time will be more useful and a small change in the indicator will be enough to address this issue. Such change will be coherent with figure B1 "Changes in the number of Parties that have implemented measures, including legal and administrative measures, to control the production, import, export and use of POPs, from before 2004 and up to 2014" in the effectiveness evaluation report UNEP/POPS/COP.8/INF/40 and will not change the question or the analysis of data.

21. Have the production and use of new pesticides or new industrial chemicals that have the characteristics of POPs been prevented? The current indicator (process indicator 4) is "Number of Parties with regulatory and assessment schemes for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals" which does not provide a direct measure of the prevention of the production/use of new POPs as the question does not ask whether the regulatory schemes include the POPs criteria; it is based on the assumption that if Parties have regulatory/assessment schemes for new chemicals, it is possible that such schemes include provisions to screen for POPs criteria and therefore "may" identify new POPs and stop their production/use. This indicator can be improved by using the formulation used by the POPRC in its survey and that asked whether these assessment schemes allow for screening substances for their POPs characteristics using the criteria in Annex D of the Convention.

22. The availability of information on import of POPs for use was lower than that of production of POPs and export of POPs for use. The numbers did not match with the information available for the export of POPs for use. When a country A reports that it imported to or exported POPs from a country B it may happen that the same information does not appear in the reporting by the country B, generating discrepancies in the global quantitative import/export aggregation.

23. This shows the need for a verification and validation mechanism of national reports. Such validation would have been implemented through a compliance system if the latter had been in place. In the absence of compliance mechanism, consideration should be given to other approaches that could fill the gap either through feedback from the Secretariat or an electronic support in the reporting form in order to secure coherence between data reported for import and for export by Parties.

E. Impact of data compilation and validation processes

24. In the absence of a platform to verify compliance and validate the accuracy of compiled data, the work of the effectiveness evaluation committee has been conditional to the clarity of responses from Parties. Where dedicated processes and expert groups have been established to support data generation, compilation and review, the committee received structured and verified reports that helped them in assessing the performance of measures. The monitoring report produced under the Global Monitoring Plan of the Convention, the reports received from the DDT expert group, from the experts on the Toolkit for unintentional POPs, and from the PCB Elimination Network, are illustrative of this case. These groups through their operation and data analysis have contributed to QA/QC of the reported data in their respective areas.

25. It is however essential that the various reports contributing to the effectiveness evaluations are synchronized so as to ensure integration and coherence in the assessments presented to the Conference of Parties. A point in case is the audit of the financial mechanism that has not been available for consultation by the committee.

26. Other information collection processes such as the national reports, where the responsibility is with each Party to provide, through its focal points, the available information in response to the questions in the reporting form, have been associated with two major problems:

(a) The first is linked with the lack of focus in questions. Despite all efforts made in aligning the reporting questionnaires and the framework of effectiveness evaluation, there are still occurrences where questions do not have the desirable specificity for generating the data required by the evaluators and cases where the reporting forms do not contain questions informing an indicator. For example, while quantities of POPs used appears in the indicators, there is no direct question in the national reporting questionnaire asking for information on the use of POPs including the quantities due to the fact that, according to paragraph 2 of Article 15, only information on production, import and export is required by the Convention;

(b) The second is the low percentage of responses and the number of responses that contain missing, partial, or incoherent data for issues such as import and export or differences in interpretation of similar situations. In this regard, for the assessment of whether Parties should be considered as having implemented measures to control POPs, some Parties considered that they have met their obligations using existing general legislation which can cover listed POPs, while other Parties considered that they have not met their obligations, as they have no specific legislation for the listed POPs.

III. Comments and recommendations on the elements and indicators of the framework

27. During its operation, the Committee evaluated the effectiveness of Convention articles through the lenses provided in the framework for effectiveness evaluation and also compiled the shortcomings it noticed in the use of the indicators to be used for the assessment. These assessments of the indicators are summarized below and in the tables of the appendix to the present annex.

A. Objectives (Article 1)

28. Of the three indicators that were identified for this Article:

(a) All indicators 1 to 3 are considered adequate to evaluate the effectiveness of the efforts to achieve the Convention objective set out in Article 1;

(b) Further data sources could be expanded beyond the data published in the GMP to include other relevant monitoring data validated by monitoring experts under the GMP.

B. Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production and use (Article 3)

29. Of the four indicators that were identified in the framework for this Article:

(a) Indicator 1 assesses the date on which each Party has implemented measures to control the production, import, export and use of the POPs listed in Annexes A and B. The overall number of Parties taking measures could be a more informative indicator than the date at which these are taken, at least for the first 12 chemicals. Using this measure, one would be able to assess the increase over time in the number of Parties implementing measures. The date when Parties take measures is nevertheless important for newly listed chemicals. Additionally it would be useful to have information on the extent to which the Convention is being implemented through legal or administrative measures and the extent to which such measures are enforced. Such data are not readily available, however, and when available are not easily compared between countries or regions;

(b) Indicator 2 assesses, for each chemical listed in Annexes A and B, changes in quantities produced, used, imported and exported for use. Information about the quantities of the chemicals used can currently only be compiled from the NIPs. Increased capacity of Parties to report data on quantities of POPs used including on whether import and export are for use or disposal will support both indicators 2 and 3;

(c) Indicator 4 assesses the number of Parties with regulatory and assessment schemes for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals but does not tell whether the schemes cover POPs criteria. The question relevant to Article 3 paragraph 3 of the Convention, whether the national regulatory framework to control new chemicals includes the POPs criteria specified in Annex D of the Convention has been added to the Article 15 reporting questionnaire and the indicator should be revised to reflect this addition.

C. Specific exemptions and notification of use (Article 4)

30. The two indicators identified for assessing the effectiveness of Article 4 are adequate. However, it is also possible that not all Parties that are in need of such exemptions have notified to the Secretariat to register.

D. Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production (Article 5)

31. Of the seven indicators that were identified:

(a) The number of proposed indicators to evaluate the effectiveness of Article 5 is too high. While process indicators can enable an assessment of the action taken by Parties on these issues, the number of process indicators can be reduced;

(b) The major information needed to assess the effectiveness of Article 5 relates to changes in releases over time (outcome indicator 7). BAT and BEP guidance indicated that PCDD/PCDF can be used as indicative of the releases of other unintentionally released POPs;

(c) Indicator 7 should be kept and the other indicators should be revised or combined in order to reduce their number if possible.

E. Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from stockpiles and wastes (Article 6)

32. Of the six indicators that were identified for this Article:

(a) The major information needed to assess the effectiveness of Article 6 pertains to changes in quantities of POPs disposed of over time (i.e. outcome indicators 3 and 6). While the quantities of stockpiles and the quantities of wastes identified and destroyed are not addressed in the national reporting questionnaire, there are possibilities to obtain this information. As recommended in the evaluation report, data collection mechanisms for determining how much of specific POPs waste has been destroyed or otherwise appropriately disposed of should be improved, in particular through working more closely with the Basel Convention (see recommendation in paragraph 102 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report);

(b) While process indicators can enable an assessment of the action taken by Parties on these issues, the number of process indicators can be reduced;

(c) In order to support indicators 3 and 6, improvement of the reporting on quantities should be considered. Process indicators 2, 5 and 9 could be kept for evaluating Article 6; the other indicators should be revised or combined in order to reduce their number.

F. Implementation plans (Article 7)

33. Of the three indicators that were identified for this Article:

(a) The important question to be asked when assessing this Article is whether the NIPs are serving their purpose and are improving implementation of the Convention. It may be useful to further examine the purpose of Article 7 as NIPs may prove to be helpful tools for Parties in more ways than that originally contemplated when the Convention was drafted;

(b) Process indicators 1 and 2 give a good overview of the implementation of Article 7 of the Convention;

(c) While all three indicators are considered as useful, outcome indicator 3 (comparison in the percentage change in the quantity of POPs produced, used, imported and exported for use by Parties that have completed national implementation plans and by Parties that have not completed such plans) presents a challenge; in effect the low number of Parties reporting use and import and export data does not enable a thorough evaluation of progress through this quantitative indicator;

(d) Indicator 3 needs to be revised to reflect listing of new substances in the Annexes of the Convention and the resulting need to update the NIPs.

G. Listing of chemicals in Annexes A, B and C (Article 8)

34. Using the single indicator in the framework and supplementing it by a qualitative assessment of the efficiency of the work of POPRC, e.g. submissions of information and comments, process details for particular chemicals, as well as the duration of the review process (length of time from nomination to listing) could enable addressing more comprehensively this Article.

H. Information exchange (Article 9)

35. Of the four indicators that were identified for this Article:

(a) Outcome indicators need to be defined for this Article e.g. % of Parties having an National Focal Point; and/or the number of Parties that sought information and have not been able to obtain it;

(b) The framing of process indicator 4 limits it to the number of Parties participating in information exchange activities organized by regional centres and excludes activities organized through other channels and in developed countries when reported through the national reports or other relevant sources. This indicator could be revised to include activities organized through other channels;

(c) The indicators for Article 9 should be amended to reflect the recommendation set out in paragraph 120 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report, that “Parties should continue to exchange information through the clearing-house mechanism. User surveys on the content, quality and impact of information exchange activities could be performed. Such surveys should be conducted in a cost efficient way e.g. through online questionnaires”.

I. Public information, awareness and education (Article 10)

36. Of the three indicators that were identified for this Article:

(a) Outcome indicators need to be defined for this Article, e.g. number of Parties with publicly accessible PRTRs;

(b) An essential step in the development or updating of NIPs is supporting communication, information exchange and awareness-raising through multi-stakeholder participatory processes. NIP may serve as a proxy indicator for the effectiveness of Article 10. Needs assessment report and any other relevant documents could be used as well;

(c) Indicator 3 should evaluate what is happening at the national level and therefore activities by regional centers are not relevant here and should be evaluated under Article 12. Indicator 3 should be revised accordingly.

J. Research, development and monitoring (Article 11)

37. Of the three indicators that were identified for this Article:

(a) There is a need to define an outcome indicator for this Article that captures the collaborative/partnership aspect in addressing research and development needs for POPs, e.g., accounting for the Parties that are engaged in multinational research and development activities related to POPs. Such a metric would account for smaller and less developed countries (in terms of their POPs analysis capacity) engaging in partnerships with other Parties that are better equipped to address POPs research and development and analysis needs. Both developed and developing country (in terms of POPs analysis capacity) could contribute positively to such an outcome indicator. This metric could also capture two equally developed countries benefiting from each other’s expertise with the analysis of specific POPs;

(b) The availability of relevant data sources for a new outcome indicator should be verified and confirmed.

K. Technical assistance and financial resources (Articles 12–14)

38. Of the fourteen indicators that were identified for several outcomes of these Articles:

(a) The order of the indicators in the framework, mixing financial and technical assistance indicators, could be revised to facilitate separate assessment of financial and technical assistance aspects;

(b) Overall, the number of indicators is too high, and, for some, information is very difficult, if not impossible, to find. Some of them could be combined to reduce the number;

(c) The revision of technical assistance indicators should take into account the relevant recommendation in the effectiveness evaluation report (see recommendation in paragraph 134 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report: “There is a need to strengthen the gathering of information on the provision of technical assistance and technology transfer through national reports under Article 15, the Secretariat’s technical assistance programme, from GEF projects and other sources. This could also include information on how these activities impacted Parties’ capacities to fulfill their obligations under the Stockholm Convention;

(d) Given the provisions of Article 12.4, process indicators 9 and 10 may need to be amended to cover both technical assistance and technology transfer needs. They could also be combined as reporting on technical assistance and technology transfer is often mixed up, making a clear delineation between them difficult;

(e) For the assessment of financial resources, indicators are needed to address what are the eligible needs, how much funding is available to meet the needs, and how funding is being disbursed. Decision SC-7/20 adopted the terms of reference for the fourth review of the financial mechanism which could inform a revised set of indicators in accordance with the aspects assessed in the review, namely:

- (i) The ability of the financial mechanism to meet the changing needs of developing-country Parties and Parties with economies in transition;
- (ii) The criteria and guidance referred to in paragraph 7 of Article 13 of the Convention, including the financial mechanism's ability to incorporate policy guidance from the Conference of the Parties;
- (iii) The level of funding;
- (iv) The effectiveness of the performance of the institutional entities entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism.

L. Reporting (Article 15)

39. Of the three indicators have been identified for this Article:

- (a) The first indicator could become an outcome indicator which combines completeness and timeliness of reporting, i.e., "Proportion of Parties' reporting complete and on time" This would include information from indicator 2 (as it addresses completeness), and indicator 3 would then not be needed;
- (b) An additional indicator could include 'optional information' provided in national reports; these data could help inform future effectiveness evaluations;
- (c) The timeliness, completeness and quality of the national reports submitted by Parties are essential to support the evaluation process. The present evaluation was hampered by the limited available data from national reports. These limitations will also impact the work of a future compliance committee, when established, and remedial measures are required to address the issue.

M. Effectiveness evaluation (Article 16)

40. The one indicator identified for assessing the effectiveness of Article 16 can only be assessed after the end of the first evaluation cycle and the development of the first set of recommendations from effectiveness evaluation.

N. Non-compliance (Article 17)

41. At the time of the writing of this report, the Conference of the Parties has not approved procedures and institutional mechanisms for determining compliance with the provisions of the Convention and for the treatment of Parties found to be in non-compliance. Accordingly, there is no information currently available on non-compliance even though Article 17 is clear that a mechanism shall be developed by the Parties "as soon as practicable".

42. It is recommended that the framework contain at least one indicator regarding the establishment of the compliance mechanism.

O. General and cross-cutting issues

43. The evaluation also considers more general and cross-cutting questions of effectiveness, which do not relate to specific Articles, but to the effectiveness of the Convention as a whole, such as:

- (a) How many Parties are there to the Convention?;
- (b) What is the number of Parties for which the amendments to list additional chemicals in Annexes A, B or C have entered into force?;
- (c) Of the non-Parties, are there any major producers, users, importers, exporters, or emitters of POPs?;
- (d) Are all processes and requirements in the Convention implemented? (E.g. rules of procedure, development of guidance, review of articles requiring review, establishment of a compliance mechanism etc.).

44. While these are important to support the evaluation of the general effectiveness of the Convention, other related issues, such as POPs in products and alternatives, as well as the impacts of institutional settings, e.g., synergies, built to support the effective and efficient operation of the Convention are also of value and may be considered when amending the indicators. In developing new indicators, due consideration should be given to recommendations set out in paragraphs 173, 181, 182, 184 and 188 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report.

APPENDIX: Summary table of assessment of indicators in the framework document

Protecting human health and the environment (Article 1)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Outcome indicator 1	Changes in levels of each of the listed persistent organic pollutants in air	Global monitoring reports; The second global monitoring report has been developed on the basis of the five regional monitoring reports (UNEP/POPS/COP.7/INF/38)	Data exist to evaluate changes in POPs levels over time starting with the second phase of the GMP and second monitoring reports. Baseline data on the 12 initially listed POPs exist in all core matrices and in additional media from the five UN regions. Data on the newly listed POPs exist mostly for air, and partially for human milk and blood. Temporal trend information for PFOS in water is still very limited.		Indicators (1) – (3) are considered adequate to evaluate the effectiveness of the efforts to achieve the Convention objective set out in Article 1. Further, data sources could be expanded beyond the data published in the GMP reports, to include other relevant monitoring data validated by monitoring experts under the GMP.
Outcome indicator 2	Changes in levels of the listed persistent organic pollutants in humans				
Outcome indicator 3	Changes in levels of the listed persistent organic pollutants in other environmental media, as available				
Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production and use (Article 3)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Date on which each Party has implemented measures, including legal & administrative measures, to control the production, import, export and use of POPs	Either the third, second, first national reports or the national implementation plans (NIPs) <u>for indicators 1, 2, and 3.</u> The information on POPs	The quantitative information on the production of POPs reported by Parties is extremely limited There is no question in	The date of implementation of a measure would not reflect voluntary actions that took place before the measure was in place. The degree to which the	Indicator 1 assesses the date on which each Party has implemented measures to control the production, import, export and use of the POPs listed in Annexes A and B. Revise indicator 1 to derive the overall number of Parties taking

	listed in Annexes A and B that meet or exceed the Convention's requirements	listed in 2013 and 2015 is expected to be reported in the fourth national report to be submitted in 2018. Therefore reports on those chemicals are not covered in the current report.	the national report questionnaire asking for information on the use of POPs including the quantities.	measure is implemented would not be measured, nor its enforcement.	measures at specific date. Using this measure, one would be able to assess the increase over time in the number of Parties implementing measures. The date when Parties take measures is important for newly listed chemicals and should be retained in the indicator.
Outcome indicator 2	For each chemical listed in Annexes A and B, changes in quantities produced, used, imported and exported for use	The information on the use of POPs was solely obtained from the NIPs as it was not asked in the national reports	Quantities produced, imported and exported for use are provided for some chemicals in a few national reports.	Data reported are not always for the same span of years. Data for certain years may be missing or available only for a range of years.	Additionally it would be useful to have information on the extent to which the Convention is being implemented through legal or administrative measures and the extent to which such measures are enforced. A new indicator may be developed to this end.
Outcome indicator 3	For each chemical listed in Annexes A and B, changes in quantities imported or exported for environmentally sound waste disposal	Information on DDT ¹ , PCB, PFOS, its salts and PFOSF and BDEs (hexa and heptaBDE, tetra and pentaBDE), from the separate dedicated processes for collecting and reviewing information. <u>For indicator 4:</u> the third national reports and document UNEP/POPS/COP.5/INF/9 on the functioning of regulatory and assessment schemes for new and existing pesticides and industrial chemicals (POPs Review committee survey).	For PCBs the data obtained from the national reports are likely to be an underestimation due to a number of reasons e.g. low response rates, different units used in reporting, incomplete inventories. Quantities imported or exported for environmentally sound waste disposal are provided for some chemicals in a few national reports. Currently there is a lack of information on environmentally sound disposal and recycling operations for BDEs.	Parties might not indicate whether imports or exports were for use or disposal. The numbers for import of POPs did not match with the information available for the export of POPs for use. Providing a global overview of the production and use of PFOS, its salts and PFOSF is currently challenging. Data gaps are notable in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Identification of products that contain PFOS is difficult, particularly in imported products. Information on quantities imported or exported for environmentally sound waste disposal is scarce.	Indicator 2 assesses, for each chemical listed in Annexes A and B, changes in quantities produced, used, imported and exported for use. Information about the quantities of the chemicals used can currently only be compiled from the NIPs, which don't assist in tracking changes. Find ways to improve the capacity of Parties on reporting of data on use volumes; and include options to report concisely on whether import and export are for use or disposal. This will support both indicators 2 and 3.

¹ Country responses to the DDT questionnaire, reports from the DDT expert group and the Global Alliance on Alternatives to DDT, publications of the World Health Organization (WHO), GEF documents and published articles.

Process indicator 4	The number of Parties with regulatory and assessment schemes for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals				<p>Indicator 4 is appropriate, as the question relevant to Article 3 paragraph 3 of the Convention, whether the national regulatory framework to control new chemicals includes the POPs criteria specified in Annex D of the Convention has been added to the Article 15 reporting form in the third national reports.</p> <p>Indicator 4 text should be revised as follows: “The number of parties with regulatory and assessment schemes, for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals, considering Annex D criteria.”</p>
Specific exemptions and notification of use (Article 4)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties who are registered for specific exemptions.	The register; COP decisions	Data are readily available.	It is assumed that Parties have registered exemptions as required. The number of Parties registered for specific exemptions for the newly listed chemicals in commerce is lower than expected	The indicators for assessing the effectiveness of Article 4 are adequate. However, it is also possible that not all Parties that are in need of such exemptions have notified to the Secretariat to register
Process indicator 2	Number of extensions that have been granted after the five year exemption period			No extensions of registrations of specific exemptions have been requested to date.	
Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production (Article 5)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties with	Section IV of part B of the	Data are readily	The degree to which an	The number of proposed indicators

	action plans under Article 5	national reports. The information supporting the analysis conducted by the Toolkit experts, was collected from either the third, second, first national reports or the national implementation plans (NIPs).	available	action plan is implemented is not measured. It is difficult to compile data from different Parties as a result of differences in methodologies and years in which inventories in the Parties were compiled. Comparisons can therefore only be made within countries.	to evaluate the effectiveness of Article 5 is too high. While process indicators can enable an assessment of the action taken by Parties on these issues, the number of process indicators can be reduced. The major information needed to assess the effectiveness of Article 5 relates to changes in releases over time (outcome indicator 7) and should be kept. BAT&BEP guidance indicated that PCDD/PCDF can be used as indicative of the releases of other unintentionally released POPs. Outcome indicator 7 could be kept and the other indicators revised in order to reduce their number if possible.
Process indicator 2	Number of Parties that have subsequently implemented their action plans as part of implementation plans				
Process indicator 3	Number of these Parties that have undertaken five-year reviews of the strategies to meet the obligations in Article 5				
Process indicator 4	Number of Parties that have promoted the adoption of best available techniques and best environmental practices for priority source categories				
Process indicator 5	Number of Parties that have adopted measures that require best available techniques for priority source categories				
Process indicator 6	Number of Parties that have evaluated the efficacy of the laws and policies relating to the management of releases				
Outcome indicator 7	Percentage change in the quantity of Annex C persistent organic pollutants produced unintentionally and released into the environment by each Party				

Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from stockpiles and wastes (Article 6)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties that have developed and used appropriate strategies to identify stockpiles	The information relevant to Article 6 was collected from either the third, second, first national reports or the national implementation plans (NIPs).	Information is generally available, but significant data limitations exist.	Quantitative information on the stockpiles being managed in an environmentally sound manner is limited.	The major information needed to assess the effectiveness of Article 6 pertains to changes in quantities of POPs disposed of over time (i.e. outcome indicators 3 and 6). While the quantities of stockpiles and the quantities of wastes identified and destroyed are not addressed in the questionnaire for national reporting there are possibilities to obtain it As recommended in the evaluation report, data collection mechanisms for determining how much of specific POPs waste has been destroyed or otherwise appropriately disposed of should be improved, in particular through working more closely with the Basel Convention (see recommendation in paragraph 102 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report). While process indicators can enable an assessment of the action taken by Parties on these issues, the number of process indicators can be reduced.
Process indicator 2	Number of Parties with measures in place to manage stockpiles in a safe, efficient and environmentally sound manner			Quantitative information on the stockpiles being managed in an environmentally sound manner is limited.	
Outcome indicator 3	Changes in the quantity of stockpiles being managed in an environmentally sound manner			None	
Process indicator 4	Number of Parties with measures in place to manage wastes in an environmentally sound manner				
Process indicator 5	Number of Parties that have developed and used appropriate strategies to identify products and articles in use and wastes containing persistent organic pollutants				
Outcome indicator 6	Quantity of wastes identified and destroyed over time			It is generally difficult to identify a specific quantity of a specific POP waste	

	(includes wastes of products and articles consisting of or contaminated with persistent organic pollutants)			which has been destroyed due to the nature of wastes whereby most of the data collected are limited and restricted to a particular point in time in the life-cycle, and considering that wastes contain mixtures of substances.	be kept for evaluating article 6. The other indicators should be revised in order to reduce their number if possible
Process indicator 7	Number of Parties that have developed and used appropriate strategies to identify contaminated sites			None	
Process indicator 8	Number of Parties that have identified contaminated sites				
Process indicator 9	Number of Parties that have voluntarily undertaken remediation activities				
Implementation plans (Article 7)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties that have completed their national implementation plans and transmitted them to the Conference of the Parties in a timely manner	Convention's webpage; http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/NIPs/NIPTransmission/tabid/253/Default.aspx	Data are available but data limitations exist.	Available data provides only an indication that Parties have met their obligations to develop their plans. The implementation of plans is reflected in the other elements reviewed in the effectiveness evaluation.	Process indicators 1 and 2 give a good overview of the implementation of Article 7 of the Convention. While all three indicators are considered as useful, outcome indicator 3 on the 'comparison in the percentage change in the quantity of persistent organic pollutants produced, used, imported and exported for use by Parties that have completed national
Process indicator 2	Number of Parties that have reviewed and updated their amended plans and transmitted them to the Conference			Given that the newly listed chemicals are still in use as opposed to the 12 initial POPs, many Parties face	

	of the Parties			challenges in identifying these newly listed POPs in products and articles.	implementation plans and by Parties that have not completed such plans' present a challenge; in effect the low number of Parties reporting use and import and export data does not allow a thorough evaluation of progress through this quantitative indicators.
Outcome indicator 3	Comparison in the percentage change in the quantity of persistent organic pollutants produced, used, imported and exported for use by parties that have completed NIPs and by Parties that have not completed NIPs	Periodic reports submitted by Parties pursuant to Article 15		The information currently available from the national reports and NIPs is too limited to support the assessment of this indicator.	Indicator 3 needs to be revised to reflect listing of new substances in the Annexes of the Convention and the resulting need to update the NIPs. The important question to be asked when assessing this Article is whether the NIPs are serving their purpose and are improving implementation of the Convention. It may be useful to further discuss the purpose of Article 7 as NIPs may prove to be helpful tools for Parties in more ways than that originally contemplated when the Convention was drafted.
Listing of chemicals in Annexes A, B and C (Article 8)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Outcome indicator 1	Percentage of the recommendations for listing chemicals of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee that have been adopted by the COP	Decisions of the Conference of the Parties	Information readily available	None	The indicator is fully applicable An additional indicator for the qualitative assessment of the efficiency of the work of POPRC e.g. submissions of information and comments, the duration of the review process (length of time from nomination to listing) could enable addressing more comprehensively

					this Article.
Information exchange (Article 9)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties with designated national focal points	Section VII of part B of the national reports; national focal points (NFP) and official contact points (OCP) nomination forms submitted to the Secretariat, the national reports pursuant to Article 15 from the third, second or first national reports, national implementation plans (NIPs), various reports extracted from the Secretariat information systems, and the activity reports submitted by regional centres.	Data and information are available to assess the indicators.	None	Outcome indicators need to be defined for this Article e.g. % of Parties having a National Focal Point; and/or the number of Parties that sought info and have not been able to receive it. The framing of process indicator 4 limiting it to the number of Parties participating in information exchange activities organized by regional centres exclude activities organised through other channels and in developed countries (provided it is reported through the national reports or other relevant sources); this may need to be revised to include also activities organized by other channels. See recommendation in paragraph 120 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report on Article 9 and amend the list of indicators accordingly.
Process indicator 2	Number of Parties that have established information exchange mechanisms				
Process indicator 3	Number of Parties, IGOs and NGOs that have submitted information on POPs and POPs related issues through the clearing house mechanism				
Process indicator 4	Number of Parties participating in information exchange activities organized by regional centres				
Public information, awareness and education (Article 10)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties that	National reports pursuant to	Data are available and	None	

	have taken measures to implement Article 10.	Article 15 from either the third, second, first cycles, national implementation plans (NIPs), various reports extracted from the Secretariat information systems, and the activity reports submitted by SC regional centres.	support the assessment of indicators 1-3		<p>defined for this article, e.g. the number of Parties with publicly accessible PRTRs.</p> <p>An essential step in the development or updating of NIPs is supporting communication, information exchange and awareness raising; NIP may serve as a proxy indicator for the effectiveness of article 10. Needs assessment report and any other relevant documents could be used as well.</p> <p>Indicator 3 should evaluate what is happening at the national level and therefore activities by regional centers are not relevant here and should be evaluated under Article 12. Indicator 3 should be revised accordingly as: "Number of activities related to public information, awareness and education activities organized by Parties."</p>
Process indicator 2	Average number of measures under paragraph 1 of Article 10 that are being implemented by parties.				
Process indicator 3	Number of Parties participating in public information, awareness and education activities organized by regional centres.	Activity reports submitted by the regional centres			
Research, development and monitoring (Article 11)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Number of Parties that report undertaking research and development initiatives to implement Article 11	National reports submitted by Parties pursuant to Article 15 and in the NIPs, the global monitoring report developed by the coordination group for the global monitoring plan, information concerning submissions by Parties to various scientific / technical processes on risk profiles and	Data are available	Data that are captured in national reports are qualitative, giving only an indication. Information on level of effort is mostly qualitative.	There is a need to define an outcome indicator for this article that captures the collaborative / partnership aspect in addressing R&D needs for POPs. E.g. accounting for the Parties that are engaged in multinational R&D activities related to POPs. The availability of relevant data sources needs to be verified during
Process indicator 2	Average number of items under paragraph 1 of Article 11 that are being implemented by Parties				

Process indicator 3	Number of Parties that report monitoring of persistent organic pollutants in humans and the environment	risk management evaluations, and other scientific publications on POPs.			this exercise.
Technical assistance and financial resources (Articles 12–14)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Process indicator 1	Total monetary value of financial resources, including technical assistance, provided	Sections X and XI of part B of the national reports. Reports from the Secretariat on the implementation of Articles 12–14. Reports from the entity entrusted with administering the financial mechanism. Reports from the regional centres. Executive summaries of needs assessments and national implementation plans, as per decision SC-5/22, paragraphs 8–10.	Data are generally available but limitations in using these data exist.	Data available may not readily provide information on the degree to which technical assistance and technology transfer have met Parties' needs. National reports may need to be revised to capture more detailed information to support evaluation of the questions. The Conference of the Parties may wish to consider other measures to collect relevant data.	The order of the indicators in the framework, mixing financial and technical assistance indicators, could be reorganized to facilitate assessment of financial and technical assistance aspects The number of indicators is too high, and, for some, information is very difficult if not impossible to find. Some of them could be combined to reduce the number. The revision of technical assistance indicators should take into account the relevant recommendation in the effectiveness evaluation report (see recommendation in paragraph 134 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report). Given the provisions of Article 12.4, process indicators 9 and 10 may need to be amended to cover both technical assistance and technology transfer. They could be combined as well. It was noted that reporting on technical assistance and technology transfer is often
Process indicator 2	Total monetary value of financial resources, including technical assistance received				
Process indicator 3	Number of Parties providing technical assistance and financial resources				
Process indicator 4	Number of Parties requesting technical assistance and financial resources				
Process indicator 5	Number of Parties receiving technical assistance and financial resources				
Process indicator 6	Total monetary value of technology transfer provided				
Process indicator 7	Total monetary value of technology transfer received				
Process indicator 8	Number of Parties providing technology transfer				
Process indicator 9	Number of Parties requesting technology				

	transfer					
Process indicator 10	Number of Parties receiving technology transfer					<p>mixed up and makes distinction difficult. Therefore they could be combined in one indicator.</p> <p>For financial resources, indicators are needed to address what are the eligible needs, how much funding is available to meet the needs and how funding is being disbursed. The review of the financial mechanism adopted in Decision SC-7/20 could inform a revised set of indicators in accordance with the aspects assessed in the review.</p>
Process indicator 11	Number of initiatives regional centres have undertaken					
Process indicator 12	Total monetary value of technical assistance provided by regional centres					
Process indicator 13	Number of Parties that mobilized national resources for implementing the Convention					
Process indicator 14	Total monetary value of national financial support and incentives for implementing the Convention					
Reporting (Article 15)						
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators				
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations	
Process indicator 1	Proportion of Parties reporting on time	Compilation of information from national reports prepared by the Secretariat.	The existing information is supporting the evaluation of the indicators	None	<p>Indicators 1 and 2 could be combined to give an outcome indicator: Proportion of Parties reporting complete and on time; the revision of the indicators should take due consideration of the recommendation on reporting/data validation in the effectiveness evaluation report (see recommendation set out in paragraph 154 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report).</p> <p>Indicator 3 may not be needed.</p>	
Process indicator 2	Proportion of Parties indicating that information is not available for specific questions			Attention should be paid to the consistency and comparability of the reported information over reporting cycles.		
Process indicator 3	Changes in reporting levels between cycles					

					An additional indicator about national reports may include optional information that would help inform effectiveness evaluation.
Effectiveness Evaluation (Article 16)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Outcome indicator 1	Evidence of implementation of recommendations from effectiveness evaluation through decisions and actions of the Conference of Parties	NA			The indicator for assessing the effectiveness of Article 16 can only be assessed after the first evaluation cycle and the development of the first set of recommendations.
Non-Compliance (Article 17)					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
None		NA			At the time of the writing of this report, the Conference of the Parties has not approved procedures and institutional mechanism for determining non-compliance with the provisions of the Convention and for the treatment of Parties found to be in non-compliance. Accordingly, there is no information currently available on non-compliance provided through these procedures, which are to be adopted, as per Article 17, “as soon as practicable”. It is recommended that the

					framework contain at least one indicator regarding the establishment of the compliance mechanism.
General indicators					
Effectiveness evaluation framework		Assessment of information sources and applicability of indicators			
Indicator	Definition	Source of information	Data availability/ Applicability of indicator	Data limitations	Conclusions/ Recommendations
Indicator (a)	How many Parties are there to the Convention?	Treaty Section of the United Nations Office of Legal Affairs; Convention's website	The available information supports the application of the indicator	None	Additional indicators may be identified to address other related issues, such as POPs in products, alternatives, as well as the impacts of institutional settings, such as synergies, built under the Convention. In developing the new indicators due consideration should be given to recommendations set out in paragraphs 173, 181, 182, 184 and 188 of the executive summary of the effectiveness evaluation report.
Indicator (b)	What is the number of Parties for which the amendments to list additional chemicals in Annexes A, B or C have entered into force?				
Indicator (c)	Of the non-Parties, are there any major producers, users, importers, exporters, or emitters of persistent organic pollutants?	Global monitoring reports; National reports submitted under Article 15; Regular reports by the Secretariat to the Conference of the Parties on the evaluation of the procedure in Paragraph 2 (b) of Article 3; Information provided by non-Parties under the clearing-house mechanism as per Article 9	Information readily available, but from scattered sources, some sources incomplete		
Indicator (d)	Are all of the processes and requirements in the Convention now implemented?	The Convention. Official reports of the meetings of the Conferences of the Parties; Procedures and mechanisms on compliance, once adopted	Information is considered suitable to support the application of the indicator		