



Distr.: General
7 March 2005

Original: English



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

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

Punta del Este, 2–6 May 2005
Item 6 (i) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference
of the Parties: Reporting**

**Summary of the results of field testing of the draft model format for
Party reporting****

Note by the Secretariat

1. At its seventh session, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for an International Legally Binding Instrument for Implementing International Action on Certain Persistent Organic Pollutants, in its decision INC-7/11, noted the draft model format for reporting contained in annex III to document UNEP/POPS/INC.7/19 and the comments submitted to the Committee at its seventh session. Also, in paragraph 2 of the decision, the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee requested the Secretariat, inter alia, to field test the draft model format and to submit a report on that experience to the Conference of the Parties at its first meeting.
2. Paragraph 3 of decision 7/11 invited Governments to volunteer for such field tests in order to minimize budget implications.
3. In response to that request, the Secretariat conducted a field test of the draft model format revised on the basis of comments received at the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee.
4. From January to February 2005, the Secretariat invited Governments to volunteer to field test the reporting format. Governments which did so were given an average of two weeks to complete the draft format and return it by electronic means to the Secretariat. Governments were requested to fill in, as appropriate, the draft model format and to provide their feedback by electronic means to the Secretariat.
5. The Governments of Argentina, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Chile, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Germany, Japan, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yemen took part in the field test.

* UNEP/POPS/COP.1/1.

** Stockholm Convention, Article 15; Report of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on the work of its seventh session (UNEP/POPS/INC.7/28), annex I, decision INC-7/11.

Results

6. Generally, participating Governments found the draft model reporting format to be user-friendly.

7. It was noted that the questions were clear and straightforward and that they corresponded well with the provisions of the Convention. That made it possible to easily transfer information from the national implementation plan onto the reporting format, which made the reporting exercise relatively simple and quick.

8. The following issues were identified by those field testing the draft model format for reporting under Article 15 of the Convention:

- (a) Language problems were encountered by those whose official language was not English, which reflected difficulty in understanding the meaning of certain terms used in the reporting format, such as “legal measure”, “administrative measure”, “reporting period”, “land”, “product” and “residue”;
- (b) Inconsistencies were noted in the Spanish version of the format;
- (c) Further options for responses (e.g., “yes but not as part of NIP”) in the applicable questions were identified;
- (d) Consistency in the response options should be ensured throughout the entire reporting format;
- (e) Historical data on exports, imports, production and use was not always readily available;
- (f) Clearer instructions were needed to facilitate the provision of information;
- (g) An improved electronic version of the format was needed which would allow easy selection of answers by “ticking” the boxes.

9. Taking the above into account and taking account also of the experience gained from the field-testing exercise, the Secretariat prepared the revised draft format given in annex II of document UNEP/POPS/COP.1/20.

10. Some further possible considerations involving the reporting format which were identified by the Secretariat included:

- (a) Developing an improved electronic version of the format which would allow users to provide information more easily;
 - (b) Designing a database to store and effectively manage the data submitted by Parties in such a way as to ensure easy access, and to facilitate the compilation of the data to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of the Convention.
-