



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
23 February 2007

Original: English

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

Dakar, 30 April–4 May 2007

Item 5 (d) of the provisional agenda*

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

**Analysis of implementation plans transmitted to the Conference
of the Parties pursuant to Article 7 of the Convention ****

Note by the Secretariat

1. Paragraph 1 (a) of Article 7 of the Stockholm Convention requires each Party to develop and endeavour to implement a plan for the implementation of its obligations under the Convention. Paragraph 1 (b) of the Article states that each Party shall transmit its implementation plan to the Conference of the Parties within two years of the date on which the Convention enters into force for it.
2. In paragraph 5 of decision SC-2/7, adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting, the Conference requested the Secretariat to prepare an analysis of the national implementation plans transmitted pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, to be submitted to the Conference of the Parties for consideration at its third meeting. This analysis should focus on frequently identified national priority actions and best practices for controlling persistent organic pollutants.
3. As a follow-up to the above request, the Secretariat analysed the 42 national implementation plans it had received as of 12 February 2007. Table 1 below contains a list of those plans.

* UNEP/POPS/COP.3/1.

** Stockholm Convention, Article 7; report of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention on the work of its second meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.2/30), annex I, decision SC-2/7.

Table 1. Geographical distribution of national implementation plans that had been transmitted as of 12 February 2007

Africa	Asia and the Pacific	Central and Eastern Europe	Latin America and the Caribbean	Western Europe and others
Burundi	Fiji	Albania	Bolivia	Australia
Chad	Jordan	Armenia	Chile	Canada
Côte d'Ivoire	Lebanon	Belarus	Ecuador	Denmark
Egypt	Niue	Bulgaria	Nicaragua	Finland
Mali	Philippines	Czech Republic	Uruguay	Germany
Mauritius		Latvia		Japan
Morocco		Republic of Moldova		Monaco
Togo		Romania		Netherlands
Tunisia		Slovakia		New Zealand
United Republic of Tanzania		The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		Norway
				Sweden
				Switzerland

4. In undertaking the analysis, the Secretariat took into account the guidance for assisting countries in the preparation of national implementation plans, as adopted by the Conference of the Parties in its decision SC-1/12. It was observed that, although decision SC-1/12 encouraged Governments to use the guidance, its use is reflected only in a minority of the implementation plans that have been officially transmitted. The format and the type of information contained in the plans vary substantially, making it difficult in some cases to compare the data.

5. Although the Conference of the Parties at its first meeting agreed to include in the guidance specific text relevant to the requirements of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, only 12 per cent of the implementation plans reviewed acknowledged the existence of synergies at the national level between the chemicals-related multilateral environmental agreements and 7 per cent indicated the relevance of the specific requirements of the Rotterdam Convention to their future implementation of the Stockholm Convention. Eighty-five per cent of the Parties which submitted implementation plans stated whether or not they are a Party to the Rotterdam Convention.

6. In accordance with the guidance for assisting countries in the preparation of national implementation plans, most implementation plans indicate that an interagency or multi-stakeholder coordinating mechanism had been set up in order to prepare the plan; very few of them, however, set out a role for the coordinating mechanism in the implementation of the Convention.

7. Overall, the implementation plans reviewed contain an in-depth assessment of each Party's institutional structure, legislation and capacity in the field of persistent organic pollutants and chemicals management in general. Only a few Parties, however, actually indicate how they intend to implement the obligations under the Stockholm Convention in the short, medium or long term.

8. Although the majority of the implementation plans reviewed contain some information on priorities, these priorities are not clearly highlighted and are thus not always obvious to the reader. Furthermore, the priorities are not often ranked in order of importance, thus making it very difficult to identify a Party's priorities at the national level or to identify overall common priorities for the next five or ten years at either the subregional, regional or global levels.

9. A number of national implementation plans indicate the Party's future interest in taking into account, when implementing their national priorities, the experiences of other Parties in applying best practices for controlling persistent organic pollutants. None of the implementation plans, however, mentioned the current use of best practices for controlling persistent organic pollutants.

10. A table summarizing the national priority actions identified by Parties and their existing implementation infrastructure is set forth in the annex to the present note.

11. Article 5 of the Convention requires Parties to develop action plans on measures to reduce the total releases derived from anthropogenic sources of each of the chemicals listed in Annex C of the Convention, as well as strategies on the identification of contaminated sites and their remediation in an environmentally sound manner, among other things. It also requires Parties to implement the action plans as part of their implementation plan. The guidance for assisting countries in the preparation of their implementation plans also encourages Parties to develop strategies on the different measures to be taken under the Convention. Few Parties, however, have actually included such plans and strategies in their national implementation plan.

12. The implementation plans reviewed acknowledge the need to mobilize financial resources in order to implement the obligations under the Stockholm Convention. Parties which are developing countries or countries with economies in transition have highlighted their need to access external financial resources and some Parties have even included budgets describing in detail what their financial needs over the next years will be in order to implement their obligations under the Convention. On the other hand, developed country Parties have in general highlighted the activities related to the implementation of the Convention that they have funded at the international level.

Possible action by the Conference of the Parties

13. The Conference may wish:

- (a) To consider the information provided in the present note;
- (b) To encourage Parties that have not finalized their implementation plans pursuant to Article 7 of the Convention to ensure that the guidance for assisting countries in the preparation of national implementation plans, as adopted by the Conference of the Parties in its decision SC-1/12, is fully taken into account and thus reflected in their respective action plans and strategies;
- (c) To invite Parties to provide to the Secretariat an indication of their main priorities in implementing the Stockholm Convention for the period 2007–2015;
- (d) To request the Secretariat, taking into account the information received from Parties, to prepare a report on the priorities identified by Parties in implementing their national implementation plans, which should, among other things, identify possible areas of technical assistance needs.

Annex

National priority actions identified by Parties and existing implementation structure

Region	Priorities identified in national implementation plans	Best practices for controlling persistent organic pollutants	Policy and legal regime	Financial resources mobilization for implementation of national implementation plan
Africa	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional and regulatory reform and capacity-building; 2. Disposal of persistent organic pollutant stockpiles including polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) and persistent organic pollutant (POP) pesticides; 3. Identification and remediation of POPs-contaminated sites; 4. Reduction of unintentional POPs releases particularly from combustion sources. 	No specific indication.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mixed legal systems; 2. Most have environment protection acts and laws to regulate chemicals; 3. Some have national environmental policy but most don't seem to have separate policy document. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Priority resource mobilization through external sources; 2. Indication of some internal resources mobilization; 3. Private sector mobilization and other sources not clearly spelled out.
Asia and Pacific	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional and regulatory strengthening and preparation of guidelines on PCBs and organo-chloride pesticides management; 2. Strengthening of monitoring capabilities; 3. Management of stockpiles of persistent organic pollutant waste; 4. Identification and management of hotspots. 	No specific indication.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No separate environmental policy in most of the countries; 2. Environmental law exists in many countries but some still don't have such legislation; 3. Mixed legal system, separate laws on different components of environment. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mostly dependent on the national budget and external funding for implementation of national implementation plan; 2. Private sector mobilization in some countries but not in majority.

Region	Priorities identified in national implementation plans	Best practices for controlling persistent organic pollutants	Policy and legal regime	Financial resources mobilization for implementation of national implementation plan
Central and Eastern Europe	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Management of persistent organic pollutant stockpiles with emphasis on PCB-contaminated equipment, waste and site clean ups; 2. Institutional and regulatory strengthening including the establishment of persistent organic pollutant national centres; 3. Updating persistent organic pollutant inventories as well as the improvement of laboratory capabilities; 4. Control measures to reduce unintentionally produced persistent organic pollutants, including improved public awareness and information. 	No specific indication.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the countries lack separate environment policy; 2. Laws on environment exist in most of the countries in some form; 3. Large number of government decisions have been taken on the issues of relevance to the Convention; 4. No coordination among environmental legislation, mostly separate laws for air, water, waste, hazardous substance management; 5. Most of them are in transitional stage of adopting European Union legislation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mostly dependent on the national budget and external funding for implementation of the national implementation plan; 2. A few indicate that they have created or are in the process of creating an environment fund.
Latin America and the Caribbean	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduction of release of unintentional persistent organic pollutants from waste and biomass combustion; 2. Elimination of stockpiles of persistent organic pollutants both PCB and POP pesticides; 3. Education, information and awareness-raising on persistent organic pollutants; 4. Improvement of persistent organic pollutant monitoring capacity; 5. Institutional and regulatory strengthening. 	No specific indication.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although no specific Stockholm Convention legal regimes have been put in place, Parties tend to have extensive legal regimes addressing the environment in general; 2. Laws on the management of chemical substances and pesticides exist; 3. In general there is no indication of the enforcement of regimes/systems at the national level. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National and external assistance; 2. Bilateral and multilateral cooperation; 3. Private resource mobilization in some countries.

Region	Priorities identified in national implementation plans	Best practices for controlling persistent organic pollutants	Policy and legal regime	Financial resources mobilization for implementation of national implementation plan
<p>Western Europe and others</p>	<p>The majority of the implementation plans and their relevant action plans lack an indication of the Party's national priorities in relation to the implementation of the Stockholm Convention, however the following priorities can be highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of unintentional releases of persistent organic pollutants; • Assessment and elimination of POPs contamination through articles in use; • Assessment of new persistent organic pollutants. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most Parties have a separate ministry of environment; 2. All of them have enforcement agencies on environmental regulations; 3. Coordination efforts with sector ministries are clearly spelled out. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most of the Parties have separate environment policy; 2. Laws on environment exist in most of the Parties with mixed legal system; 3. Laws on hazardous chemical management exist in most countries; 4. Mostly separate laws for air, water, waste, hazardous substances. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Parties are donors to the Global Environment Facility and multilateral environmental agencies; 2. They mobilize the federal budget and the private sector to achieve pollution control goals; 3. They have bilateral and regional cooperation programmes.