

**First meeting of the ad hoc working group on effectiveness evaluation**

UNEP/POPs/EE

Geneva, Switzerland, 10-12 November 2009**1st meeting of the ad hoc working group on effectiveness evaluation
10-12 November 2009**

1) The first meeting of the ad hoc working group on effectiveness evaluation took place from 10 to 12 November 2009 in Geneva, Switzerland. The following members of the working group were present: Prof. Dr. Jose Okond' Ahoka (Democratic Republic of Congo), Prof. Dr. Saad Hassan (Egypt), Ms. Chhanda Chowdhury (India), Mrs. Homeira Ekhtari (Islamic Republic of Iran), Ms. Irena Ježić (Croatia), Dr. Andrea Lopez Arias (Colombia), Dr. John Buccini (Canada) and Mr. Ramon Guardans i Cambo (Spain). Ms. Deborah Hardwick (Simcoe Muskoka District Health Unit, Ontario Canada) participated as an invited expert.

1. Opening and Welcome

2) The meeting was opened on Tuesday, 10 November 2009, by Mr. Donald Cooper, Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention. He stressed the fact that the Convention had included a mechanism for evaluating its effectiveness when it was developed and that the Parties had high expectations of this process. He encouraged the group to design a successful framework that would cover all aspects of the Convention.

2. Organization of work of the ad hoc working group

3) Mr. Ramon Guardans from Spain was elected chair of the meeting. The Agenda was adopted without change. The Secretariat introduced the Terms of Reference of the ad hoc working group as decided upon by the fourth Conference of the Parties in decision SC-4/32, as well as the objectives of the meeting.

3. Overview

4) The Secretariat gave overview presentations on the Stockholm Convention, national reports, the global monitoring plan and compliance information.

5) It was noted that the Stockholm Convention had several reporting obligations with different timelines (national reports, PCBs, DDT, national implementation plans, etc.). The Secretariat explained that upcoming changes on the format for national reports are aimed at including information on the new POPs, improving user friendliness of the system and enhancing comparability of data. The working group was invited to suggest changes that would make national reports more useful for effectiveness evaluation. The Secretariat is planning to develop a user manual for the new system and training workshops with the aim of increasing the number of Parties who will report in 2010.

4. A framework for effectiveness evaluation

6) Ms. Deborah Hardwick presented an overview of a framework for effectiveness evaluation, based on the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention framework. It outlined the purpose and elements of a framework and explained how a framework can help address the challenges of conducting effectiveness evaluation.

5. Discussion – Statement of objectives for the effectiveness evaluation

7) The evaluation of the effectiveness of the Convention seeks to assess whether the measures adopted by the Convention and implemented by the Parties have had the desired effect. Participants noted that according to SC-

2/13, the work required for each effectiveness evaluation should be conducted in two stages. The first stage consists of the independent compilation of: information on environmental monitoring in core media provided through the global monitoring plan (UNEP/POPS/COP4/33); information from Parties provided through national reports pursuant to Article 15; and information on non-compliance provided through procedures that will be established under Article 17. The second stage consists of the evaluation of such information to assess the effectiveness of the Convention.

8) Many factors can affect the effectiveness of the Convention, therefore other elements, such as awareness raising, change in consumer behavior, sharing of information, engaging stakeholders, need to be considered during the evaluation. It was also recognized that factors outside the Convention could influence in positive or negative ways the results observed: for example, changes in the environmental factors that influence the long range atmospheric and marine circulation of POPs can have an impact on trends. Additional information will therefore be required to have a complete picture on the results and to support the interpretation of data.

9) It was agreed that the effectiveness evaluation would look at trends over a time interval (GMP has established a 6 year cycle, with the next assessment due in 2015) and should include conclusions and recommendation that could contribute towards improvement of the evaluation process. The proposed objectives for the effectiveness evaluation are:

- To assess and interpret the trends of levels of POPs in humans and the environment.
- To assess the effectiveness of Convention measures that have been implemented.
- To assess what factors contribute to overall effectiveness of the Convention.

6. Discussion of selection of parameters to be included in the evaluation and process factors which are likely to contribute to the Convention's success

10) The members noted the need to design a cost-effective, streamlined and pragmatic proposal (SC4/32 paragraph 3). The members of the ad hoc working group agreed that, in general, availability of data would influence the final selection of indicators, but noted that even if data are not available for a specific indicator, it would be useful to highlight this, so that it could be considered in future, should data become available. Additional sources of information, such as reports to the Conference of the Parties on technical and financial assistance could be a source of information for the evaluation as appropriate.

11) The members considered the note of the Secretariat (UNEP/POPS/COP.4/30) and the various articles in Convention. Articles 1 and 3 to 17 inclusive were selected as relevant for the effectiveness evaluation.

7. Discussion - Identification of indicators and 8. Review of data requirements

12) The discussion of agenda item 7 included consideration of agenda item 8. For each of the articles identified above, members discussed the purpose or aim of the article, and identified both process and outcome indicators. Process indicators measure what happens during implementation (e.g. adoption of legal and administrative measures, the development of national implementation plans) and outcome indicators measure the desired impact of the activity (e.g. reductions in the quantities of POPs released). At the same time the group reflected on potential sources of information for the indicators and noted where changes might be necessary to the format for reporting under Article 15. The proposed process and output indicators as agreed upon are found in Annex I, and proposed changes to the reporting format in Annex II.

A) Article 3 – Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production and use

13) There was agreement that the indicators should include trends in quantities of production, import and export. For quantities imported and exported for trade have to be distinguished from those imported or exported for environmentally sound disposal; this may need a modification to the format for national reports. It was suggested that information on quantities used could also be considered; after some discussion it was agreed that this data was too difficult to collect.

14) There was a discussion on how to account for illegal trade. It was concluded that it would be difficult to get accurate data on this, but that this aspect could be considered when interpreting the data.

15) It was noted that effectiveness of the Convention depended not only on the adoption of legal and administrative measures, but also on their implementation. It was recognized that, while it would be useful to have information on the extent of implementation or degree of enforcement, this would be difficult to obtain. The group decided to keep the idea in mind for future discussion.

16) The group discussed whether it would be possible to consider cost-effectiveness of these measures. It noted such information would be difficult to collect and would go beyond the statement of objectives (Section 5, above).

B) Article 4 – Specific exemptions (Annexes A and B)

17) It was noted that the main reason for including specific exemptions for some chemicals in Annexes A and B of the Convention was to provide a period of transition for Parties that needed to find alternative products or processes. If Parties no longer need the specific exemptions after the period of five years, this would provide an indication of effectiveness.

C) Article 5 – Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production

18) A measure of effectiveness would be the adoption of best available techniques (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP) by Parties. It was recommended that in addition to noting if they had undertaken an action plan, Parties should indicate if they have undertaken activities to promote the use of BAT and BEP and whether they had adopted measures to require them.

19) With respect to the data from emission inventories, it was noted that it would be difficult to compile data from different Parties due to differences in methodologies and year the inventory was taken. Therefore, comparisons can only be made within countries. When action plans are reviewed (every five years), an update of the inventory can be used to provide trends – Parties would need to ensure the data are comparable and include trend data in their national reports (eventually recalculating older data if the methods have changed). It was noted that periodic inventories of releases of unintentionally produced POPs was also helpful to interpret data on levels of POPs collected under the global monitoring plan.

D) Article 6 – Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from stockpiles and wastes

20) To make a better distinction between stockpiles and wastes, and to include all the information useful for effectiveness evaluation, several changes to the national reporting format were recommended (see Annex II), including data on contaminated sites identified and any remedial action taken.

21) It was noted that information on the amount of products and articles in use and wastes that consist of or are contaminated with POPs is useful, and particularly relevant for some of the new POPs; however, this information is likely difficult to obtain. The feasibility of collecting data on this could be considered in the future.

22) The group noted that the current reporting format does not ask for information on identified contaminated sites nor on remediation measures that have been taken. While remediation is not an obligation under the Convention, the group concluded that this information, if available, is important to help assess effectiveness and progress towards achieving the Convention's objective.

E) Levels in humans and the environment

23) This element is related to Articles 1 (Objective of the Convention), 11 (Research, Development and Monitoring) and 16 (Effectiveness Evaluation). Participants re-iterated the importance of consolidating long term global monitoring data in core media, continuing monitoring programmes and providing support for developing countries and countries with economies in transition to participate in monitoring activities to address the gaps

identified (UNEP/POPS/COP4/33). There was a discussion on whether it would be important to include reference to specific activities as listed in Article 11. In the end, the group agreed that this level of detail would likely not be very helpful in the evaluation.

F) Implementation Plans

24) The group discussed the use of the national implementation plans (NIPs) as a source of information for the evaluation. Given their diversity and that data in the national reports are often derived from the NIPs, analysis of the NIPs was not considered useful for effectiveness evaluation. However, given the requirement to update NIPs as the result of the listing of the new POPs, the number of Parties that updated their NIPs should be considered as an indicator. There is no outcome indicator for this element, since these are reflected in the implementation of the other articles.

G) Article 8 – Listing new chemicals in Annexes A, B or C

25) Successful implementation of this article is necessary to ensure that the Convention remains a living agreement. A success parameter is the successful review of chemicals and the eventual listing of new POPs. Participants recognized that more discussion was needed to refine appropriate indicators, but one indicator could be the number of Parties for which the amendments to list the new chemicals have entered into force.

H) Article 9 – Information exchange

26) The group decided that some information on Articles 9 and 10 activities would be important and agreed that the level of detail currently in the reporting format was sufficient. The group agreed that activities of the Clearing House Mechanism should be included in the evaluation. The data and indicators to do this will need to be developed. The questions the evaluation could answer are: “Has the convention been successful in establishing an information exchange mechanism among parties”, and “Has the Clearing House Mechanism been established and is it meeting the needs of parties?”

I) Article 10 – Public information, awareness and education

27) Although public awareness is an important factor for effectiveness evaluation, the ad hoc working group concluded that obtaining comparable data on outcome indicators or specific activities would be very difficult. It was agreed that information on the number of Parties that have taken measures to implement Article 10 would be sufficient as an indicator.

J) Article 11 – Research, development and monitoring

28) The group agreed that the number of Parties that have taken measures to implement Article 11 was sufficient as an indicator, as obtaining more detailed and comparable data would be very difficult. The work under GMP provides a forum to follow progress in monitoring core media and work under UNEP Chemicals can identify capacity enhancement of POPs laboratories. The regional and global monitoring reports can also provide information on this element

K) Articles 12, 13, 14 – Technical and financial assistance

29) The group discussed articles 12, 13 and 14 jointly and agreed that these factors were essential in evaluating effectiveness. The COP receives, on a regular basis, reports on the implementation of Articles 12, 13 and 14 from the Secretariat and for Articles 13 and 14 from the financial mechanism (Global Environment Facility). It was agreed the results of these reports would be used to inform the effectiveness evaluation.

30) It was suggested that it would be useful to include a separate question in the reporting format on technology transfer to distinguish it from technical assistance.

L) Article 15 – Reporting

31) The main issue raised was the current low submission rate of reports under Article 15. It would be important to identify the reasons for this low response rate. One hurdle is that not all Parties have identified official contact points, who are the ones authorized to transmit the reports. It was also noted that some Parties may not have submitted reports because they had not been able answer all the questions. It was therefore recommended that the reporting format include an option to answer “data not available” as appropriate.

M) Article 16 – Effectiveness evaluation

32) The working group considered if the performance of the effectiveness evaluation itself would be evaluated. The members finally agreed that it would be important for the evaluation to reflect on quality and quantity of data available. Subsequent evaluations could also review the follow-up that had occurred as a result of recommendations made in the previous evaluation.

N) Non-compliance

33) Members agreed that there was a two-way flow of information between the effectiveness evaluation process and the compliance mechanism. While the Conference of the Parties has yet to adopt procedures on compliance, it was noted that the working group should anticipate the role of such procedures, especially in providing information on systemic issues of non-compliance. Information of this type could prove helpful in assessing whether or not there are weaknesses in the design of the Convention, the content of a particular measure, or simply compliance with the measure.

9. Discussion – Logic model for the evaluation

34) The Secretariat presented a model for the evaluation that outlined the aims of the various articles, expected outcomes and possible indicators. The working group discussed the proposal and developed a revised version, found in Annex I.

10. Discussion – Processes and procedures

A) Who will do the evaluation

35) Various models were discussed. It was noted that a diverse range of expertise and experience would be needed in the group – effectiveness evaluation, environmental monitoring, compliance, reporting and national implementation, and financial and technical assistance. The group agreed that the best approach was a group composed of 15-20 participants with the appropriate expertise as follows:

- Representatives from Parties in the region; 3 representatives per region
- Representatives from the coordinating group of the global monitoring plan
- Representatives from the compliance committee (once established)

36) The ad hoc working group will propose terms of reference for one full cycle of effectiveness evaluation, at the end of which the group would make recommendations on arrangements for future evaluations. Members would be nominated to serve a full cycle.

B) How the evaluation will be done

37) The members agreed that the sources of information for the effectiveness evaluation will include:

- The global monitoring report
- National reports
- Reports from the compliance mechanism (when available)
- Technical and financial assistance reports considered by the Conference of the Parties

38) The Secretariat would prepare reports and compile information coming from the various sources. The Secretariat could prepare an initial analysis of the data received to facilitate the work of the group. The group could establish thematic sub-groups to review data on specific topics.

C) When will the evaluation be done

39) When discussing the schedules for effectiveness evaluation, the members noted that there were various reporting schedules, some of which related to the date of entry into force of the Convention for each Party. Given this, the group agreed that there could be two different types of evaluations – *major* ones that consider all elements and *other* reports that consider selected elements based on the information available. Annex III provides a schedule for the first cycle that includes a report on selected elements to COP 6 (2013) and a report on all elements to COP 8 (2017).

D) How will results be reported and disseminated?

40) The results would be reported and disseminated according to standard procedures.

E) Who are the stakeholders and how will they be engaged?

41) International organizations, non-governmental organizations, industry and public interest groups have important roles in implementing the Convention and ensuring its effectiveness. They are therefore very important stakeholders in the effectiveness evaluation process. It was agreed the meetings of the evaluation group would be open to observers. A nomination process for observers could be instituted as has been done in other bodies under the Convention.

11. Elements of a framework for EE

42) The group discussed the outline of the document that will be presented to the COP at its fifth meeting. The revised outline is found in Annex IV. The document will describe the process of doing the effectiveness evaluation. Keeping in mind the limit for COP documents (20 pages), it was agreed that a user-friendly and short report should be aimed for.

43) It was noted that the ad hoc working group will also have to include the standards for selection of data and its interpretation of data. The standards used for the global monitoring plan could serve as a guide.

44) It was decided that the logic framework should only contain the articles under the convention and the identified process and outcome indicators in order to avoid doing an interpretation of the articles under the Convention. Also, the members agreed that in order to finalize the document, the Secretariat will revise it and send it to the members for comments.

12. Work Plan

45) When discussing the work plan, the members agreed on the following points:

- The Secretariat will, in cooperation with the Chair of the ad hoc working group, prepare a draft meeting report and send it out for comments to the members of the group. The final version of the report will be put on the Stockholm Convention website.
- The report will include annexes that indicate the changes that were requested to the reporting format under Article 15 by the group during discussions, as well as other changes identified. The working group will provide comments on the proposed changes by December 15.
- The Secretariat will support the Chair to prepare a first draft of the effectiveness evaluation framework. The schedule for comments, review and the next meeting is found in Annex V.
- The Secretariat will provide a draft compilation of the national reports once available. The group will consider if there is a need to meet to review information compiled and before finalizing recommendations for the fifth Conference of the Parties to consider.

46) The meeting was closed on 12 November 2009 at 3 p.m.

ANNEX I - Logical Model for the Evaluation

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
1: Objective of the Stockholm Convention	To protect human health and the environment from POPs	Levels of POPs in the environment and humans diminish over time and remain below levels of concern in all regions		Levels of POPs in air Levels of POPs in humans Levels of POPs in other environmental media, as available Source of data: Global Monitoring Plan
3: Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production and use of POPs	Prohibit and/or take the legal and administrative measures necessary to eliminate production and use of the chemicals listed in Annex A subject to the provisions of the Annex Prohibit and/or take the legal and administrative measures necessary to eliminate import and export of the chemicals listed in Annex A in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 3	Subject to provisions in the Convention: production , use, import and export of the chemicals listed in Annex A is eliminated the production and use of new pesticides or new industrial chemicals which have the characteristics of persistent organic pollutants is prevented	The time when Parties have taken measures to control production and use of POPs in Annex A that meet or exceed the Convention's requirements Source of data: Section II of the National Reports	For each of the chemicals listed in Annex A: Changes in quantities of POPs produced, used, imported and exported for use Changes in quantities of POPs imported, exported for environmentally sound waste disposal Source of data: Section VI of the National Reports
	Restrict production and use of the chemicals listed in Annex B in accordance with the provisions of the Annex	Subject to provisions in the Convention: production, use, import and export of the chemicals listed in Annex B is restricted	The time when Parties have taken measures to control production and use of POPs in Annex B that meet or exceed the Convention's requirements Source of data: Section II of the National Reports	For each of the chemicals listed in Annex B: Changes in quantities of POPs manufactured, imported, exported for use Changes in quantities of POPs imported, exported for environmentally sound waste disposal Source of data: Section VI of the National Reports

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
4: Register of specific exemptions	Establish a register to identify Parties that have specific exemptions listed in Annex A or B	Parties successfully make the transition to alternative products and processes within the allowed time period and the specific exemption is no longer needed	The number of Parties who have registered for specific exemptions and who no longer need them Number of years the specific exemption was in effect. Source of data: The register	
5: Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production	To reduce the total releases derived from anthropogenic sources of each of the chemicals listed in Annex C, with the goal of their continuing minimization and, where feasible, ultimate elimination	The amount of POPs that are produced unintentionally and released into the environment or disposed of are as low as possible or eliminated	Number of countries with action plans under Article 5 Number of parties that have undertaken a 5-year review* [Extent to which best available techniques and best environmental practices are adopted]* [Number of parties that have adopted measures that require BAT/BEP]* [Has your country undertaken an evaluation of the effectiveness of the measures taken? [Include information on methodology used for inventory]]* Source of data: Section IV of the National Reports * Modification to the form required	Percent change in the quantity of POPs that are produced unintentionally and released into the environment for each Party Source of data: Section IV of the National Reports

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
6: Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from stockpiles and wastes	Ensure that stockpiles consisting of or containing chemicals listed either in Annex A or Annex B and wastes, consisting of, containing or contaminated with a chemical listed in Annex A, B or C, are managed in a manner protective of human health and the environment	All stockpiles of POPs are managed in an environmentally sound manner All wastes containing POPs are managed and destroyed or disposed of in an environmentally sound manner	Number of parties that have strategies to identify stockpiles Number of Parties with measures in place to manage stockpiles in an environmentally sound manner. Number of parties with measures in place to manage wastes in an environmentally sound manner Number of parties that have strategies to identify products and articles in use and wastes containing POPs Number of parties that have strategies to identify contaminated sites Number of parties that have identified contaminated sites* [Number of parties that have undertaken remediation activities]* Source of data: Section V of the National Reports * Modification to the form required	[Changes in the quantity of POPs that are present in stockpiles] Quantity of wastes identified and destroyed over time [reporting period] (includes wastes of products and articles consisting or contaminated with POPs)* Source of data: Section V of the National Reports * This information may be difficult to collect, but important for new POPs)

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
7: Implementation plans	Each party Develop and endeavour to implement a plan for the implementation of its obligations under this Convention	Each Party manages POPs in an environmentally sound manner to meet the obligations and objective of the Convention.	Number of Parties that have completed their plans and transmitted them to the Conference of the Parties; Number of Parties that have reviewed, updated and transmitted their plans Number of parties that have submitted the plans within 2 years Source of data: Secretariat	
8: Listing of chemicals in Annexes A, B and C	The COP must decide, in a precautionary manner, whether to list a chemical in Annexes A, B and/or C and specify related control measures.	The Convention includes "all" chemicals known have the properties of POPs	Number of chemicals added to Annexes A, B or C Source of data: Decisions of the Conference of the Parties	Number of Parties for which the amendments to list the additional chemicals in Annexes A, B or C have entered into force Source of the data: Secretariat / Depository
9: Information exchange	To facilitate or undertake the exchange of information between Parties and the secretariat.	Parties have access to existing and relevant information on POPs, their effects, management, and alternatives	Number of Parties that have established information exchange mechanisms Number of Parties with designated national focal points [Indicators for clearing house mechanism to be developed] Source of data: Section VII of the National Reports / Secretariat	

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
10: Public information, awareness and education	To promote and facilitate the provision of the information to the public and stakeholders	All stakeholders are informed of the effects of POPs and their sound management, including BAT & BEP and alternatives, so that POPs are managed in an environmentally sound manner	Number of Parties that have taken measures to implement Article 10 Source of data: Section VIII of the National Reports	
11: Research, development and monitoring	To encourage and/or undertake appropriate research, development, monitoring and cooperation pertaining to POPs and, where relevant, to their alternatives and to candidate POPs	To create knowledge on POPs, candidate POPs, and their alternatives so that Parties are better able to implement the Convention and achieve its objective	Number of Parties that have taken measures to implement Article 11 [Amount of funds dedicated to research, development of best practices and techniques, and monitoring of POPs]* Source of data: Section IX of the National Reports	
12: Technical assistance	To provide timely and appropriate technical assistance to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition, to assist them, taking into account their particular needs, to develop and strengthen their capacity to implement their obligations under this Convention	Timely and appropriate technical assistance and technology transfer are available to developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition so that they have the necessary capacity to implement the Convention	Number of Parties giving or receiving technical assistance; Amount of technical assistance in financial terms provided or received. Source of data: Secretariat	Gap between estimated need for technical assistance and technology transfer and the amount of resources allocated Source of data: Secretariat, GEF and other agencies

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
13: Financial resources and mechanisms 14: Interim financial arrangements	To provide financial support and incentives in respect of those national activities that are intended to achieve the objective of the Convention in accordance with national plans, priorities and programmes Developed country Parties provide new and additional financial resources to enable developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition to meet the agreed full incremental costs of implementing measures which fulfill their obligations	Developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition are provided the resources necessary to meet the incremental costs of implementing measures which fulfill their obligations	Number of Parties that mobilized national resources Number of Parties that provided financial assistance Data source: Secretariat	Gap between estimated cost of implementation and the amount of funds allocated Data source: Secretariat, GEF and other agencies
15: Reporting	Each Party to report to the Conference of the Parties on the measures it has taken to implement the provisions of this Convention and on the effectiveness of such measures in meeting the objective of the Convention	The Conference of the Parties has the necessary information to assess the effectiveness of the implementation of the Convention	Proportion of parties that have submitted national reports on time Proportion of parties that have answered each question Source of data: Secretariat	
16: Effectiveness Evaluation	To evaluate the effectiveness of this Convention	The quantity and quality of data available is sufficient for conducting the evaluation Recommendations from the evaluation are implemented	Quantity and quality of data available Extent to which recommendations in the EE were acted upon Source of data: All	

Convention Article	Purpose	Desired or Expected Outcome	Process Indicator	Outcome Indicator
17: Non-compliance	To have procedures and institutional mechanisms for determining non-compliance with the provisions of this Convention and for the treatment of Parties found to be in non-compliance	All Parties are in compliance with the provisions of the Convention	To be determined	To be determined

ANNEX II - Suggested changes to the reporting format

As appropriate include

- Data not available Not applicable

Question 1 (ref Article 7)

Insert

- in progress

Add question

- Have you updated your national implementation plan to address the new POPs added to the annexes of the Convention?

Section II (ref. Article 3)

Question 5 – Specify specific measures as found in the annexes

Section IV (ref. Article 5)

- Has your country taken measures to promote/require the adoption of BAT/BEP?
- Has your country undertaken an evaluation of the efficacy of the laws and policies adopted to manage releases of unintentionally produced POPs?
- Has your country updated your action plan?

Question 15 – include a field to indicate method used to estimate releases.

- Ensure data from NIPs and updated evaluation of releases can easily be transferred to the national report

Section V (ref. Article 6)

- Group the questions on stockpiles together, followed by questions on wastes (e.g. question 21 should come before question 20)
- Reword question 20 to make more clear and to better reflect the Convention text.
- Add to Question 23 – Has your country identified contaminated sites? Has your country remediated contaminated sites?

Section VI (ref. Article 15, paragraph 2)

- Question 25 – need to include purpose of export (for acceptable purpose / specific exemption or for environmentally sound disposal)
- Question 26 – need to include purpose of import (for acceptable purpose / specific exemption or for environmentally sound disposal)

Section X (ref. Article 12)

- Repeat questions 32/33 but refer specifically to technology transfer

ANNEX III - Proposed Schedule for 1st evaluation cycle

Year	Reporting	GMP	EE
2010	Oct 31 Parties submit national reports to Secretariat Nov-Dec Secretariat compiles information		Jan-May Framework for EE elaborated May WG meets to agree on framework and proposal on procedures and arrangements and draft report Jul/Aug WG finalises proposal Dec (Optional) WG meets to review compilation of data from national reports and any additional monitoring data available
2011 COP5	May COP considers report		May COP considers proposal
2012	August NIPs for new POPs from most Parties due		
2013 COP6			May Effectiveness Evaluation report on selected elements
2014	Dec 31 Parties submit national reports to Secretariat		
2015 COP7	May COP considers report	May COP considers 2 nd GMP report	
2016			
2017 COP8			May Effectiveness Evaluation report on all elements Recommendations for future evaluation procedures

ANNEX IV - Suggested outline for the framework for the effectiveness evaluation

- I. Introduction including description of the Convention
- II. Scope of effectiveness evaluation
 - A) Logic model
 - B) Assumptions, and external factors (context), challenges
 - C) Objectives
 - D) Evaluation questions
 - E) Expected outcomes (e.g. conclusions and recommendation)
- III. Arrangements for effectiveness evaluation
 - A. Who will do the evaluation?
 - B. How will the evaluation be done – methodology for the analysis?
 - C. When will the evaluation be done?
 - D. How will recommendations be determined and results be reported and disseminated?
 - E. Who are the stakeholders and how will they be engaged, and when?
 - F. Resources required?
- IV. Indicators for effectiveness evaluation
 - A. Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from intentional production and use
 - 1. Indicators
 - 2. Source of information for the indicators
 - 3. Data limitations
 - 4. Baseline
 - B. Specific exemptions and notification of use
 - C. Assessing measures to reduce or eliminate releases from unintentional production
 - D. Measures to reduce or eliminate releases from stockpiles and wastes
 - E. Levels in humans and the environment
 - F. Implementation plans
 - G. Listing new chemicals in Annexes A, B or C
 - H. Information Exchange
 - I. Public information, awareness and education
 - J. Research, development and monitoring
 - K. Technical assistance
 - L. Financial resources
 - M. Reporting
 - N. Effectiveness Evaluation
 - L. Compliance
- V. Baseline for the evaluation
- VI. Standards for interpretation
- VII. Conclusions and Recommendations to the COP
- Annex Terms of reference for effectiveness evaluation group

ANNEX V - Draft Work Plan for Effectiveness Evaluation (November 2009 to May 2011)

Activity	Responsibility	Target date
Meeting of Ad Hoc Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of indicators and data requirements • Recommendations for changes to reporting format 	WG	10 - 12 November
Draft report of November 2009 Meeting (including recommendations for changes to the reporting format) Final report of meeting distributed to participants and posted on the web.	SSC/WG	30 November 2009 15 December (comments) 31 December
1 st draft of proposal for effectiveness evaluation framework Draft circulated to Ad Hoc Working Group	Chair with support of the Secretariat	28 February 2010 1 March 2010
Comment on 1 st draft of proposal for effectiveness evaluation framework	WG	1 - 31 March 2010
2 nd draft of proposal for effectiveness evaluation framework Draft circulated to Ad Hoc Working Group	Chair with support of the Secretariat SSC	1 - 30 April 2010 1 May 2010
Ad Hoc Working Group reviews 2 nd draft of proposal for effectiveness evaluation framework	WG	May 2010
Meeting of Ad Hoc Working Group to agree on EE procedures and draft report to the COP	WG	May 2010
Final report on proposal for effectiveness evaluation procedure		31 August
National reports submitted	Parties	31 October 2010
Data from national reports compiled and circulated to ad hoc working group members	SSC	30 November
(Optional) Meeting of Ad Hoc Working Group to discuss compilation of data from national reports	WG	early December 2010
Report to the COP - finalised	WG	January 2011
Conference of the Parties considers proposed effectiveness evaluation procedures and arrangements	WG	May 2011