



**STOCKHOLM CONVENTION  
ON PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS  
(POPs)**



**Effectiveness Evaluation  
Provisional Ad Hoc Technical Working Group (TWG)  
First meeting, Brno, 9-12 October 2006**

**Document GMP-TWG-1/4**

**Proposal on a Framework for Application of Criteria for Evaluation of Monitoring Activities  
that can potentially contribute to the Stockholm Convention GMP.**

Definitions used:

Phase I Activities to support the Article 16 effectiveness evaluation that will be conducted by the COP at its fourth meeting in 2009.

Phase II = Activities to support effectiveness evaluations after 2009.

Activity = 'Package' of related monitoring and/or research activities that constitute a self-contained 'programme' implemented at the national or regional level [what about sub-national?]

Tier = A combination of media that may be used for the initial and latter evaluations.

**Step 1 -**

<i>Question(s) to be addressed</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<p>Is the activity a 'tier 1' - i.e. concerned with repetitive monitoring measurements of POPs in air, human milk or human blood?</p> <p>Is the activity a 'tier 2' - i.e. concerned with repetitive monitoring measurements of POPs in bivalves, bird eggs, fish, marine mammals?</p> <p>Is the activity a 'tier 3' - i.e. concerned with repetitive monitoring measurements of POPs in water, sediments, soils, food?</p> <p>If the activities are not repetitive (e.g. for research, survey or screening), the activity may be referred to step 5 to assess the potential for that activity to be used to increase geographic coverage given an identified level of capacity building.</p>	<p><b>The purpose of this 'step' is to categorise 'activities' in the countries/regions according to their relevance to the core elements of the GMP in:</b></p> <p><b>a) the initial or subsequent evaluations; or</b> <b>b) in subsequent evaluations subject to possible identified levels of capacity building.</b></p> <p>(Answer to these questions is obtained from questionnaire 1)</p>

**Step 2 -**

<b><i>Question(s) to be addressed</i></b>	<b><i>Notes</i></b>
<p>Evaluation of information derived from questionnaire responses and other relevant sources concerning:</p> <p>a) Capabilities of laboratories involved in the activity (laboratory capability, capacity, accreditation, etc.)</p> <p>b) Sampling and analytical methodologies (use of internationally standardised methods / nationally standardised methods, appropriateness of methods).</p> <p>c) QA/QC regimes (are reference materials available and if so are they routinely analysed; participation of labs in international inter-comparisons or laboratory testing schemes; and, participation of labs in nationally coordinated inter-comparisons, etc.)</p>	<p><b>The purpose of this `step` is to evaluate `activities` with respect to their ability to deliver data of `adequate` quality for effectiveness evaluation</b></p> <p>(Answer to these questions is obtained from questionnaire 2a, 2b and 2e)</p> <p>This part of the `evaluation` may require an expert panel to review the descriptive information provided on the questionnaire together with other relevant sources of information (UNEP GEF LABCAP, information in NIPs, etc.)</p> <p>The evaluation will need to consider `adequacy` with respect to different POPs and media combinations concerned</p> <p>Adequacy could be rated according to three categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adequate to allow comparison with data from other regions;</li> <li>2. Internally consistent (e.g. potentially useful for establishing time trends); or</li> <li>3. Not adequate for use in Article 16 evaluations.</li> </ol>

**Step 3 -**

<b><i>Question(s) to be addressed</i></b>	<b><i>Notes</i></b>
<p>Is the activity part of an international programme possessing international reporting of results?</p> <p>If yes: Are data accessible from international programmes and data centres.</p> <p>If no: Are data archived and accessible at the, international, national and/or programme level.</p>	<p><b>The purpose of this `step` is to identify possible sources of data and information to use in the Article 16 evaluations, and to ascertain the degree of information transparency.</b></p> <p>The answer to these questions is obtained from questionnaire 1, 2c and 2d, and supplementary information in Section 2 of the questionnaire, e.g. reference to NIPs.</p> <p>There will be a need to address considerations</p>

	relating to the level of data required for Article 16 evaluations - `raw data; and aggregated / summarised data` (may be difficult to `combine themselves; and with `interpreted data products` (e.g. regional assessment report from other programmes). All data products used should allow raw data to be accessed.
--	---

**Step 4 -**

<i>Question(s) to be addressed</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<p>Is the activity part of a `continuing` programme?</p> <p>If yes: The information is of potential relevance to Phase I and Phase II.</p> <p>If no: The information is immediately relevant to Phase I only. However, the activity may be referred to step 5 to assess the potential for that activity to be used to increase geographic coverage given an identified level of capacity building.</p>	<p><b>The purpose of this `step` is to identify possible sources of data and information to use in the Article 16 evaluations.</b></p> <p>The answer to these questions is obtained from questionnaire. Is there a question on the `basis` for the activity, perhaps related to provision of funding for the activities?</p> <p>`Continuing` in this respect refers to a programme with a long-term implementation perspective, or possibly multi-annual repeated sampling (allows for retrospective analysis ... including activities based on environmental archives?.</p>

**Step 5 -**

<i>Question(s) to be addressed</i>	<i>Notes</i>
<p>What are the perspectives for the activity contributing to the GMP if additional capacity is added?</p> <p>Does the response indicate that the perspectives to contribute to the GMP can be improved if related capacity building is implemented/</p> <p>If no: no further action.</p> <p>If yes: Are there options that would allow the proposed capacity building to be effected in time for the activity to contribute</p>	<p><b>The purpose of this `step` is to:</b></p> <p><b>a) Identify perspectives for the activities to contribute to the GMP if capacity were to be added or extended; and</b></p> <p><b>b) Assist in prioritisation of capacity building.</b></p> <p>The answer to these questions is obtained from questionnaire 3.</p> <p>Given the time frame for Phase I, "feasible" capacity building as a contribution to Phase I could include for example bilateral cooperations</p>

<p>more effectively to Phase I?</p> <p>If yes: Consider practical implementation of capacity building.</p> <p>If no: Either eliminate activity from further consideration or consider capacity building to develop the activity so that it can contribute to Phase II</p>	<p>or offers by a given country to analyse samples from other countries/regions</p> <p>Capacity building aiming at Phase II might include activities such as setting up new monitoring programmes, establishing new laboratories and getting them operational, etc.</p>
---	---

### **Geographical coverage**

When the issue of geographical coverage issue is addressed, potential sources of information will include the NIPs and answers to non-mandatory parts of questionnaire. Questionnaire question 1 will allow coverage to be evaluated in terms of ‘countries’ (e.g. preparing maps for air monitoring or human tissue monitoring that show which countries have an activity that includes these media) but not in terms of individual locations or populations that are monitored.