

INC4/30July,2012

## **Intervention:**

### **IPEN views on Article 21: National implementation plans (NIPs)**

**Presented by: Dr. Shahriar Hossain, ESDO, Bangladesh**

IPEN believe, the Stockholm Convention experience showed that the availability of fund for NIPs preparation was critical in enabling Convention ratification and implementation. However, at INC3 some countries proposed that NIP preparation itself should be voluntary. If this is approved, NIP preparation may not be considered a compliance activity and may not automatically be eligible for financial support.

This will likely negatively impact the ability of developing countries to set priorities, prevent them from bringing critically important treaty provisions into the treaty compliance regime, and make them ineligible for support from the financial mechanism. NIPs can play a critical role in sensitizing concern ministries to mercury issues and enhancing the priority of sound chemicals management, through establishment of focal points and development of a national panel of experts. NIPs should include an inventory of mercury supplies, sources, wastes, and contaminated sites. An improved UNEP Toolkit could be useful to Parties in identifying and quantifying their mercury sources and releases.

The various national action plans required under various articles could be chapters in the NIP. In addition, enabling activities will be a critical part of the mercury treaty. NIPs are a tangible, logical output from enabling activities that help set country priorities and cover the way for meaningful treaty implementation.

Technical assistance to countries in preparation of their NIP could help establish a country-driven plan with tangible outputs. Finally, NIPs also have a role in helping the wider public understanding and support the goals of national implementation by involving civil society in their formulation and execution.