

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, WATER,  
ANIMAL AND FISHERIES RESOURCES**

-----  
**GENERAL SECRETARIAT**  
-----

**Directorate General for the Environment  
and Living Conditions**

**BURKINA FASO**

-----  
*Homeland or Death, we  
will prevail*

**COMMENTARY ON THE EXPERTS' REPORT**

Congratulations to the team for the quality of the report. To contribute to its improvement, we have listed a number of comments, which are as follows:

In general, the absence of a table of acronyms and abbreviations makes it difficult to understand certain acronyms and abbreviations mentioned in the document.

Throughout the document, I noticed that after each point developed, a bibliography is appended at the bottom of the point. I was going to suggest that we group all the bibliographies at the end of the report.

181 Biote: given that the spatial coverage was uneven, can the results obtained be generalized since artisanal gold mining sites were not taken into account, particularly in Africa.

221: Fish: no reference value (toxicity risk) was mentioned, while values were given for the others. Complete this section with data.

460. 1.1. Effectiveness assessment framework: separate this point from the objectives of the effectiveness assessment of the implementation of the convention.

678 1.6 Report Organization: No elements have been described in this section. This section should allow readers to understand the report's structure. It would be advisable to complete it.

687 2.1.1 What data are available: several data sources have been mentioned, however the analysis was done on the Emissions for Global Atmospheric Research (EDGAR) database and the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLTRAP) database. What about other data sources such as MIA, etc.?

3548 Arctic case study: temporal evolution of mercury bioaccumulation in the circumpolar Arctic. This section is very interesting; however, no data on mercury levels are described. It would be beneficial to supplement it with the time series data described.

3608 : The first sentence of the paragraph states that mercury levels in belugas hunted by the Inuvialuit increased between 1981 and 2002, and in the second line, high mercury levels were measured between 1996 and 2002. Is this the same information? If so, harmonize.

3838: On both tables we see that the concentrations evolved between 2002 and 2024 and did not change significantly; instead of mentioning that the concentrations at the end of the time series were not significantly different from those at the beginning of the time series, it will be necessary to specify the values .

4652 1) Gradual phasing out of dental amalgam for children under 15 years of age (Slovenia). For this section, it would be helpful to provide a brief summary of the results (mercury levels) obtained after discontinuing the use of dental amalgam in these children. This could contribute to assessing the effectiveness of this measure on children's health.

### **3. Integrated Analysis**

This section highlights the reduction in mercury emissions and releases compared before and after the adoption of the Minamata Convention on Mercury. However, my question is whether the case studies mentioned in this section are necessary.

The data assessed predate the implementation of the Convention; these issues could be addressed earlier, as this section concerns the Convention's implementation period. This refers to (7283), the FFL case study: Impacts of Mercury Emission Reduction on the Flin Flon Ecosystem