2025 FULL REPORTS OF THE MINAMATA CONVENTION ON MERCURY

Report submitted on 19 December 2025

REPORTING PERIOD:
1 January 2021 to 31 December 2024

Attachments can be found on the website

▼ INFORMATION ON THE PARTY

1. Information on the party

Name of party
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Date on which its instrument of ratification, accession, approval or acceptance was deposited
23 March 2018

Date of entry into force of the Convention for the party
21 June 2018

2. Information on the national focal point

Full name of the institution
Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs – United Kingdom Government

Title of Contact Officer
Mr.

Name of Contact Officer
Simon Allcock

Mailing address
Seacole Building
2 Marsham Street
Westminster
London
SW1P 4DF

Telephone number
+447502587190

Fax number
{Empty}

E-mail
simon.allcock@defra.gov.uk

Second E-mail
ukmeas@defra.gov.uk

Web page
{Empty}

3. Information about the contact officer submitting the reporting format if different from the above

Focal Point is submitting the national report

- (●) Information is submitted by the national focal point
- ( ) Information is submitted through the national focal point by the contact officer

▼ ART. 3: MERCURY SUPPLY SOURCES AND TRADE

3.1: Does the party have any primary mercury mines that were operating within its territory at the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party?

- ○ Yes – primary mercury mining with available data
- ○ Yes – primary mercury mining with no available data
- ◉ No

3.2: Does the party have any primary mercury mines that are now in operation that were not in operation at the time of entry into force of the Convention for the party?

- ○ Yes – primary mercury mining with available data
- ○ Yes – primary mercury mining with no available data
- ◉ No

3.3: (A) Has the party endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons that are located within its territory?

3.3: (A) Has the party endeavoured to identify individual stocks of mercury or mercury compounds exceeding 50 metric tons that are located within its territory?

- ◉ Yes – with new data* (also to be selected by parties reporting for the first time)
- ○ Yes – endeavoured and indicates same stocks as reported in the previous report
- ○ No

ba33a_subsection

i. Please attach the results of your endeavour or indicate where it is available on the Internet;

- GBR_3.3a.docx

i. Please attach the results of your endeavour or indicate where it is available on the Internet;
{Empty}

ii. Supplemental: Please provide any related information – for example, on the use or disposal of mercury from such stocks.
New data for England is in Table 1 (see attachment).
Northern Ireland have identified no stocks over 50 tonnes.
The data remains the same as previously submitted for Scotland and Wales

3.3: (B) Has the party endeavoured to identify individual sources of mercury-supply-generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year that are located within its territory?

3.3:(B) Has the party endeavoured to identify individual sources of mercury-supply-generating stocks exceeding 10 metric tons per year that are located within its territory?

- ◉ Yes – with new data* (also to be selected by parties reporting for the first time)
- ○ Yes – endeavoured and indicates same stocks as reported in the previous report
- ○ No

ba33b_subsection

i. Please attach the results of your endeavour or indicate where it is available on the Internet;

- GBR_3.3b.docx

i. Please attach the results of your endeavour or indicate where it is available on the Internet;
{Empty}

ii. Supplemental: Please provide any related information – for example, on the use or disposal of mercury from such stocks.
New data for England is in Table 1 and 2 (see attachment).

Northern Ireland have identified no stocks over 10 tonnes.

The data remains the same as previously submitted for Scotland and Wales.

3.4: Has the party determined that it has excess mercury available from the decommissioning of chlor-alkali facilities?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No – has determined it has no excess mercury
- ( ) No – has not made a determination

If yes, please explain the measures taken to ensure that the excess mercury was disposed of in accordance with the guidelines for environmentally sound management referred to in paragraph 3 (a) of article 11 using operations that did not lead to recovery, recycling, reclamation, direct re-use or alternative uses.
The remaining chlor-alkali facility in England is in the process of decommissioning its mercury cells.

The elemental mercury, from when the mercury cell rooms ceased operation, was converted to mercury sulphide in a temporary mobile treatment (ECON) unit on site before shipping to Germany for final disposal. The ECON Unit was removed from site in 2019.

The facility sought a derogation from the UK Plan for Shipments of Waste to export metallic mercury for conversion to mercury sulphide prior to its permanent disposal and subsequently approval from the Environment Agency's International Waste Shipments (IWS) Team.

Since then, mercury containing sludges have been generated from the decommissioning of the redundant mercury cell rooms and downstream chlor-alkali assets which is a requirement of the Chlor-alkali BAT Conclusions (BAT 2).

The sludges are sent to a waste site in the UK to remove elemental mercury via retorting processes. The elemental mercury is returned to the chlor-alkali facility and is then shipped to Batrec Industrie AG in Switzerland under an IWS authorisation for stabilisation to mercury sulphide before final disposal in a salt mine in Germany.

The stabilisation and disposal routes are requirements of the United Kingdom's Mercury Regulations, as well as the Chlor-alkali BAT Conclusions.

There is no excess mercury from the decommissioning of chlor-alkali facilities in Scotland, Wales or Northern Ireland.

3.5: *Has the party received consent, or relied on a general notification of consent, in accordance with article 3, including any required certification from importing non-parties, for all exports of mercury from the party's territory in the reporting period?

- [ ] Yes – exports to parties
- [ ] Yes – exports to non-parties
- [x] No – no export took place
- [ ] No – consent was not given

3.6: Has the party allowed the import of mercury from a non-party?

- (●) No
- ( ) Yes
- ( ) The importing party has relied on paragraph 7 of article 3

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 4: MERCURY-ADDED PRODUCTS

4.1. Has the party taken any appropriate measures to not allow the manufacture, import or export of mercury-added products listed in Part I of Annex A of the Convention after the phase-out date specified for those products?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Yes (implementing paragraph 2 of article 4)

If yes, please provide information on the measures.
Following EU Exit an assimilated version of Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 was brought into UK law.

Article 5 states-
'Export, import and manufacturing of mercury-added products
Without prejudice to stricter requirements set out in other applicable assimilated law, the export, import and manufacturing in Great Britain of the mercury-added products set out in Annex II shall be prohibited.
The prohibition laid down in paragraph 1 shall not apply to any of the following mercury-added products:
(a)products that are essential for civil protection and military uses;
(b)products for research, for calibration of instrumentation, or for use as a reference standard. as from the dates set out therein.'

Under the Windsor Framework, in order to support Northern Ireland's dual market access to the EU Single Market and rest of the UK internal market, Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 on mercury, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2024/1849, applies in Northern Ireland. European Commission Notice C/2024/4675 provides further guidance regarding the application of this regulation in Northern Ireland, where the import and use of dental amalgam will be permitted until the end of 2034 and export is currently prohibited. The Government has introduced legislation to enable enforcement.

If yes, has the party registered for an exemption pursuant to article 6?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

4.3: (A) Has the party taken two or more measures listed in subparagraphs (i) to (ix) of part II of annex A for the mercury-added products listed in part II of annex A in accordance with the provisions set out therein?

4.3:(A) Has the party taken two or more measures listed in subparagraphs (i) to (ix) of part II of annex A for the mercury-added products listed in part II of annex A in accordance with the provisions set out therein?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

If yes, please provide information on the measures.
Across the UK a number of actions have been taken including-
• Setting national objectives aiming at dental caries prevention and health promotion, thereby minimising the need for dental restoration.
• Restricting the use of dental amalgam to its encapsulated form

• Promoting the use of best environmental practices in dental facilities to reduce releases of mercury and mercury compounds to water and land.
• Encouraging representative professional organizations and dental schools to educate and train dental professionals and students on the use of mercury-free dental restoration alternatives and on promoting best management practices.

In the UK dentistry is a devolved issue. Therefore each country has produced its own action plan. The current national action plans provide more detail and are available here-
England - https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/dental-amalgam-plan-to-phase-down-use-in-england
Scotland - https://www.gov.scot/publications/amalgam-dental-fillings-action-plan/
Wales - https://www.gov.wales/plans-phase-down-use-dental-amalgam
Northern Ireland - https://www.health-ni.gov.uk/publications/dental-amalgam-plan

4.3: (B) If the amendment to annex A adopted in decision MC-4/3 has entered into force for the party, has the party (please check the appropriate box below) taken relevant measures:

4.3:(B) If the amendment to annex A adopted in decision MC-4/3 has entered into force for the party, has the party (please check the appropriate box below) taken relevant measures:

◉ Yes

○ No

○ Not applicable

If the party answered yes please select from the bellow checkboxes

☑ Excluded or not allowed, by taking measures as appropriate, the use of mercury in bulk form by dental practitioners

☑ Excluded or not allowed, by taking measures as appropriate, or recommended against, the use of dental amalgam for the dental treatment of deciduous teeth of patients under 15 years of age and of pregnant and breastfeeding women, except when such use is considered necessary by the dental practitioner based on the needs of the patient

If the party answered yes to either option above, please provide information on the measures.
Following EU Exit an assimilated version of Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 was brought into UK law.

Article 10 (2) states-
'From 1 July 2018, dental amalgam shall not be used for dental treatment of deciduous teeth, of children under 15 years and of pregnant or breastfeeding women, except when deemed strictly necessary by the dental practitioner based on the specific medical needs of the patient.'

Article 10 (1) states-
'From 1 January 2019, dental amalgam shall only be used in pre-dosed encapsulated form. The use of mercury in bulk form by dental practitioners shall be prohibited.'

Article 10(4) states-
'From 1 January 2019 a requirement for dental facilities to be equipped with an amalgam separator with a retention level of at least 95%.'

4.4: Has the party taken measures to prevent the incorporation into assembled products of mercury-added products whose manufacture, import and export are not allowed for it under article 4?

◉ Yes

○ No

○ No - not applicable (do not have facilities assembling products using mercury-added products)

If yes, please provide information on the measures.
Following EU Exit an assimilated version of Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 was brought into UK law.

Article 5 states-
‘Export, import and manufacturing of mercury-added products
Without prejudice to stricter requirements set out in other applicable assimilated law, the export, import and manufacturing in Great Britain of the mercury-added products set out in Annex II shall be prohibited.
The prohibition laid down in paragraph 1 shall not apply to any of the following mercury-added products:
(a)products that are essential for civil protection and military uses;
(b)products for research, for calibration of instrumentation, or for use as a reference standard. as from the dates set out therein.’

Under the Windsor Framework, in order to support Northern Ireland’s dual market access to the EU Single Market and rest of the UK internal market, Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 on mercury, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2024/1849, applies in Northern Ireland.

European Commission Notice C/2024/4675 provides further guidance regarding the application of this regulation in Northern Ireland, where the import and use of dental amalgam will be permitted until the end of 2034 and export is currently prohibited. The Government has introduced legislation to enable enforcement.

4.5: Has the party discouraged the manufacture and the distribution in commerce of mercury-added products not covered by any known use in accordance with article 4, paragraph 6?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No – no action taken
- ( ) No – an assessment of the risks and benefits of the product demonstrates benefits to human health or the environment

If yes, please provide information on the measures.
Following EU Exit an assimilated version of Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 was brought into UK law.

Article 8 ‘New mercury-added products and new manufacturing processes’ states –

1. Economic operators shall not manufacture or place on the market mercury-added products that were not being manufactured prior to 1 January 2018 (‘new mercury-added products’) unless authorised to do so in accordance with paragraph 6 of this Article or allowed to do so under the Restriction of the Use of Certain Hazardous Substances in Electrical and Electronic Equipment Regulations 2012.
The first subparagraph shall not apply to any of the following:
(a)equipment which is necessary for the protection of the essential interests of the security of the United Kingdom, including arms, munitions and war material intended for specifically military purposes;
(b)equipment designed to be sent into space;
(c)technical improvements made to or the redesign of mercury-added products that were being manufactured prior to 1 January 2018 provided that such improvements or redesign lead to less mercury being used in those products.

2. Economic operators shall not use manufacturing processes involving the use of mercury or mercury compounds that were not processes used prior to 1 January 2018 (‘new manufacturing processes’) unless authorised to do so in accordance with paragraph 6.
The first subparagraph of this paragraph shall not apply to processes manufacturing or using mercury-added products other than those subject to the prohibition laid down in paragraph 1.

3. Where an economic operator intends to apply for authorisation in accordance with paragraph 6 in order to manufacture or place on the market a new mercury-added product, or to use a new manufacturing process, that would provide significant environmental or health benefits and pose no significant risks either to the environment or to human health, and where no technically practicable mercury-free alternatives providing such benefits are available, that economic operator shall notify

one of the competent authorities. That notification shall include the following information:
(a)a technical description of the product or process concerned;
(b)an assessment of its environmental and health benefits and risks;
(c)evidence demonstrating the absence of technically practicable mercury-free alternatives providing significant environmental or health benefits;
(d)a detailed explanation of the manner in which the process is to be operated or the product is to be manufactured, used and disposed of as waste after use, in order to ensure a high level of protection of the environment and of human health.#

4. The competent authority concerned shall forward to the Secretary of State, the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs in Northern Ireland, the Scottish Ministers and the Welsh Ministers the notification received from the economic operator if the competent authority considers on the basis of its own assessment of the information provided that the condition in the second subparagraph of paragraph 6 is fulfilled.
The competent authority concerned shall inform the Secretary of State, the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs in Northern Ireland, the Scottish Ministers and the Welsh Ministers of cases in which it considers that the condition in the second subparagraph of paragraph 6 is not fulfilled.

5. ….

6. The Secretary of State shall examine the notification received and assess whether it has been demonstrated that the condition in the second subparagraph is met.
The condition is that the new mercury-added product or new manufacturing process would provide significant environmental or health benefits and pose no significant risks either to the environment or to human health, and that no technically practicable mercury-free alternatives providing such benefits are available.
The Secretary of State shall inform the competent authority of the result of the assessment under the first subparagraph.
Where the Secretary of State assesses that the condition in the second subparagraph is met, the Secretary of State shall, by regulations, specify that the relevant new mercury-added product or new manufacturing process is authorised.'

Under the Windsor framework 'Regulation (EU) 2024/1849 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 amending Regulation (EU) 2017/852 on mercury as regards dental amalgam and other mercury-added products subject to export, import and manufacturing restrictions' applies in Northern Ireland

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 5: MANUFACTURING PROCESSES IN WHICH MERCURY OR MERCURY COMPOUNDS ARE USED

5.1: Are there facilities within the territory of the party that use mercury or mercury compounds for the processes listed in Annex B of the Minamata Convention in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 5 of the Convention?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No
- ○ Do not know

5.2: Are measures in place to not allow the use of mercury or mercury compounds in manufacturing processes listed in Part I of Annex B after

the phase-out date specified in that Annex for the individual process?

CHLOR-ALKALI PRODUCTION

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not applicable (do not have these facilities)

ACETALDEHYDE PRODUCTION IN WHICH MERCURY OR MERCURY COMPOUNDS ARE USED AS A CATALYST

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not applicable (do not have these facilities)

5.3: Are measures in place to restrict the use of mercury or mercury compounds in the processes listed in Part II of Annex B in accordance with the provisions set out therein?

VINYL CHLORIDE MONOMER PRODUCTION

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not applicable (do not have these facilities)

SODIUM OR POTASSIUM METHYLATE OR ETHYLATE

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not applicable (do not have these facilities)

PRODUCTION OF POLYURETHANE USING MERCURY-CONTAINING CATALYSTS

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ Not applicable (do not have these facilities)

5.4: Is there any use of mercury or mercury compounds in a facility using the manufacturing processes listed in Annex B that did not exist prior to the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

5.5: Has the party discouraged the development of any facility using any other manufacturing process in which mercury or mercury compounds are intentionally used that did not exist prior to the date of entry into

force of the Convention?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No – no action taken
- ○ No – the party demonstrated to the Conference of the Parties the significant environmental and health benefits of the manufacturing process and that there are no technically and economically feasible mercury-free alternatives available providing such benefits.

Part E – Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 7: ARTISANAL AND SMALL-SCALE GOLD MINING

7.1: Have steps been taken to reduce, and where feasible eliminate, the use of mercury and mercury compounds in, and the emissions and releases to the environment of mercury from, artisanal and small-scale gold mining and processing subject to article 7 within your territory?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No
- ◉ There is no artisanal and small-scale gold mining and processing subject to article 7 in which mercury amalgamation is used in the territory

7.2: Has the party determined, and notified the secretariat, that artisanal and small-scale gold mining and processing within its territory is more than insignificant?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ No

7.5: Supplemental: Has the party cooperated with other countries or relevant intergovernmental organizations or other entities to achieve the objective of this article?

- ◉ Yes
- ○ No

Please provide information

The UK Government has cooperated with Ghana via the UK-Ghana Gold Programme. This includes ASGM regulation, and supporting government agencies to tackle serious organised crime related to ASGM. Additionally, the UK has collaborated with the Ghana Environmental Protection Agency to build capacity to monitor heavy metals around mining sites, reporting levels of heavy metals including mercury over a number of sites.

Please provide information

{Empty}

Part E – Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 8: EMISSIONS

8.1: Identify any Annex D source categories for which there are new sources of emissions of mercury or mercury compounds as defined in

paragraph 2 (c) of article 8.

For each of those source categories describe the measures in place, including the effectiveness of such measures, to implement the requirements of paragraph 4 of article 8.

- [ ] Coal-fired power plants
- [ ] Coal-fired industrial boilers
- [ ] Smelting and roasting processes used in the production of non-ferrous metals
- [ ] Waste incineration facilities
- [ ] Cement clinker production facilities

Has the party required the use of best available techniques or best environmental practices (BAT/BEP) to control and where feasible reduce emissions for new sources no later than 5 years after the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party?

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No (please explain)

If Yes, please explain
Information below summarises controls in place as a whole to Annex D source categories for which there are new sources of emissions of mercury or mercury compounds.

England -
Permits for 14 new waste incineration facilities have been issued between 2021 and 2024. Each of these plants has powdered activated carbon injection combined with bag filters to abate mercury. These are recognised BAT abatement measures set out in the 2019 European Waste Incineration BAT Conclusions. Plant must also meet the upper end of the BAT-AEL range for mercury set out in the 2019 Waste Incineration BAT Conclusions of 20 µg/m3. In addition, to avoid the need for continuous monitoring, plants must consistently meet a lower mercury emissions limit of 10 µg/m3.

Scotland-
All new installations (including any Annex D source categories) are permitted according to devolved legislation; previously permitted under the Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 (as amended) and now authorised under the Environmental Authorisations (Scotland) Regulations 2018 (as amended). There are no changes in the methods of control of emissions between the two regulatory regimes. Permitting/authorisation is in accordance with requirements of the European Union (EU) Industrial Emissions Directive and the accompanying Best Available Techniques (BAT)/BAT Reference (BRef) process (and all relevant environmental quality standards and associated emission levels (AELs)). Permitted installations are subject to various requirements for compliance assessment (including inspections, monitoring/data reporting and analysis, review of permit/authorisation conditions and appropriate levels of enforcement where required). Permitted/authorised installations are required to comply from date of first operation and subject to an appropriate commissioning period prior to final permission to operate being granted.

Northern Ireland-
Any sites classified as source categories in Annex D will be permitted under IED legislation, which requires use of BAT - there are statutory inspection and reporting requirements that NIEA regulates as part of this.

8.2: Identify any Annex D source categories for which there are existing sources of emissions of mercury or mercury compounds as defined in paragraph 2 (e) of article 8.

For each of those source categories, select and provide details on the measures implemented under paragraph 5 of article 8 and explain the progress that these applied measures have achieved in reducing emissions over time in your territory:

▼ COAL-FIRED POWER PLANTS

☐ A quantified goal for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources

☐ Emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources

☐ Use of BAT/BEP to control emissions from relevant sources

☐ Multi-pollutant control strategy that would deliver co-benefits for control of mercury emissions

☐ Alternative measures to reduce emissions from relevant sources

Measures
See summary information for question 8.2 in 'Part E - additional comments on this article'.

Progress
{Empty}

▼ COAL-FIRED INDUSTRIAL BOILERS

☐ A quantified goal for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources

☐ Emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources

☐ Use of BAT/BEP to control emissions from relevant sources

☐ Multi-pollutant control strategy that would deliver co-benefits for control of mercury emissions

☐ Alternative measures to reduce emissions from relevant sources

Measures
{Empty}

Progress
{Empty}

▼ SMELTING AND ROASTING PROCESSES USED IN THE PRODUCTION OF NON-FERROUS METALS

☐ A quantified goal for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources

☐ Emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources

☐ Use of BAT/BEP to control emissions from relevant sources

☐ Multi-pollutant control strategy that would deliver co-benefits for control of mercury emissions

☐ Alternative measures to reduce emissions from relevant sources

Measures
{Empty}

Progress
{Empty}

▼ WASTE INCINERATION FACILITIES

- [ ] A quantified goal for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources
- [ ] Emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources
- [ ] Use of BAT/BEP to control emissions from relevant sources
- [ ] Multi-pollutant control strategy that would deliver co-benefits for control of mercury emissions
- [ ] Alternative measures to reduce emissions from relevant sources

Measures
{Empty}

Progress
{Empty}

▼ CEMENT CLINKER PRODUCTION FACILITIES

- [ ] A quantified goal for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources
- [ ] Emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources
- [ ] Use of BAT/BEP to control emissions from relevant sources
- [ ] Multi-pollutant control strategy that would deliver co-benefits for control of mercury emissions
- [ ] Alternative measures to reduce emissions from relevant sources

Measures
{Empty}

Progress
{Empty}

Have the measures for existing sources under paragraph 5 of article 8 been implemented no later than 10 years after the date of entry into force of the Convention for the party?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

8.3: Has the party prepared an inventory of emissions from relevant sources within 5 years of entry into force of the Convention for it?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Have not been a party for 5 years

If yes, when was the inventory last updated?
31 December 2023

Please indicate where this inventory is available
Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) https://prtr.defra.gov.uk/pollutant-releases-details?q=1135243

National Atmospheric Emissions inventory Available at https://naei.energysecurity.gov.uk/data/data-selector

Attach
{Empty}

8.4: Has the party chosen to establish criteria to identify relevant sources covered within a source category?

◉ Yes

○ No

If yes, please explain how the criteria for any category include at least 75 percent of the emissions from that category and explain how the party took into account guidance adopted by the Conference of the Parties.
PRTR data is provided by operators who submit their annual emission and waste data to the appropriate regulator. A number of quality checks are built into the data collection and reporting processes. These include cross referencing information contained in permits with operator-reported PRTR data, using information from inspections and monitoring regimes to validate reported data, scrutinising and validating data from each operator for omissions, errors and/or incomplete information. Quality assurance is an ongoing exercise and is kept under regular review.

The PRTR regulation places the responsibility for data collection on the operator. The operator has a legal responsibility to monitor substances that are released by an installation using a variety of methods as specified in the operating permit and sector guidance. These are reported to the regulators who compile and check the information before it is published online.

The UK's PRTR legislation and the UN ECE PRTR protocol specify which industrial activities are included for reporting purposes and their associated thresholds. This means that an installation whose details are not shown on the site have not reached the stated thresholds and therefore do not have to be included. Also, for installations shown but where the threshold for reporting for a pollutant is not reached or where there has been no release, no data for the pollutant will be shown.

8.5: Has the party chosen to prepare a national plan setting out the measures to be taken to control emissions from relevant sources and its expected targets, goals and outcomes?

○ Yes

◉ No

Part E - Additional comments on this article

In response to question 8.2, please see the below information.

The Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 includes a target to 'Reduce land-based emissions of mercury to air and water by 50% by 2030.'

There are no coal-fired power plants remaining in the UK. The last plant (in Radcliffe-on-Soar) shut down in September 2024.

In Scotland there are no coal-fired industrial boilers. There are no smelting and roasting processes used in the production of non-ferrous metals. For waste incineration facilities there are emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources and the use of BAT/BEP to control emissions from relevant sources. All facilities have Emission Limit Values (ELVs) and monitoring requirements for emissions of mercury. Abatement measures include dry scrubbing using activated carbon dosing into the flue gas stream followed by removal of particulate matter using a bag filter (this is considered BAT for this activity). Permits issued on or after 3 December 2019 include a lower daily ELV for emissions of mercury in line with the requirements of the Waste Incineration BAT Conclusions. For permits that were issued prior to 3 December 2019 a lower Daily ELV was applied to the permit from 3 December 2023 (some smaller incinerators have not had this review yet so their ELVs are currently unchanged). The BAT-AEL range for both new and existing plants is

In cement clinker production facilities, there are emission limit values for controlling and, where feasible, reducing emissions from relevant sources - and BAT/BEP is used to control emissions from relevant sources.

In Wales waste incineration facilities have specific ELVs under the Industrial Emissions Directive (IED), retained in UK/Welsh law, covering both air and water emissions and all industrial installations are subject to the use of Best Available Techniques (BAT).

In Northern Ireland any sites classified as source categories in Annex D will be permitted under IED legislation, which requires use of BAT - there are statutory inspection and reporting requirements that NIEA regulates as part of this.

▼ ART. 9: RELEASES

9.1: Are there, within the party's territory, relevant sources of releases as defined in paragraph 2 (b) of article 9?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do not know (please explain)

Please indicate the measures taken to address releases from relevant sources and the effectiveness of those measures.
Evidence - Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) https://prtr.defra.gov.uk/pollutant-releases-details?q=1135243

9.2: Has the party established an inventory of releases from relevant sources within 5 years of entry into force of the convention for it?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) Relevant sources do not exist in the territory
- ( ) Have not been a party for 5 years
- ( ) No (please explain)

When was the inventory last updated?
31 December 2023

Please indicate where this inventory is available.
{Empty}

Please explain
https://prtr.defra.gov.uk/pollutant-releases-details?q=1135243

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 10: ENVIRONMENTALLY SOUND INTERIM STORAGE OF MERCURY, OTHER THAN WASTE MERCURY

10.1: Has the party taken measures to ensure that the interim storage of non-waste mercury and mercury compounds intended for a use allowed to a party under the Convention is undertaken in an environmentally sound manner?

- (●) Yes

○ No (please explain)

○ Do not know (please explain)

If yes, please indicate the measures taken to ensure that such interim storage is undertaken in an environmentally sound manner, and the effectiveness of those measures.
Following EU Exit an assimilated version of Regulation (EU) 2017/852 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 May 2017 was brought into UK law.

Article 7 (3) states-
Interim storage of mercury and of the mercury compounds and mixtures of mercury listed in Annex I to this Regulation shall be carried out in an environmentally sound manner, in accordance with the thresholds and requirements set out in

(a)for England and Wales, the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 and the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 2015;

(b)for Scotland, the Pollution Prevention and Control (Scotland) Regulations 2012 and the Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 2015.

The appropriate authority may, by regulations, prescribe technical requirements for environmentally sound interim storage of mercury, mercury compounds and mixtures of mercury in line with decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention in accordance with Article 10(3) and Article 27 of the Convention.

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 11: MERCURY WASTES

11.1: Have measures outlined in article 11, paragraph 3, been implemented for the party's mercury waste?

◉ Yes

○ No

☑ Yes - the party has taken measures so that mercury waste is managed in an environmentally sound manner

Please describe measure and effectiveness of measures
See comments below.

☑ Yes - the party has taken measures so that mercury waste is recovered, recycled, reclaimed or directly re-used for a use allowed to a party under the Convention or for environmentally sound disposal pursuant to paragraph 3 (a)

Please describe measure and effectiveness of measures
See comments below.

☑ Yes - the party has taken measures so that mercury waste is not transported across international boundaries except for the purpose of environmentally sound disposal

Please describe measure and effectiveness of measures
See comments below.

If the party answered yes to any measures above, please describe the measures implemented pursuant to paragraph 3, and please also describe the effectiveness of those measures.
The United Kingdom is a signatory to the Basel Convention on transboundary movements of waste. The Basel Convention is implemented in UK law primarily through the Waste Shipment Regulations (EC)1013/2006 as amended by The International Waste Shipments (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019.

Transboundary movement of mercury waste is controlled under these regulations.

Further, the UK Plan for shipments of waste sets out the government policy on shipments of waste, including mercury waste, for disposal to and from the UK. UK plan for shipments of waste - GOV.UK

The relevant competent authorities in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are responsible for regulating the transboundary movement of waste, as well as recycling and disposal sites.

UK Border Force are notified about mercury imports and exports, including wastes.

In Scotland the Scottish Environment Protection Agency have had 10 consented notifications for the shipment of waste that contained mercury during the reporting period. All were sent to Parties to the Basel and Minamata Conventions and were consented to Parties and complied with the requirements of those Conventions (and with the requirements of domestic waste management legislation).

Natural Resources Wales is the Competent Authority for international waste movements that start, end or transit through Wales. Included in the convention are the various controls that are needed for the trans-boundary movements of waste.

11.2: *Are there facilities for final disposal of waste consisting of mercury or mercury compounds in the party's territory?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Do not know (please explain)

If the party answered yes to any measures above, please select from the following

- [ ] Yes - there are facilities in the party's territory
- [x] Yes - there are facilities outside the party's territory accessible to the party (in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 11)

Kindly attach any additional relevant information
{Empty}

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 12: CONTAMINATED SITES

12.1: Has the party endeavoured to develop strategies for identifying and assessing sites contaminated by mercury or mercury compounds in its territory?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please elaborate
In England, Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 provides a means of identifying and remediating land that poses a significant risk to health or the environment, where there is no alternative solution. It also works alongside planning rules to help ensure that this land is made suitable for use following redevelopment. Guidance Part 2A's implementation in England can be found at Environmental Protection Act 1990: Part 2A - Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance.

In Scotland the requirement rests with the local authorities as the lead regulator for the Part IIA Contaminated land regime. Relevant local authority duties include:

- To prepare and maintain an inspection strategy detailing how they will prioritise identifying contaminated land in their area.

- Responsibility for formally identifying contaminated land and / or designating ‘special sites’ (a small sub-set of contaminated land which meet the criteria outlined in paragraphs 2 and 3 of The Contaminated Land (Scotland) Regulations 2000 (as amended)

- To bring about the remediation of contaminated land sites

- To maintain a public register of contaminated land sites. Whilst the local authority is the lead regulator for contaminated land, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency does have some limited duties and powers.

The Scottish Environmental Protection Agency’s duties are:

- To become the lead regulator for any ‘special sites’ designated by the local authority. As highlighted above – these are a very small sub-set of contaminated land sites and there are currently only three in Scotland, none of which have significant pollutant linkages relating to mercury.

-To keep a public register of special sites.

In Wales mercury and other hazardous chemicals are considered through a broader regulatory framework (Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 – Contaminated Land) and associated Statutory Guidance. The legislation requires local authorities to inspect their areas ‘from time to time’ to identify and prioritise land impacted by contamination. Mercury is usually one of many contaminants that can impact ground and ground waters as a result of past land uses and waste disposal practices.

In Northern Ireland the Northern Ireland Environment Agency has undertaken a review of the historical land use database for activities that could have resulted in land contamination for mercury or mercury compounds.

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 13: FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND MECHANISM

13.1: Has the party undertaken to provide, within its capabilities, resources in respect of those national activities that are intended to implement the Convention in accordance with its national policies, priorities, plans and programmes?

◉ Yes

○ No

Please specify

The Environment Agency’s Chemical Compliance Team (CCT) monitors online sales for illegal mercury-added-products such as skin lightening creams, measuring devices and mercury switches.

The Environment Agency’s waste teams monitor and regulate recycling and disposal sites.

The import and export of mercury waste across international borders is controlled under the Waste Shipment Regulations (EC)1013/2006 as amended by The International Waste Shipments (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. International waste shipments from England can be subject to notification controls. Where these controls apply the customer will need permission from the Environment Agency’s International Waste Shipments (IWS) Team before moving the waste.

UK Border Force are notified about mercury imports and exports, including wastes.

13.2: Supplemental: Has the party, within its capabilities, contributed to

the mechanism referred to in paragraph 5 of article 13?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please provide comments, if any.
Yes, the UK has contributed to the Specific Trust Fund of the Minamata Convention.

The UK also pledged £330m to the Global Environment Facility for the cycle covering 2022-26.

13.3: Supplemental: Has the party provided financial resources to assist developing-country parties and/or parties with economies in transition in the implementation of the Convention through other bilateral, regional and multilateral sources or channels?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please specify
The UK has also contributed to the UNEP Special Programme, which supports implementation of the Minamata Convention.

Please provide comments, if any.
{Empty}

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 14: CAPACITY-BUILDING, TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

14.1: Has the party cooperated to provide capacity-building or technical assistance, pursuant to article 14, to another party to the Convention?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

Please specify
The UK has contributed to the UNEP Special Programme, which supports implementation of the Minamata Convention.

14.2: Supplemental: Has the party received capacity-building or technical assistance pursuant to article 14?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No

Please specify
{Empty}

Please provide comments, if any.
{Empty}

14.3: Has the party promoted and facilitated the development, transfer and diffusion of and access to, up-to-date environmentally sound alternative technologies?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) Other

Please specify

The UK has contributed to funding mechanisms such as the GEF which fund projects that have included developing environmentally sound alternative technologies.

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 16: HEALTH ASPECTS

16.1: Have measures been taken to provide information to the public on exposure to mercury in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 16?

◉ Yes

○ No

Supplemental: If yes, describe the measures that have been taken.
The UK has published guidance online, which is available here https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mercury-properties-incident-management-and-toxicology

16.2: Have any measures been taken to protect human health in accordance with article 16 beyond the provision of information to the public on exposure to mercury (referred to in question 16.1)?

◉ Yes

○ No

Supplemental: If yes, describe the measures that have been taken.
The UK has taken part in information exchanges on mercury containing skin lightening creams with Minamata focal points in manufacturing countries.

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 17: INFORMATION EXCHANGE

17.1: Has the party facilitated the exchange of information referred to in article 17, paragraph 1?

◉ Yes

○ No

If yes, the Party may wish to indicate in the space provided below the exchange of information it has facilitated, such as:

☐ Scientific, technical, economic and legal information concerning mercury and mercury compounds, including toxicological, ecotoxicological and safety information

☐ Information on the reduction or elimination of the production, use, trade, emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds

☐ Information on technically and economically viable alternatives to:

☐ Epidemiological information concerning health impacts associated with exposure to mercury and mercury compounds, in close cooperation with the World Health Organization and other relevant organizations, as appropriate. (Art. 17.1 (a)-(d))

Part E - Additional comments on this article

The UK has taken part in information exchanges on mercury containing skin lightening creams with Minamata focal points in manufacturing countries.

▼ ART. 18: PUBLIC INFORMATION, AWARENESS AND EDUCATION

18.1: Have measures been taken to promote and facilitate the provision to the public of the kinds of information listed in article 18, paragraph 1?

◉ Yes

○ No

If yes, the party may wish to indicate in the space provided below, the measures it has taken to promote and facilitate information to the public, such as:
(a) Provision to the public of available information on:

☐ The effects of mercury and mercury compounds on human health and the environment

☐ Alternatives to mercury and mercury compounds

☐ The topics identified in paragraph 1 of article 17

☐ The results of its research, development and monitoring activities under article 19

☐ Activities to meet its obligations under the Convention

(b) Education, training and public awareness related to the effects of exposure to mercury and mercury compounds on human health and the environment in collaboration with relevant intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and vulnerable populations, as appropriate.

Activities to meet its obligations under the Convention
The UK has published relevant guidance online, available in the links below -

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mercury-properties-incident-management-and-toxicology

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/mercury-properties-incident-management-and-toxicology

(Art. 18 (1) (a) and (b))

Part E - Additional comments on this article

{Empty}

▼ ART. 19: RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND MONITORING

19.1: Has the party undertaken any research, development and monitoring in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 19?

◉ Yes

○ No

If yes, the party may wish to indicate in the space provided below, the research, development and monitoring it has undertaken, such as:

☐ Inventories of use, consumption, anthropogenic emissions to air and releases to water and land of mercury and mercury compounds

☐ Modelling and geographically representative monitoring of levels of mercury and mercury compounds in vulnerable populations and in environmental media, including biotic media such as fish, marine mammals, sea turtles and birds, as well as collaboration in the collection and exchange of relevant and appropriate samples

☐ Assessments of the impact of mercury and mercury compounds on human health and the environment, in addition to social, economic and cultural impacts, particularly in respect of vulnerable populations

☐ Harmonized methodologies for the activities undertaken under subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 1 of article 19

☐ Information on the environmental cycle, transport (including long-range transport and deposition), transformation and fate of mercury and mercury compounds in a range of ecosystems, taking appropriate account of the distinction between anthropogenic and natural emissions and releases of mercury and of remobilization of mercury from historic deposition

☐ Information on commerce and trade in mercury and mercury compounds and mercury-added products

☐ Information and research on the technical and economic availability of mercury-free products and processes and on best available techniques and best environmental practices to reduce and monitor emissions and releases of mercury and mercury compounds

(Art. 19 (1) (a)-(g))

Part E - Additional comments on this article

A range of activities have been undertaken including:

- Online monitoring for skin lightening creams containing mercury (laboratory and XRF analysis) and exchange of information with Minamata focal points in manufacturing countries.

- Online monitoring for mercury measuring devices/mercury switches.

- Monitoring via inventories PRTR https://prtr.defra.gov.uk/pollutant-releases?q=1135244 and National Atmospheric Emissions Inventory: https://naei.energysecurity.gov.uk/data/data-selector

- Questionnaire on use, production and disposal of mercury.

▼ COMMENTS REGARDING POSSIBLE CHALLENGES IN MEETING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CONVENTION

Part C: Comments regarding possible challenges in meeting the objectives of the Convention

{Empty}

▼ COMMENTS REGARDING THE REPORTING FORMAT AND POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS, IF ANY

Comments regarding the reporting format and possible improvements, if any

The UK would like to express its sincere gratitude to the secretariat for preparing the online reporting tool.

As a suggested improvement, we would propose that the format of the offline word document is, as far as possible, aligned to the format of the online reporting tool. There are a few questions in the word format that look quite different to the format online, and it is not obvious that they were questions that needed responding to. The offline word document is an important way of gathering information in preparation for submission.

We would also propose parties are given the option under each question to upload documents that could provide further explanation on their responses. This would allow, for example, parties to provide further information in a table format which is not currently possible in the text boxes. Uploading a document would be optional or supplemental for parties.

Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury
International Environment House 1
Office address: 11-13 chemin des Anémones, 1219 Châtelaine, Geneva, Switzerland
Postal address: Avenue de la Paix 8-14, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland
MEA-MinamataSecretariat@un.org | www.minamataconvention.org

UN environment programme