



Distr.: General
12 February 2009

English only



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Global Mercury Partnership
Partnership Advisory Group
First meeting
Geneva, 31 March – 2 April 2009

**2007-2008 - Reporting of the mercury waste management
partnership area**

UNEP Global Mercury Partnership

Note by the Secretariat

Individual partnership area evaluations have been prepared by the partnership areas in response to Annex I Section 3.f.iv of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership Overarching Framework. The mercury waste management partnership area has a drafted partnership area evaluation. It is available in the annex to this document for information.

Annex:

2007-2008 – Evaluation of the Mercury waste management partnership area

1. General Information	
1.1 Individual partnership area:	Mercury Waste Management Partnership Area
1.2 Individual partnership area lead:	Ministry of the Environment, Japan. Prof. Dr. Masaru TANAKA, chair of committee on waste management, Central Environment Council of Japanese Government.
1.3 Reporting year/period:	The partnership area was initiated early in 2008 by the Ministry of Environment, Japan based on the call of UNEP Governing Council 24 to consider new and emerging areas within the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership, including waste.
1.4 How many meetings were held over the reporting period?	Number of face to face meetings: zero Number of teleconferences: zero Other: This partnership was initiated in April 2008, and is still in the development stage. The first face to face meeting of the partnership area will take place from 12-13 March 2009 in Tokyo.
1.5 How many partners are part of this partnership area?	Total : 14 Governments: Japan , Liberia Malawi Nigeria, Norway, United States of America, IO:UNEP,UNITAR, UNIDO NGO: Ecologic / Grupo Parques Nacionales Panam • / Alianza Contaminaci Cero Informer, Sensibiliser, Eduquer sur les Polluants Organiques Persistants en Cote d'Ivoire (ISE-POPS-CI) Pollution Control Association of Liberia Pro-Biodiversity Conservationists in Uganda (PROBICUO) Centre de Recherche et d'Education pour le Développement (CREPD) A formal process of joining the partnership was established under the Overarching Framework. Partners are reminded to submit partnership support letters to UNEP. Information on joining the partnership can be found at: www.chem.unep.ch/mercury/partnerships/new_partnership.htm
1.6 How much funding was raised through this partnership area? What about in-kind assistance?	New funding was raised by Ministry of the Environment, Japan, about 200,000 US\$, to cover the BAT/BEP guidance development and face-to-face meeting (The end of Japanese fiscal year is the end of March, so that it includes both of the cost of preparation and holding of the first face to face meeting in March 2009.
1.7 What is the objective of the individual partnership area?	

Minimize and, where feasible, eliminate unintentional mercury releases to air, water, and land from mercury waste by following a lifecycle management approach.

2. MONITORING PERFORMANCE

(tracking partnership activities and partner contributions)

2.1 Please provide a short overview of the key current partnership area efforts (brief description, expected outcomes, budget, timeframe).

(1)Multilateral

Japan International Cooperation Agency's training courses have provided capacity building opportunity on waste management for developing countries (sunset is not planned).

Development of BAT/BEP guidance will be started by Japan in this autumn and is intended to be finalized in two years.

UNEP will launch pilot projects on waste management and long term storage in 2008.

(2)Bilateral

Norway has conducted bilateral projects with Arkhangelsk, Russia and South Africa. Former two projects will be finalized in 2008 and the latter one will continue till 2010.

(3)National

Nigeria registers its national project on the Healthcare Waste Management Plan.

(4)Cross reference

USA conducts related projects in chlor alkali sector in Russia, waste management and safe storage with Arctic Contaminants Action Program of the Arctic Council, and Kazakhstan projects on bio-remediation monitoring of mercury.

2.2 Please provide a short overview of any key upcoming, planned partnership area efforts (brief description, expected outcomes, budget, timeframe).

Development of BAT/BEP guidance will be launched by Japan soon (domestic preparation will be started in this autumn) and is intended to be finalized in two years. The first face to face meeting is scheduled in March 2009 to promote the exchange of information among partners and other issues e.g. consideration of indicators. The budget for these two issues is around 200,000 US\$.

In 2009, pilot projects will be undertaken to provide initial input to the Basel Guidelines on the management of waste containing mercury, prior to their finalisation and adoption by the Basel Conference of the Parties. This work is already underway under a project funded by Norway. Following the initial project, additional work to extend the work into other countries and provide further input into the draft guidelines will be undertaken. Priority will be given to countries which have developed a mercury inventory.

Safe long-term storage of mercury has been identified as a priority and is linked to mercury waste management issues. Safe long-term storage enables mercury to be removed from the market and managed in an environmentally sound manner. Work will start in 2009 to develop mechanisms for long-term storage in Asia and South America. Both of these regions are expected to have surplus mercury that will require storage within 10 years. The work will initially involve the development of feasibility studies, consultations within the region to determine the best approach to storage, followed by a process to select a suitable site for storage. Work that is underway is funded by Norway.

2.3 Please provide a short overview of key partnership area efforts completed since the previous Governing Council (brief description, outcomes, costs, timeframe).

This partnership was launched in April 2008, and almost all of the projects are on-going, not completed. The first face to face meeting (March 2009) will be managed as one of the opportunities to identify the current overview on the results of current on-going work.

3. ASSESSING EFFECTIVENESS

(measuring the impact of partnership activities on target beneficiaries)

3.1 What are the partnership area indicators of progress? If no indicators, please specify why.

Indicators have not been developed yet. Partners may wish to discuss them in the first face to face meeting (March 2009), with reference of other areas.

3.2 Please report on progress in terms of each of the partnership area indicators outlined within the partnership area business plan.
See 4.
3.3 Please summarize the key results achieved to date by the partnership area in terms of the following areas (as applicable):
i) Sharing and exchanging information: Information was exchanged in the Informal meeting in the opportunity of the Partnership Meeting in Geneva in April 2008 and development process of business plan. The contents of the discussion are reflected to the current business plan.
ii) Strengthening capacity: Multilateral and bilateral projects in the business plan aim to strengthen the capacity in developing countries on environmentally sound management of waste containing mercury, for example through training courses.
iii) Other results you may wish to highlight:
3.4 What are the strengths of the partnership area?
1. Contribution to the discussion of “elements” Environmentally sound management of mercury-containing wastes is placed as one of the elements of comprehensive mercury framework which is included in the report from OEWG to GC25. Therefore, the work through this partnership will contribute and support the discussion of technical aspects on the elements in the future.
2. Contribution to show the variety of measures Partners conduct various activities, national, bilateral, multilateral cooperation. The results of exchange information through this partnership would be summarized as “show case” of measures, which is useful considering the variety of current waste management style in countries.
3. Cross cutting This partnership area will be conducted in close relationship with other areas e.g. products. That enables partners to consider lifecycle approach to reduce mercury emission to the environment.
3.5 What are the weaknesses and/or major challenges for this the partnership area?
This partnership area being still in the development stage, it would be necessary to involve more partners in order to gather various measures on environmentally sound management of waste containing mercury.
3.6 Can the weaknesses or major challenges be addressed through the partnership? If yes, what is the best strategy to address such weaknesses / major challenges in moving forward?
Continuation of addressing its importance and sharing information in related meetings e.g. OEWG2.
3.7 In view of above, how should the partnership area be modifying its approach in the coming two year cycle? Should the objective and indicators of the partnership area be revised in moving forward?
The first face to face meeting will be held in March 2009 to discuss the approach in the coming two years.
3.8 Please specify whether the promotion of non-mercury technologies (where suitable economically feasible alternatives do not exist) is relevant to the partnership area, and if it is, how the partnership area is addressing this aspect.
Yes. The increase of non-mercury product will significantly contribute the reduction of emission of mercury

from waste.

3.9 Please outline how this report was drafted and who was consulted with in doing so?

MOEJ only at this stage.

4. This section is intended for other relevant comments.