Final:posted on 15 December 2011

UNEP Global Mercury Partnership
Report of the Partnership Advisory Group on the work of its third meeting

Nairobi, Kenya 5-6 November 2011

1. The third meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Mercury Partnership was held from 5 to 6 November 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya at the United Nations Office in Nairobi, Gigiricomplex.

Background

2. The UNEP Global Mercury Partnership consists of up to 25 members representing Governments, regional economic integration organizations and major groups and sectors. The Group aims to meet at least annually. Its functions and responsibilities include:

(a) To encourage the work of the partnership areas consistent with the overall goal and operational guidelines of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership;

(b) To review the partnership area business plans in order to advise the partnership areas on the consistency of their business plans with the overall goal and the operational guidelines of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership;

(c) To report to the Executive Director of UNEP on overall progress;

(d) To communicate overarching issues and lessons learned while promoting synergy and collaboration across partnership areas;

(e) To report on activities undertaken within the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.

I. Opening of the meeting

3. The meeting was opened at 13:00 on Saturday, 5 November 2011 by Mr. Tim Kasten, Head, Chemicals Branch of the UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (UNEP Chemicals). He expressed his gratitude to the participants for taking the time to participate in the meeting. He noted that the Global Mercury Partnership now has 94 partners; with 8 new partners registered since the second Intergovernmental Negotiations Committee meeting that took place in January 2011. He indicated that he hoped the discussions over the session would result in productive encouragement for the partnership areas in moving forward.

II. Organization of work

A. Election of a chair

4. Annex I Section 3.d of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership Overarching Framework states that the Partnership Advisory Group will select a Chair who will serve for a two-year term. The Group elected by acclamation, Ms. Abiola Olanipekun, as its Chair for a second two year term.

5. Ms. Olanipekun accepted this role and expressed her gratitude to the Group for being re-elected as the Chair.

B. Adoption of the agenda

6. At its opening session the Group adopted the provisional agenda as set out in document UNEP(DTIE)/Hg/PAG.3/1. The main orders of business included: to review overall progress, including status of partnership areas; consider overarching issues and lessons learned; and other matters raised by the Group.

C. Attendance

7. The meeting was attended by the following members of the Partnership Advisory Group: Ms. Karissa Taylor Kovner (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Mr. Richard Gutierrez (Zero Mercury Working Group), Ms. Susan Keane (Natural Resourses Defense Council), Mr. Ken Davis (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Mr. Shunichi Honda (Japan), Mr. David Evers (Biodiversity Research Institute), Ms. Grace Howland (Environment Canada), Mr. Xia Yingxian (Ministry of Environment of China), Ms. Abiola Olanipekun (Federal Ministry of Environment of Nigeria), Mr. Manoranjan Hota (Ministry of Environment and Forests of India), Ms. Lesley Sloss (International Energy Agency Clean Coal Centre), Ms. Sergio de Souza Oliveira (Ministry of Environment of Brazil), Mr. Sarun Sambo (Ministry of Environment, Cambodia), Mr. Oumar Dit Diaouré Cisse (National Department of Sanitation, Mali), Ms. Bettina Lorz (European Union), Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Ministry of Environment, Pakistan) , Mr. Vladimir Lenev (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russia), Ms. Ana Garcia-Gonzalez (Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural Marino, Spain), Ms. Jane Dennison (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Ms. Judith Torres (Ministry of Land, Housing and Environment, Uruguay), Mr. Marcello M. Veiga (University of British Columbia, Canada), Mr. Samuel Tetsopgang (CREPD Research and Education Centre for Development, Cameroon), and Mr. Shuxiao Wang (Tsinghua University, China).

8. The following individuals and organizations attended or were represented at the meeting as observers: Mr. Bashir Abba Wiziri (Ministry of Mines & Steel Development, Nigeria), Mr. Alexander Romanov (Russian Federation), Mr. Manuel Ramos-Pino (Spain) and Mr. Juan Fernando Lugris (Uruguay), Mr. Wojciech Jozewicz (Arcadis U.S., Inc.), Mr. John Tychsen (Geological Survey Development of Denmark and Greenland), Mr. Jindrich Petrlik (International POPs Elimination Network, IPEN), Mr. Shahriar Hossain (International POPs Elimination Network, IPEN), Ms. Yuyun Ismawati (International POPs Elimination Network, IPEN), Mr. Vagner Maringolo (The European Cement Association), Jonathan Krueger (UNITAR), Mr. Arseen Seys (World Chlorine Council), Mr. Dolf Van Wijk (World Chlorine Council), Mr. Julian Fisher (FDI World Dental Federation).

III. Review of overall progress, including status of partnership areas

A. Overall progress and status of partnership areas

1. Presentations by the partnership area leads

9. Following the secretariat's overview of the overall Partnership, the leads of the seven partnership areas reported on progress in their respective partnership areas, highlighting in particular issues from the business plans in the seven areas and progress made since PAG 2. All of the presentations were followed by a brief question and answer session.

Mercury releases from Chlor alkali partnership area

10. The lead for the chlor-alkali partnership area, Mr. Kenneth Davis, noted that there are about 100 mercury cell facilities in about 40 countries. He noted that non-mercury chlor-alkali processes are more environmentally friendly and energy efficient than the mercury-cell process, and that all new facilities are constructed with non-mercury technology. Consistent with this, mercury use in the sector has been declining for some time as older plants close down or are converted to non-mercury technology (membrane-cell or diaphragm technology). Between 2005 and 2010 the total mercury cell chlorine capacity has declined about 30 %, with many other conversions planned.

11. He explained that the partnership area has been working on two main initiatives. First, they have developed an inventory of mercury cell facilities around the world, and second they have completed a draft paper on the economics of converting mercury cell facilities to alternate non-mercury technologies.

12. In the discussion that followed the presentation, Pakistan shared their experiences in implementing a pilot project with UNEP Chemicals Branch and World Chlorine Council. The project aims to assess the technologies and procedures of the modern chlor-alkali industry in developed countries and to adopt these technologies in their country. The overall objectives of the project were to reduce mercury emissions and use in existing mercury chlor-alkali cell facilities, share information and to encourage appropriate procedures and methods to convert to non mercury processes. Lessons learned in this project could be applied to other facilities.

13. The International POPs Elimination Network asked whether measures are taken to develop an inventory of facilities that have shifted to non-mercury procedures and any associated contaminated sites. The lead responded that he knew of no such inventory of contaminated sites at former mercury-cell facilities, but that it is true that many former mercury-cell facilities have significant legacy contamination issues.

Mercury use in Artisanal and Small Scale gold mining partnership area

14. The co-lead for the artisanal and small-scale gold mining (ASGM) partnership area, Ms. Susan Keane, noted that as of 9 June 2011 there were 38 partners within the ASGM partnership area. She explained that the partnership activities were organized in three main areas, these being i) Supporting governments to collect data and developing strategies to address the issue of ASGM in their countries, ii) Providing practical guidance information on how to reduce (and ultimately eliminate) mercury from the sector and iii) Exploring market based approaches to provide economic incentives to miners to encourage the use of mercury free alternatives.

15. She commented that the hallmark of the ASGM partnership activities was the Global Forum on artisanal and small-scale gold mining, which was held in Manila, Philippines in December 2010. Some 100 participants, representing 17 Governments and a number of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, attended the forum. The forum provided an opportunity for stakeholders to consider how to tackle mercury-related issues in artisanal and small-scale gold mining and to initiate a dialogue on the broader range of issues associated with such mining.

16. An important project completed during the year 2011 was the Asia Regional Strategic Planning, which was started in 2009. The conclusion workshop for this project was held in Siem Reap, Cambodia and the governments of Cambodia and Philippines presented their country's National Strategic Plan for reducing mercury use in ASGM. Another significant meeting was the regional multi-stakeholder workshop: Anglophone West Africa sub-regional action planning on mercury use in artisanal and small scale gold mining, from 8-10 June 2011 in Nigeria. Not only was this an excellent opportunity to raise awareness in the region, the meeting also helped raise an understanding of the small scale mining issues in the Zamfara state in Nigeria and foster a dialogue in developing a way forward.

17. She also highlighted the projects being carried out by partners in Peru, which are promoting non-mercury technologies for gold mining. There is a similar project being established in Franco-phone Africa (Mali). The European Environmental Bureau (EEB) and Artisanal Gold Council (AGC) are undertaking projects on promoting direct smelting (non-mercury technology) and fume hoods.

18. She mentioned that following up on a request that the Partnership Advisory Group made at its first meeting (April 2009), the partnership area, in collaboration with UNEP, has developed two papers. The first one is the 'Analysis for stakeholders on formalization in the artisanal and small-scale gold mining sector based on experience in Latin America, Africa and Asia'. The document will help generate awareness and provide guidelines to policy makers and other stakeholders on approaches to formalization. The other document developed is 'Reducing Mercury use in artisanal and small scale gold mining – A practical guideline', which gives information about available technologies and approaches for reducing, and ultimately eliminating, mercury use in artisanal and small-scale gold mining. UNEP has also developed a paper 'Environment for development perspectives: Mercury use in ASGM', which makes an economic argument for investing in mercury reduction/ elimination in the sector.

19. The representative from the Government of Brazil asked about the social problems surrounding the sector and how to address these issues. The co-lead referred to the formalization document and the specific case studies in the document, which elaborate on approaches some governments have taken. It was further discussed that formalization alone might not be sufficient to address these issues. Technical interventions must underpin ASGM work.

20. An update was given about a new project by Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland, Ban Toxics and the University of Copenhagen that aims to reduce mercury use in ASGM. In the Philippines, the project has three components i) 'miner to miner training' promoting the use of gravitational methods and the Borax method ii) Health awareness and iii) Information, education and communication, including engagement of stakeholders to promote less use of mercury. The results of this project will be available in 2012 and shared with the partnership area.

21. A brief presentation on a project entitled 'International Training Center for Artisanal Miners (ITCAM)' was delivered by Mr. Marcello M. Viega, Associate Professor at University of British Columbia, Canada. He informed the Group that this project is an educational-research initiative to be based in Portovelo, Ecuador and is supported by the Governments of Ecuador, Peru and United States of America. The facility would have offices, laboratories, a restaurant and classrooms for educating miners. There would be a pilot plant which will test different ores and

also show the miners how they can increase the recovery of gold and decrease the use of mercury. Responding to a question, Mr. Viega commented that they are considering to initiate similar kinds of project in Guyana and Indonesia.

22. He also noted that the document 'Reducing Mercury use in Artisanal and small scale gold mining – A practical guideline' has collected a number of options for less mercury and mercury free techniques for gold mining. It was mentioned that not enough knowledge is known about the mercury and cyanide interaction.

Mercury in products partnership area

23. In her report, Ms. Karissa Kovner, the representative of the mercury in products partnership area lead noted the partnership area had increased its roster of partners to more than 40 members and has completed 19 pilot projects dealing with mercury in products in various sectors, media, and regions around the globe.

24. Ms. Kovner reported that the priority actions for the products partnership are to reduce global mercury demand related to use in products and production processes; to encourage and implement environmentally sound management of mercury waste, by following a lifecycle approach; and to improve global awareness on mercury exposure, use, production, trade, disposal, and release through exchange and dissemination of information. There are five ongoing projects designed to address those priority actions, these include focus on healthcare and mercury risk management plans/inventories, three of which are expected to be completed in 2012.

25. Within the healthcare sector, the products partnership area is working with the Basel Secretariat on waste management in hospitals, with work having been completed in Argentina and Uruguay and with ongoing work in Costa Rica. There is also continuation of the multi-year project with Healthcare without Harm to expand and create inventories, training pilot projects, and reduction initiatives. Partners for this project include Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Mexico, the USA, HCWH, and the University of Massachusetts at Lowell.

26. The partnership area lead gave an update on the two inventory / risk management UNITAR projects supported by the products partnership in South Africa and in Mongolia.

27. The final project supports the WHO in its efforts to demonstrate the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of mercury-free medical devices. The projects include Nepal and Tanzania, with the work in Nepal having been completed and the final report pending in Tanzania.

28. It was also noted that there are several emerging areas of interest, including batteries, dental amalgam, lighting, and cosmetics.

29. The representative from FDI (World Dental Organization) informed the plenary about a recent meeting of International Organization for Standardization TC 106 sub committee, in which it was suggested to revise the standard for dental amalgam. The prospective new ISO standard for dental amalgam will limit the scope to capsulated alloy and mercury. This will reduce the use of bulk mercury, thus supporting actions to control global trade of bulk mercury.

30. The delegate from India asked about the efficacy of the alternatives, to which the partnership area lead responded that there was still ongoing work on alternatives. It was also mentioned that the website of Health Care Without Harm contains information on product efficiency. Organizations like the WHO are making progress in developing alternatives which take less infrastructure and where the waste management options are easier to handle. The WHO has validated the efficiency of a mercury free solar-powered sphygmomanometer. It was noted that a study by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, funded by USEPA, has shown that the transition cost of mercury to mercury free products is minimal.

Mercury control from coal combustion partnership area

31. The next presentation was made by Ms. Lesley Sloss, the partnership area lead for the mercury releases from coal combustion partnership area. She explained that the purpose of the partnership was the continued minimization and elimination of mercury releases from coal combustion where possible. As of 1 Nov 2011 there were 30 partners involved in the partnership area. The activities for the partnership area have been focused on the development of guidance material (the Process Optimization Guidance (POG) and the interactive Process Optimization Guidance (iPOG), and in supporting China, Russia, South Africa and India in developing studies of their coal-fired power sector, including emissions factors/inventories and demonstration projects. The iPOG is a user-friendly software that calculates Hg emission rates from coal-fired utility plants based on plant specific data. It helps facilities and governments to gain a better understanding of how such specific technologies might assist in substantially reducing their mercury emissions.

32. It was agreed that before the next meeting, the partnership area would aim to conduct a study on incorporating cost consideration into this work and the extent of adaptability of certain countries in using particular mercury control technologies.

33. The partnership has also assisted in technology/information transfer using The United States Environment Protection Agency (USEPA) Mercury (emissions) Monitoring Toolkit) in Russia and South Africa. The lead noted that there were two demonstration projects in Russia (sorbent injection and oxidation), dry process coal washing demonstration project in South Africa and a proposed project for India on coal cleaning.

34. The future plans for the partnership area include completing and publishing reports from projects in Russia and South Africa, continue work in India and promoting synergies amongst funding sources.

35. It was mentioned that there is need to clearly distinguish between the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) mercury toolkit. The toolkit developed by UNEP is a guidance and calculation tool for the identification and quantification of mercury releases (UNEP Mercury Inventory Toolkit), while the US EPA Toolkit is a physical set of equipment that measures mercury emissions ("US EPA Mercury Monitoring Toolkit").

36. It was noted that mercury specific controls exist today and are used in many countries. These controls are not specifically required in existing national regulation of mercury, but are necessary as additional control measures for the industry in some countries where emissions targets are strict (e.g. USA).

Mercury air transport and fate research partnership area

37. The representative for the lead of Mercury air transport and fate research partnership area, Mr. David Evers, reported that the partnership has over 30 members. Currently, the partnership area is engaged in developing a Global Mercury Observation System (GMOS), involved in the assessment of existing data, developing a model for source-receptor relationships and building capacity through training programs. It was noted that the partnership is working on a number of activities, including: the North American Regional Mercury Summaries, Global Biotic Mercury Synthesis, Global/Regional Atmospheric Heavy Metals Model (GRAHM) and capacity building programmes in South Africa, Slovenia and Mexico.

38. The presenter indicated that the partnership would continue to support UNEP Intergovernmental Negotiations Process with technical resources and also endeavor to increase linkages with other partnership areas. The presenter noted that the partnership had revised its business plan by expanding its focus and goals to include mercury transport and fate in biota and in aquatic environment and added emphasis on collecting information of contaminated sites.

39. Following the presentation, an update was given by UNEP regarding two projects: i) a study on mercury in aquatic environment carried out by Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP); ii) supporting ten countries in Africa in developing inventories of mercury releases using the UNEP Mercury Inventory Toolkit. The inventory project is funded by Government of Norway and is in collaboration with United Nations Institute for Training And Research (UNITAR) and groundWork.

40. The representative from Uruguay also informed the Group about training conducted by UNEP for the GRULAC and noted that it proved to be helpful in making progress in developing inventories in the region. It was suggested that since the information in the inventory toolkit on the soil and water was mainly from the developed countries, it does not properly reflect the situation in developing countries. It would be useful to have more data from the developing countries to improve the emission factors used in the toolkit.

41. In developing and communicating science, it was commented that the policy makers and scientists should work together and it should be a 'two-way street'. Another suggestion was to also collect data on other pollutants, while collecting global data on mercury in biota. The partnership area representative suggested that this could be done without much effort.

Mercury waste management partnership area

42. The mercury waste management partnership area lead, Mr. Shunichi Honda from the Government of Japan, stated that the priority actions for the partnership include i) identifying and disseminating environmentally sound collection, treatment and disposal techniques/practices for mercury waste following a life cycle approach ii) assessing environmental impacts of current waste management practices and processes iii) promoting public awareness of the hazards regarding mercury waste and its management and iv) support community engagement. Currently the partnership area consists of 47 partners. Recent activities of the partnership area include the

development of a resource person list (identifying personnel for technical support) and preparation of good practices document for management of mercury releases from waste.

43. The Basel Convention "Technical Guidelines for the Environmentally Sound Management of Wastes Consisting of Elemental Mercury and Wastes Containing or Contaminated with Mercury" were adopted at tenth Conference of the Parties (COP 10). The lead indicated the partnership would continue to support the synergy with the Basel Guidelines through the preparation of the Good Practices Document as a complementary supplement to the Guidelines. The representative from FDI noted that there was interest in developing a low cost amalgam separator for the African region.

44. The lead recognized that there are linkages within the partnerships and recommended that efforts should be made to strengthen them.

Mercury supply and storage partnership area

45. The representative for the supply and storage partnership area, Mr. Richard Gutierrez, stated that the partnership is contributing to minimization and where feasible, elimination of mercury supply considering a hierarchy of sources, and the retirement of mercury from the market to environmentally sound management. The partnership area currently has 13 members.

46. He noted that the EU and USA export bans are already projected to reduce the annual global mercury supply by about 1,100 Metric Tons (MT), and the partnership will seek to reduce the global mercury supply by an additional 600 MT by 2013. Proposed priority actions are intended to achieve the 50% global supply reduction goal. The Partnership will seek to achieve a 600 MT annual global mercury supply reduction by 2013.

47. Mercury storage projects, supported by the government of Norway, were implemented in the Asian region, and in the Latin America/Caribbean region. The project have been useful to help raise awareness on commodity, trade, and waste issues of the 2 regions. As a follow-up, Project Executive committees (Exe-com) were established for these two Regions and were tasked to catalyze regional action. Two options analysis studies for the environmentally sound management of surplus mercury were carried out in the regions. The revised options analysis for the Asia-Pacific (A-P) Region was supported by the US Department of State and was completed in November 2010.

48. The Eastern Europe and central Asia area was identified as a region that potentially needs an options analysis for storage. A preparatory study on the flows of mercury in the region was completed by April 2010 and can be found at UNEP website.

49. The Partnership is also engaged in the development of a "Framework Document" to assist decision making on mercury sequestration. The Framework Document seeks to highlight legal and regulatory measures that foster environmentally sound management and sequestration, informational assistance on options to develop sequestration capacity in certain regions, including considering a "decision tree" of activities, and private sector sharing in financial responsibility.

50. The secretariat provided an update on the project to address primary mercury mining in Kyrgyzstan, where the last remaining mine known to export mercury globally is located. The Government of Norway committed new funds to the project in October 2011 - a contribution of approximately 850,000 USD. A proposal for funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) is under development with the Government of Kyrgyzstan and should help further activities to transition away from primary mining.

51. It was suggested by the Government of Pakistan that UNEP and the partnership area should initiate pilot projects to test the possible options for the sound management of surplus mercury. The World Chlorine Council mentioned that there are some relevant reports concerning the mercury storage issue produced by their organization that could be profiled by the partnership area.

IV. Overarching issues and lessons learned

52. Mr. David Piper, Deputy, Chemicals Branch of UNEP Chemicals gave an overview of the opportunities and challenges for the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership. He noted that any partnership is a dynamic arrangement with common goals and objectives and key indicators of success and failure. He emphasized the importance of communication and outreach and identifying the tools that can help convey the partnership's message to the stakeholders. He also noted the importance of attracting a wider funding base, recognizing partner contributions and improving methods to identify and communicating needs and priorities for the partnership. He pointed out the importance of continuing to attract new partners and building on successes as the partnership moves forward.

53. The Chair of Intergovernmental Negotiations Committee (INC), Mr. Fernando Lugris, gave an overview of the importance of Global Mercury Partnership and its linkage with the INC process. He noted that the Partnership provides information for the policy makers, helps inform negotiations and undertakes strategic actions in support of the future treaty. He noted that the technical briefing at the INC has proved to be very useful to delegates. He acknowledged that profiling the partnership's work is an important challenge to face. During the discussion that followed, it was noted that health is an issue which can be better profiled within the partnership. Also the importance of local government was recognized.

54. After the presentation, the participants were divided into three break out groups along the following themes: i) Communication and Outreach ii) Funding and iii) Participation and Leadership.

i) Communication and Outreach

55. Ms. Susan Keane reported back to the plenary on the topic of 'Communication and Outreach'. She pointed out that the group considered two kinds of communications, namely i) technical communications like training documents, guidance, etc and ii) general communication which promotes the issues of the partnership. She noted that the group identified Governments (policy makers and donors), businesses (large and small/medium enterprises), public (all civil society) and prospective partners as the target audiences for partnership communication. It was discussed that more focus should be on the general public as they would be able to influence the governments to act on the mercury issue. For this to happen, the communication should be in simple language and solution oriented. The group recognized magazines, brochures, newsletters, radios, websites, social media, webinars, videos and educational outreach programs as valuable tools for communication. Press briefings and short documentaries on television channels were also identified as important means of communicating the message of the partnership to a wider audience. The importance of relevant regional consultations and chemicals forum in undertaking outreaches and promoting the issues of the partnerships was also highlighted

56. Language was also identified as a major barrier to communicate effectively. It was discussed that internal communication amongst partners is imperative and partners should send success stories to UNEP regularly so it can be viewed by a broader audience through UNEP's website. It was suggested that a cross-cutting subcommittee addressing communication within partnership could help increase communication. It was also suggested that for INC4 there should be a brochure for the delegates informing of the role of the partnership. Finally, there was a proposal made to consider how mercury related projects could be profiled in the joint website of the Basel, Stockholm and Rotterdam Convention.

ii) Funding

57. Ms. Jane Denison reported back to the group on the topic of 'Funding'. It was discussed that for the purpose of attracting more funding and a wider funding base, each partnership area should be encouraged to develop a matrix or 'wish list' of specific projects. Projects should have some level of detail that triggers the potential donor's interest, including the country/region, along with an estimated price tag and why it is relevant. Projects could be developed by identifying gaps in knowledge, data, information, actions needed to reduce mercury and highlight needs and priorities. It was recommended to forward these proposals to UNEP for sharing and looking for possible synergies across partnership areas. It was discussed that showing cross-linkages, added-value, piggy-backing and global outreach may allow for funding of larger projects.

58. It was suggested to get the private sector more involved in the Partnership. In doing so, the Partnership could come up with a list of potential NGO's, foundations and corporations to target specifically. It was also proposed to have UNEP medals for in-kind contribution and financial contribution to the Partnership much like what is already done for funding the INC process.

59. It was recognized that using health as a window of opportunity, making progress visible and understandable can help attract new funding.

60. It was commented that the process of 'funding of wish list' might be challenging to implement, as there was competition amongst the partnership areas. Nonetheless it is an important idea to follow through and can be developed into a useful tool for attracting funding. UNEP committed to following up with the partnership area leads with ideas on this approach.

iii) Participation and Leadership

61. Ms. Karissa Kovner reported back on the topic of 'Participation and leadership'. The group discussed how to attract new partners, share responsibility and leadership and build on the successes. It was discussed that the roles, expectations and cost implications of the partners should be clear and what it means to be a partner. There should be joint ownership, credibility and ability to move forward as a group. The leadership role was recognized as being pivotal. It was noted that finding partners whose national priorities match with the priorities of the

partnership can help attract new partners. Sharing responsibility will increase the effectiveness of the partnership. A 'Component strategy' was discussed as an important tool in realizing the goal of mercury partnership.

V. Other Matters

62. There was a proposal by the Cement Sustainability Initiative (CSI) of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development suggesting the creation of a new partnership area to address mercury issues related with cement activities. The proposal was introduced to participants in a letter of intent provided as meeting document UNEP (DTIE)/Hg/PAG.3/INF1. In making this proposal, the CSI also volunteered to lead or co-lead such a partnership area, or any other form of alternative organization that would appropriately deal with cement activities within the context of the Partnership. CSI also expressed their interest to devote resources to facilitate the activities of that partnership area and welcomed the participation and involvement of other stakeholders (associations, governments, NGOs).

63. CSI anticipates that potential priority actions for such a partnership could be:

- Development of mercury emission factors
- Baseline data on mercury emissions
- Development of guidance materials (such as Best Available Techniques / Best Environmental Practices)
- Demonstration / testing of monitoring and control technologies
- Costs (incremental) estimates of control technologies.

64. In general, the initiative was welcomed by the Group. The opinion of the Group was divided on how to organize the work. Some members proposed that an overarching emissions group be established while others preferred separating the issues. Overall, the Group encouraged the CSI to develop and submit a business plan to UNEP as a basis to initiate action.

65. To support increased communication and outreach of the partnership, UNEP presented a short movie clip on the process optimization guidance document developed by the coal combustion partnership area. The Group agreed that the clip was a useful way to relay information and encouraged UNEP to post the clip on the UNEP web-site, use the clip at future meetings and develop other relevant clips as resources allow.

66. The Governments of Spain and Uruguay expressed their interest to co-lead the partnership area of supply and storage. This suggestion was welcomed by the Group and the Chair thanked Zero Mercury Working Group for their role as interim lead for the partnership area since 2009.

67. There was a discussion about the exhibition area and the demonstration talks held at INC3. Overall these outreach activities were deemed as useful for delegates at the INC to learn more about the Global Mercury Partnership. These activities were new at INC3 and some challenges were noted by members of the Group such as timing and priority setting. UNEP indicated its willingness to gather further feedback from delegates as a means of improving further outreach initiatives at future INCs and committed to relaying the feedback to the partnership area leads.

VI. Adoption of the report

68. The Partnership Advisory Group agreed to a process to adopt the present report through the chair and rapporteur, Ms. Abiola Olanipekun. The report is to be finalized and made available in December.

VII. Closure of the meeting

69. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 4.00 p.m. on Sunday, 6 November 2011.