

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

Edinburgh, Scotland 27 July 2013

I. Introduction

1. The fifth meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Mercury Partnership was held on 27 July 2013 at the Hilton Grosvenor Hotel, Edinburgh, Scotland.
2. The UNEP Global Mercury Partnership Advisory Group (PAG) consists of up to 25 members representing Governments, regional economic integration organizations and major groups and sectors. It includes participation of developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and takes into account geographical representation. It aims to meet at least annually with the following functions and responsibilities:
 - (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.

II. Opening of the meeting

3. The meeting was opened at 9.00 on Saturday 27 July 2013 by Mr. David Piper, Deputy Head, Chemicals Branch of the UNEP Division of Technology, Industry and Economics (UNEP Chemicals). He welcomed participants and expressed his gratitude to them for taking the time to participate at the meeting. He thanked the partnership area leads for the discussion at the working dinner that had taken place the previous evening. He reminded participants of the UNEP Governing Council 27/12 decision in February 2013 that welcomed the efforts by UNEP and its partners to take immediate actions on mercury through the Global Mercury Partnership. On behalf of UNEP, he thanked partners for their efforts over the past year and urged them to continue their efforts to support, participate in and contribute to the Global Mercury Partnership. He thanked the partnership area leads, in particular, for their continuing commitment to the Partnership noting that information, advice and recommendations from the different partnership areas continues to be highly appreciated not only by recipients of immediate actions but also by all those involved in the mercury negotiations. He reminded the PAG of its role to encourage the work of the 8 partnership areas and to promote synergies and collaboration across the Global Mercury Partnership. He highlighted the expected outcomes of PAG 5: a review of progress and discussion of future plans. He noted that, with the treaty text agreed, these might need realignment in order to support Governments as they seek to address their obligations under the Minamata Convention on Mercury. He hoped the discussions over the session would provide direction and encouragement for the partnership areas in moving forward. He updated the PAG about the growing membership of the Global Mercury Partnerships which now has 119 official partners, including 26 governments, 5 intergovernmental organizations, 48 non-government organizations and 40 others (Industry and Academe).

III. Organization of Work

A. Adoption of the agenda

4. The PAG adopted the provisional agenda as set out in document PAG 5/1.

B. Election of a chair

5. The Overarching Framework of the Global Mercury Partnership states that the chair of the PAG may serve for a maximum of two terms of two years. Ms. Abiola Olanipekun of Nigeria who served as PAG Chair from 2009 has reached the maximum of her term. The PAG expressed its gratitude to Ms. Olanipekun for her chairmanship over four important years and extended its best wishes to her in her new post in the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions.
6. In seeking to identify a new Chair for the PAG, the Secretariat noted that it had taken a number of factors into consideration: (i) the benefit of having government partners to lead the partnership; (ii) the good experience of many of the partnership areas in having co-chairs; (iii) the need not to burden existing partnership area leads with additional duties of the chair; (iv) the interest to maintain geographical balance and engagement in the partnership. On this basis, the Secretariat had identified two candidates who were both already familiar with the Partnership and who also brought considerable long-term experience and enthusiasm for partnership objectives. Mr. Juan Miguel Cuna from the Philippines and Mr. Atle Fretheim from Norway were nominated to Co-Chair the Partnership. The PAG unanimously supported the nominations.
7. The new Co-chairs accepted the nominations and expressed gratitude for the confidence that the PAG has placed in them. Mr. Juan Miguel Cuna underscored the fact that the work of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership has been highly regarded by those Governments where actions have been implemented and others involved in the mercury negotiations globally, having witnessed this at the 5 sessions of the intergovernmental negotiating committee in which he had participated. He said that with PAG leadership and support, the Global Mercury Partnership can continue to play an important role taking immediate action to reduce mercury exposure and providing assistance to Governments to facilitate ratification and future implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.
8. Mr. Atle Fretheim highlighted the important role of the Partnership in providing technical assistance and capacity building to Governments as set out in article 14 of the Minamata Convention on Mercury. He said that the Partnership could play a significant role in supporting the implementation of the Convention, for example through demonstration projects, providing technical guidance documents and training activities. He suggested that it could be useful for governments to have a discussion of the role of the GMP. He also highlighted the GC decision 27/12 that welcomed and urged for continued support to the efforts by UNEP and its partners to take immediate actions on mercury through the Partnership. Apart from immediate actions on mercury, he hoped that the expertise available in the Partnership would be tapped by the future COP to provide technical information and advice in some areas but that this is, of course, for the COP to decide. He indicated that financing of Partnership activities is one concern that the PAG may wish to consider in the light of the treaty.

C. Attendance

9. The meeting was attended by the following members and nominees of the Partnership Advisory Group: Ms. Lesley Sloss (International Energy Agency Clean Coal Centre) and Mr. Wojciech Josewicz (Arcadis), Mr. Nicola Pirrone and Ms. Alessandra Fino (Institute for Atmospheric Pollution Research Italy), Mr. Kenneth Davis (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Mr. Ludovic Bernaudat (UNIDO), Ms. Ana Garcia-Gonzalez (Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural Marino, Spain), Ms. Sofia Martinez Ferrer (Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment, Uruguay), Mr. Alan Kreisberg (Lafarge S. A., World Council for Sustainable Development), Mr. Masaru Tanaka (Tottori University of Environmental Studies, Japan), Mr. Michihiro Oi (Ministry of Environment, Japan), Ms. Celia Chen (Dartmouth College, USA), Mr. Satish Sinha (Toxics Link), Ms. Hanitriniaina Lilaine Randrianomenjanahary (Ministere de L'Environnement et des Forets, Madagascar), Mr. Salvadoe Mondlane (Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique), Mr. Michael Bender (Zero Mercury Working Group), Vagner Maringolo (The European Cement Association), Ms. Corinne Stocco (Environment Canada), Mr. Yingxian Xia (Ministry of Environmental Protection, China), Mr. Atle Fretheim (Ministry of Environment, Norway) Mr. Eirik Steindal (Norwegian Environment Agency), Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Climate Change Division, Pakistan), Mr. Juan Miguel Cuna (Environment Management Bureau, Philippines), Mr. Nuritdin Inamov (Ministry of Natural Resources

and Environment, Russian Federation), Ms. Young-Hee Kim (Ministry of Environment, Republic of Korea), Ms. Hyein Chang (Department of Environmental Health, Republic of Korea), Mr. Alex Winyi Kiiza (National Environment Management Authority, Uganda), Ms. Jane Dennison (US Department of State), Ms. Yuyun Ismawati (International POPs Elimination Network, IPEN).

10. The following attended the meeting as observers: Mr. Eric Uram (Safe Minds), Mr. Bruce Vigon (Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry), Mr. Samuel Spiegel (University of Edinburgh), and Kaoru Oka (EX Research Institute Ltd.).

IV. Review of overall progress and future activities of partnership areas

11. Co-chair Cuna referred to document PAG5.3 Report of Activities and Future Plans of the Global Mercury Partnership and called on the partnership area leads to present the progress in their work over the past year and to highlight their plans for the partnership areas in the coming years. The UNEP secretariat was also invited to present its activities that cut across all the partnership areas.

12. Artisanal and small scale gold mining (ASGM) partnership area

Mr. Ludovic Bernaudat, UNIDO, co-lead with the Natural Resources Defense Council, presented the progress of the ASGM partnership area. The goal of the ASGM partnership is to reduce mercury use in ASGM by 50% by 2017. In order to achieve this, the main activities are: 1) Supporting governments in setting national objectives/ targets; 2) Eliminating worst practices and promote alternatives; and 3) Exploring innovative market-based approaches.

Activities supporting governments in setting goals and targets include:

- 1) Supporting governments in setting national objectives/ targets;
 - a) The organization of the ASGM Global Forum which will take place 3-5 September 2013 in Lima (Peru).
 - b) The development of National Action Plan as a requirement in the Minamata Convention in Cote d'Ivoire and Mali with the support of a project funded by the SAICM Quick Start Programme; and
 - c) Policy development in Nigeria and Nicaragua assisted by the U.S. Department of State (USDOS) to develop institutional and technical recommendations as well as build capacity and raise awareness about the mercury use in ASGM.
 - d) The USEPA, UNEP and the Blacksmith Institute project in Indonesia has been completed and enabled the Indonesian government to move ahead with producing their first national plan for addressing mercury use in ASGM.
- 2) Activities supporting the elimination of worst practices and promote activities focus on inventory, training, and demonstration. These include:

UNIDO GEF supported projects in Ecuador and Peru supporting the elimination of worst practices and promoting activities focus on inventory, training, and demonstration. The USDOS is supporting ASGM projects in Andean States (i.a. mercury measurements in air in a mining community and educating and training miners). In Bolivia, the Blacksmith Institute, Dialogos, and GEUS also embarked on a one-year (April 2013 to April 2014) pilot project to introduce mercury-free techniques using miner-to-miner trainings, training of health care workers and awareness raising in mining societies.

A UNIDO GEF/FFEM/USDOS/EU/US EPA supported project in Francophone Africa i.e. Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal to improve the understanding of ASGM activities in the three countries and develop and implement national strategic actions plans to promote sound management of mercury in ASGM. The project will also include health education and mercury reduction pilot projects.

In the Philippines, a multi-year GEF-funded project to introduce mercury-free techniques using miner-to-miner and rural health worker trainings is led by a Philippine NGO (Ban Toxics), together with a Danish NGO (Dialogos), the University of Copenhagen, the Danish

Society of Environmental and Occupational Medicine, the Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland, and the Benguet Federation of Small-Scale Gold Miners. Excellent progress has been made in convincing and motivating miners to move away from mercury and currently the project is beginning to monitor the amount of mercury reduction induced by the project and create local structures that will sustain the achievements long after the project's end. The USDOS is supporting a mercury storage project in Indonesia/Philippines with focus on storage of mercury from ASGM.

The future plans of the partnership area are to provide better tools for developing National Action Plans, provide guidance to governments on the development of mercury release inventories, and to initiate activities on health related issues.

Specific projects under development for GEF funding include:

A UNIDO project proposal for Indonesia to finalize its national strategic action plan, promote policy reforms, develop and deliver safe mining training programs including health and non-mercury techniques at two pilot sites. This is developed in cooperation with the NGO Balifokus in collaboration with the World Health Organization. The co-lead suggested that the Partnership should establish cooperation with WHO on ASGM activities. One participant suggested to extend cooperation with WHO in all partnership areas and for this reason, suggested to establish a health partnership area under the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.

A joint UNIDO-UNEP project proposal for Vietnam to reduce mercury releases from ASGM and from coal-fired power plants is underway.

13. Chlor-alkali partnership area

The lead, Mr. Kenneth Davis, US Environment Protection Agency (USEPA) gave updates on the chlor-alkali partnership. He reiterated the objectives of the partnership area: a) Prevent the construction of new mercury-cell chlor-alkali production facilities; b) Reduce mercury emissions and use from existing mercury-cell facilities; c) Encourage conversion to non-mercury processes; d) Reduce or eliminate mercury releases from waste generated by chlor-alkali production facilities including waste from conversion to non-mercury processes; and e) Promote environmentally-sound options for storage and disposal of surplus mercury.

To achieve its objectives, the partnership implemented the following activities:

- a) The sharing of WCC guidance on best practices in mercury management;
- b) The development of a paper on the economics of converting mercury-cell facilities to membrane cell technology;
- c) The provision of technical assistance and capacity building to mercury-cell chlor-alkali facilities in Russia, Mexico, Uruguay); and
- d) The development of an updated global inventory of mercury-cell facilities incorporating mercury use and release information from WCC member facilities compiled through their annual reporting procedure, as well as from information gathered by a UNEP survey of governments.

Mr. Davis noted that while the UNEP trade report states that 500 metric tonnes (t) per year of mercury was used in 2005, the 2012 report by the WCC points to a decrease to 160 t /year.

However, it is important to note that these two estimates use different methodologies, and that WCC only reports on mercury use by its members. However, it is clear that mercury use in the sector has been declining significantly.

Mr. Davis also noted that the 2013 UNEP Global Mercury Assessment report revealed that air emissions were estimated to be ~28 t Hg/ year or 1% of total anthropogenic emissions in 2010 while releases to water were estimated to be ~3 t Hg/ year in 2010 or 1.5% of total anthropogenic releases. He noted that these figures are higher than the 2012 WCC report that showed estimates of air emissions to be ~6 t Hg and point source releases to water to be ~0.4 t Hg. Again, these estimates involve different methodologies and different scopes (global versus WCC members)

An update and expansion of the 2010 inventory was presented. Data fields included number of facilities, chlorine capacity, purchases/sales, use, environmental releases and total amounts of mercury on site. Sources of data were from a survey conducted in 2012 by UNEP, 2012 WCC reporting information, communications with individual partners and, where no other data are available, the 2010 inventory. The inventory showed that 81 facilities were reported in 41 countries. The 81 chlor alkali facilities that remain a total chlorine capacity of 5136 thousand tonnes of chlorine. Countries reported that 9 facilities plan to close or convert to non-mercury technology by 2020. Eurochlor has made a voluntary commitment to phase out all mercury-cell chlor-alkali units by 2020, and to dispose of all surplus mercury not reused in European chlor-alkali units.

Twenty-two countries reported mercury remaining on-site. Total mercury in non-reporting countries was estimated based on chlorine capacity. Estimates were made using the industry standard relationship between capacity and mercury use and consumption. In 2012, the total estimated mercury at existing chlor-alkali facilities that needs to be managed is estimated at 10,456 t. Of this, 7,505t is being held in countries having a ban on exports while the remaining 2948t are located in countries with no export ban.

Drawing on the text of the Minamata Convention on Mercury that pertains to the chlor alkali sector, the partnership plans to

- a) continue updating the global inventory and keep track of closures and conversions;
- b) continue information sharing activities, particularly on guidance development and on best practices for decommissioning, waste management, interim storage and final disposal, and contaminated site identification and assessment;
- c) produce video on safe handling of mercury, including during decommissioning; and
- d) build linkages with the Supply and Storage Partnership Area.

The PAG 5 representative from Russia said that there is need for the chlor alkali partnership area to provide know-how and technology on safe disposal of mercury from decommissioned plants. The representative from the Zero mercury working group (ZMWG) confirmed that the Supply- Storage Partnership area has information on the technologies available.

The representative from Japan noted that the chlor alkali partnership also needs to work closely with the Waste Management partnership for guidance on the environmentally sound management of mercury considered as waste from the chlor alkali industry.

14. Mercury Air Transport and Fate Research (F&T) partnership area

Nicola Pirrone of the CNR-Institute of Atmospheric Pollution Research, Italy, partnership lead reiterated the objective of the F&T partnership area to accelerate the development of sound scientific information to address uncertainties and data gaps in global mercury cycling and its patterns (e.g., air concentrations and deposition rates, source-receptor relationships, hemispheric and global air transport and transformation and emission sources).

It would do this by enhancing information sharing among scientists and between them and policymakers and by providing technical assistance and training, where possible, to support the development of critical information.

The partnership area is also enhancing the development of a globally-coordinated mercury observation system to monitor the concentrations of mercury species in air and aquatic ecosystems. Recently, the scope of the partnership area was extended to include aquatic transport and the fate of methylmercury in the environment, including to biota and humans, and evaluation of mercury impacts.

The contributions of F&T partnership area are represented by several large publications in recent years: In 2012, the partnership area contributed to the development of the UNEP [Global Mercury Assessment 2013](#) providing scientific information and knowledge to the summary report and being responsible for several sections in the Technical Background Report. The reports were prepared through the voluntary contributions of highly recognized scientists affiliated with the partnership area.

The main current activity is to develop a globally coordinated mercury observation system (Global Mercury Observation System, GMOS) focused on air and water samples, with recent additions of biota. The following activities were conducted in 2012-2013:

- a. Revision of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) on measurement of mercury in precipitation and on Total Gaseous Mercury/ Gaseous Elemental Mercury (TGM/GEM) and mercury speciation;
- b. Development of Quality Assurance/ Quality Control (QA/QC) on-line procedures and ad-hoc software;
- c. Development of an on-line logbook, a logging system for data measurements;
- d. Development of an on-line-infrastructure that allows experts to archive, catalogue and exchange data on mercury and its compounds in ambient air and precipitation, as well as in the marine and terrestrial ecosystems, and which also provides advanced web services and processes.
- e. First aircraft ETMEP (“European Tropospheric Mercury Experiment Program”) measurements performed on Mount Etna, Sicily (Southern Italy) in July/August 2012 to improve our knowledge on the vertical distribution of tropospheric mercury as well as to understand the regional transport and the potential range plumes and relative importance of emissions (volcanic emissions and biomass burning).
- f. The next aircraft measurements plan for the second part of ETMEP flights is foreseen in summer (August) 2013.

Areas identified within the F&T Partnership for future work include the following:

- a. Develop a coordinated global monitoring network based on existing atmospheric mercury monitoring stations and using standardized and comprehensive approaches. The resulting network should have sufficient coverage to track the success and gaps of mercury control measures with monitoring including standard biotic endpoints (e.g., fish).
- b. Close coordination with the Group on Earth Observations (GEO), the organization working to build GEOSS (the Global Earth Observation System of Systems), to include mercury in GEOSS work plans;
- c. Further involvement of the F&T partners in several International Conference such as the 11th International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant to be held in Edinburgh, UK in 2013;
- d. Further coordination and liaison with various organizations and programmes (such as United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme, UNEP Regional Seas);
- e. Develop a global biotic Hg database that could provide baseline of mercury levels from which to evaluate Mercury Treaty effectiveness. Place particular emphasis on marine coastal and open ocean fish and other food items which are important to monitor for human exposure purposes;
- f. Explore opportunities to integrate current or proposed Hg monitoring programmes for biota in the western hemisphere that can be used for global monitoring purposes and linked with measurements of air deposition and watershed releases;

- g. Expand the scope of F&T to include dispersed sources of mercury to the global mercury budget, such as re-emission of mercury from contaminated sites (including emissions to the atmosphere and water cycle)
- h. Expand the scope of F&T by including ecosystems that are sensitive to the mercury loading (indicators are still to be developed).
- i. Liaise with supporting activities that are already provided through regional meteorological institutions. This link will enhance and strengthen the quality of measurement results and secure worldwide comparability (stronger collaboration with the WMO is suggested) and may assure a sustainability of efforts and coordination globally.
- j. Develop global protocols for monitoring of water, sediments & biota in terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems that will assist in model development.

15. Mercury in Products partnership area

Mr. Kenneth Davis of the USEPA and representing Dr. Tala Henry, lead of the partnership area, presented the progress of the mercury in Products partnership area. The goal of this partnership area is to phase out and eventually eliminate mercury in products and to eliminate releases during manufacturing and other industrial processes via environmentally sound production, transportation, storage, and disposal procedures.

The partnership area strives to identify and implement successful approaches for reducing or eliminating mercury in products where there are effective substitutes and operates as a partner-driven forum for discussing strategies for achieving goals and objectives.

Partnership goals are designed to achieve percentage demand reduction goals by 2015 and the Priority Actions used to shape projects are consistent with cross-cutting issues.

Project proposals and some work is underway on emerging mercury-added products such as batteries, lighting, dental amalgam and cosmetics. "Emerging" areas refer to products/issues recommended by Partners and other interested parties as the Partnership has evolved.

Key cross-cutting issues and potential paths forward raised by Partners include improving awareness via communication and outreach by improving data baselines, as well as monitoring and measurement tools and demonstrating availability and efficacy of mercury-free substitutes such as the brochure on "Alternatives to Mercury-Containing Products" produced for and distributed at INC5.

Projects are also approached from a lifecycle management perspective which includes reflecting potential emissions in all phases of the product lifecycle (including disposal and waste management, as well as local and global fate, transport, deposition, and potential bioconversion to methylmercury that can be linked to products). This approach can be challenging due to difficulties in showing the contribution of mercury emissions associated with products where release scenarios are generally limited to breakage, spills, and incineration of solid waste. Building on the life cycle management approach, the Products Partnership plans to coordinate closely with the partnership areas on Storage and Supply and Waste Management.

Recent and existing projects and activities of the partnership area include:

- a) Cooperation between the University of Massachusetts and health care facilities in Mexico and Ecuador to reduce mercury in hospitals. This work ended in July 2013. To date, the following reports are completed:

(1) “Occupational Exposure to Elemental Mercury in Odontology/Dentistry” (English) – April 2012; and (2) “Elimination of Mercury in the Health Sector: a workbook to identify safer alternatives” (Spanish) – March 2013.

- b) Health Care without Harm has completed efforts to conduct pilot projects to (1) reduce mercury in hospitals in Mexico, Brazil and Chile; and (2) conduct a Central American workshop with a final report anticipated in late 2013.
- c) The East Africa Dental Amalgam phase down project is being implemented in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. This is a collaborative project of UNEP, WHO, the World Dental Federation, the International Association of Dental Manufacturers and NGOs which aims to demonstrate the phase down of dental amalgam in developing countries
- d) The UNEP- GEF enlighten project provides a multi-stakeholder platform for the development and dissemination of information promoting the manufacture of compact fluorescent lamps (CFLs) with lower mercury content as well as advice on how to deal with broken lamps and how to organize the environmentally sound management of CFLs as waste.

The partnership area had its annual conference via telephone in November 2012. Discussion was focused on the review of proposals submitted by Partners, as requested at PAG4. Fourteen project proposals were presented and reviewed. Partners considered impact, outcome, geographical reach, and replicability. The goal is to develop handy list of proposals for potential funders. Evaluation of projects proposals is ongoing.

Future plans include:

- a) To engage in discussions to determine the role of the Partnership in the context of the Minamata Convention on Mercury;
- b) To increase the engagement with the scientific and business communities to gather and disseminate information; and
- c) To represent views of all Partners in the development of goals to reduce or eliminate use of mercury in products.

It plans to pursue these issues based on the interest and feedback from Partners and other interested parties including coordinating with other Partnerships

The PAG 5 participant from Madagascar asked about the status of the proposal submitted by Madagascar concerning the “Reduction of the use of mercury added products and waste in Madagascar” for consideration by the partnership area. The project aims to prioritize mercury added products by category, investigate its trade and waste management, build capacities in the environmentally sound management of end of life mercury products in their priority sector, and create awareness on the hazards and risks of mercury for policy makers and the general public. It also aims to establish an inter- agency committee on environmental health and lobby with policy makers for a draft bill on banning mercury product importation.

The UNEP secretariat replied that the proposal had been accepted as warranting support and had been submitted to a potential donor for funding. The representative from the ZMWG remarked that the partnership area needs to engage manufacturers to produce quality alternatives. The representative from the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry suggested a life cycle assessment of the alternatives to mercury added products.

The representative from Uganda presented the status of the UNEP- WHO “East Africa Dental Amalgam Dental Phase down Project”. This project, the first of its kind, is testing approaches to the phase down of dental amalgam in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Activities include a dental amalgam trade and waste survey; workshops in clinical preventive dentistry and oral health promotion; the promotion of alternative restorative materials and the barriers to their take up; and demonstrations of the environmentally sound collection and management of dental amalgam waste. The project is being implemented in collaboration with the World Dental Federation and the International Association of Dental Manufacturers. Uganda notes

the challenges in the disbursement of project funds and suggests having better administrative arrangements for future projects.

16. **Mercury Control from Coal Combustion partnership area**

Ms Lesley Sloss, of the International Energy Agency (IEA) Clean Coal Centre, as lead of the partnership area, provided the current status of activities in the partnership area.

The partnership area has two objectives:

- a) To continue minimization and elimination of mercury releases from coal combustion where possible; and
- b) To supplement existing programmes in key strategically selected ways to ensure that reductions are globally significant as part of a multi-pollutant reduction approach. The partnership's activities are focused on: guidance materials, inventory development and projections, and demonstration projects.

The partnership has produced useful guidance materials: the Process Optimization Guidance for Reducing Mercury Emissions from Coal Combustion in Power Plants (POG) and the iPOG (interactive POG), an interactive calculation tool for emissions and control based on plant-specific data. Both documents can be downloaded for free from the UNEP website.

For inventory development and projections activities, coal emission inventories and projections have been developed for China, Russia, South Africa and India. Reports for the first three of these countries have been published on UNEP Website, the report for India is at the final draft stage but has not yet been approved by the Indian authorities for release to UNEP.

The representative from Spain, Ms. Ana Garcia Gonzales provided additional information in a statement on behalf of Mr. Gernot Schnabl, European Commission-DG Environment. The EU Commission has been a member of the GMP since 2009 and provided 1 million euros for a project "Reducing Mercury Emissions from Coal Combustion in the Energy Sector". The project, initially timed for 2009-2011, was extended until end of 2013. The Commission sees the outcome as positive, in particular as it was able to mobilize Russia, South Africa and China; co-operation with India was unfortunately very difficult to establish.

In the near future, studies on coal used and emissions from the power sector have been proposed for Thailand, Vietnam, and the Philippines. Thailand and Vietnam have expressed their interest in the project, and Vietnam has also expressed interest in a demonstration project (UNEP/UNIDO synergy); funds have been provided by the US and the EU.

Two demonstration projects have been conducted in Russia (sorbent injection and oxidation, joint projects with US EPA, Sweden, and Albemarle), and a study characterizing coals used in South Africa with the purpose of optimizing pre-treatment processes is on-going and will be completed by the end of 2013. This project is being conducted jointly by the United States Geological Survey (USG) and the Electricity Supply Commission of South Africa (Eskom).

The partnership area's work has been presented at several international meetings, on the UNEP Mercury Programme website and partnership newsletter, and by several papers published in international journals. At the International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant 2013, the partnership will play a significant role with a session on coal emission and two sessions on control technologies.

17. Mercury Waste Management partnership area

Prof. Masaru Tanaka from Japan, lead of the partnership area, presented updates of the waste management partnership.

The overall objective of the Waste Management Partnership Area is to minimize and, where feasible, eliminate mercury releases to air, water, and land from mercury waste by following a lifecycle management approach.

Priority actions include: identification of techniques/practices, environmental impact assessment of waste management practices and processes, and promotion of public awareness. The contact point of the Waste Management Partnership Area is the Ministry of the Environment, Japan. Currently, there are 59 partners in this Partnership Area, working together on some projects and work separately on individual projects.

Prof. Tanaka presented the SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis of the waste management partnership. He said that the strength of the partnership is learning from experiences in the reduction of mercury releases from waste management through several tools such as 'Good Practices Document', 'Basel Convention Technical Guidelines', 'Information on Implemented Projects listed in the Business Plan'. Such information would enable partners to choose relevant measures suitable for their situation. The partnership area has provided a format of reporting on current activities and achievements made. Partners can easily identify in a project the type of waste that is targeted, the level of intervention made, means to contribute to the Partnership area objectives, project implementers, project objectives and accomplishments. Such information would provide Partners with ideas to improve existing projects and develop new projects. A further strength of this partnership area is the identification of experts in mercury waste management, summarized as the Resource Person List. The objective of the list is to provide information about the resource persons that could give advice from their technical standpoint. Currently, there are 27 resource persons registered on the list, available at the partnership area at the UNEP website.

A weakness of the partnership area is the limited interaction among the partners with only two face-to-face meetings since the inception of the waste partnership in 2008. There is a need to find more opportunities to have face-to-face meetings and tele-conferences. Another weakness is the limited reporting about the achievements made by each partner. Some partners promptly respond to the request to update the project information but some do not. There is lack of delivery of information about activities/results of other partnership areas; this could possibly be addressed by increasing collaboration among partnership areas and expanding membership, such as common planning and implementing concrete projects with other partnership areas in exercising the "lifecycle" approach.

One challenge of the waste partnership is to ensure environmentally sound management (ESM) of collected waste products and treated residues for the countries that have established waste collection systems. There is a need to increase the accessibility to affordable environmentally sound technology for mercury waste management and to enhance capacities of managing municipal waste, of which banning and stopping 'open burning', a common practice in many developing countries, is a priority. Measures like changing open dumping to sanitary landfills with periodical surface coverage are necessary. Another challenge is to raise awareness of the public and political leaders - this is considered key to changing people's behaviour and secure resources to implement necessary actions. Further challenges include capacity building to increase the number of specialists with sufficient knowledge to implement projects; fund raising for future activities and projects, and promoting global recognition of progress made by the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership and the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

The waste partnership area plans to hold a face-to-face meeting in December to review the existing business plan in particular on how the partnership could contribute to the future implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

One of the priority activities is supporting the update, revision, dissemination and implementation of the Basel Convention 'Technical Guidelines on the Environmentally Sound Management of Mercury Wastes'. The Government of Japan serves as a lead country on these guidelines and works with the small intersessional working group, based on the decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention at its eleventh meeting.

Another priority activity is supporting UNEP to develop a 'Practical Sourcebook on Mercury Storage and Disposal'. The waste partnership also plans to finalize the first draft of the Good Practices for Management of Mercury Releases from Waste in collaboration with UNEP Chemicals and other Partnership areas.

18. Mercury Supply and Storage partnership area

Ms. Ana Garcia, Government of Spain, co-lead with Uruguay for the Mercury Supply and Storage Partnership reminded the PAG about the projected excess supply of mercury in all regions of the world to 2050. Total excess supply projected globally by 2050 is 28,000 to 48,000 metric tonnes.

Key projects and activities under the supply and storage partnership area include: Work to support the Kyrgyz Republic in efforts to provide sustainable economic alternatives to mercury mining for the community of Haidarkan and so allow a transition away from mercury mining. The project is now in Phase 2, supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Government of Norway. Based on the assessments of the social, environmental and health aspects of the Kyrgyz primary mercury conducted in Phase 1, the current phase will focus on developing more detailed economic alternatives as well as detailed planning to remediate contaminated areas of high concern around the community.

Under the partnership area, UNEP chemicals implemented regional mercury storage projects in Asia and Latin America. These provided assessment reports and analyses of possible options for the environmentally sound storage of mercury. As a follow up, national mercury storage and disposal projects were implemented in South America (Argentina and Uruguay) and in Central America (Panama and Mexico) funded by the Government of Norway. Reports of these projects are available at the website of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership on Supply and Storage. The national level projects resulted in strengthened national capacities for ESM, reviews of relevant national legislation, strengthened interagency collaborating mechanisms, the identification of potential sites for temporary storage and draft national action plans.

The Government of Spain, in collaboration with Brazil and Uruguay, organized a workshop on mercury management for Latin American and Caribbean countries which took place in Brazil in May 2012. The workshop assessed the regional situation and existing challenges related to mercury storage; explored environmentally sound solutions; and provided a forum for knowledge sharing.

A workshop on mercury management and decontamination in the Mediterranean also took place in Almadén (Spain) in December 2012 in the framework of the Mediterranean Action Plan, (Barcelona convention, UNEP). The workshop provided technical support for ESM of mercury/mercury wastes and provided tools for implementing the Regional Plan. Ms. Garcia noted that the Regional Mediterranean plan on Mercury is legally binding.

The supply and storage partnership area aims to assist countries to manage excess supply and find environmentally sound storage solutions. The workshops raised, among others, the following conclusions: many countries have difficulty in identifying and funding appropriate facilities for ESM and storage of mercury and mercury wastes. The mercury waste management should be carried out as close to the source as possible to reduce exposure and experience has shown that adequate legislation coupled with effective enforcement is key. Priority actions of the partnership area include: Enhancing regional capacity-building for storage, developing storage criteria for the diverse waste types, and improving information on trade and supply flows.

Several stabilization and encapsulation technologies are now available. The aim is to reduce or eliminate mercury releases by converting it into a solid that is less or non-hazardous, potentially resulting in lower waste management costs. Stabilization typically involves mixing elemental sulphur and elemental mercury to form solid mercury sulphide. Encapsulation (micro or macro) involves an additional treatment for of the stabilized mercury sulphide which is incorporated into a stable matrix such as a sulphur polymer or paraffin providing a second barrier to immobilize mercury. The stabilization and micro-encapsulation technology is directly applicable to elemental mercury and to various mercury wastes and the resulting materials are technically inert (EU and US-EPA test/criteria).

In the near future, the partnership plans to support Phase 2 of the Krygyz Republic Primary Mining Project and to continue work on the environmentally safe storage/disposal of mercury from major sources. Industries such as chlor-alkali, non-ferrous metals production, industrial

gold mining, and the oil and gas sector will be engaged to determine the excess mercury likely to be generated and to derive industry sector plans for the storage and disposal of such excess. It will encourage countries to conduct national mercury inventories, adopt national policies that restrict trade in mercury and sequester, rather than export, mercury. Finding environmentally sound storage solutions taking into account national infrastructures will be important. The Partnership is currently working on potential projects to be supported.

19. **Mercury from Cement Manufacture partnership area**

Mr. Alan Kreisberg, LaFarge SA, representing the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) - Cement Sustainability Initiative (CSI), lead of the cement industry partnership presented updates of this newly established partnership area. The objective of this partnership area is to minimize mercury releases to the environment from

cement manufacture. Industry disputes emissions estimate in UNEP 2013 global assessment report, but still considers that emissions are significant and need to be addressed.

The first meeting of the partnership area took place in Geneva on 18-19 June 2013 where 50 participants from governments, industries, NGOs and UN agencies attended. At the June 18 Partnership meeting, a number of presentations were given including: Regulations in Europe and USA and an overview of regulations in other parts of world. Further work by the Partnership could be done to gain a more comprehensive understanding of regulations. Other presentations were on a mercury inventory project including a joint database in Latin America, presentation on mercury behavior in cement and emissions measurements around the world. Majority (60- 65%) of mercury in cement is from the raw materials. A presentation made by the USEPA via SKYPE highlighted the strongly log-normal distribution of mercury values in limestones used for cement manufacture. This results in a large portion of total national emissions coming from a relatively small number of plants. This phenomenon may account for disagreement between different estimates of global emissions from the sector. Additional information on the mercury content of limestones used at different cement plants could help to define those where a change of raw materials or selective mining could be effective approaches to reducing mercury emissions

The cement industry partnership defined three business plan priorities: inventories, guidance for cement plants to reduce mercury emissions and outreach/capacity building.

In terms of inventories, the partnership indicated that due to the wide variation in emissions from various sources, a mass balance approach may be a method that can be widely utilized to estimate more accurate emissions. Consequently, incorporating data on mercury content of feedstocks, a guidance on how to conduct a mass balance and make the relevant measurements will need to be developed.

-

The partnership plans to compile good practices for cement plants on how to reduce emissions. The compilation might be useful in informing any discussion of BAT/BEP convened by the INC or future COP. The compilation may include information in the following domains: how to screen raw materials and develop strategies to reduce mercury input from raw material; use of mass balance approach as a management tool to reduce mercury emissions; approaches for removal of mercury from the cement kiln process to avoid emissions, including the factors influencing the effectiveness of dust shuttling; and other abatement technologies available, such as sorbent injection (with and without polishing filter), wet scrubbers, and so on.

With regard to outreach and capacity building, the partnership will disseminate the compilation described above, provide information on appropriate techniques to reduce/minimize mercury emissions from the cement sector, increase the awareness within the cement community and develop outreach materials and collaborate with complementary programmes. The partnership will also disseminate and publish information on case studies of effective mercury reduction, particularly those in emerging countries, for example about proven use of dust shuttling or secondary controls.

In the near future, the partnership plans to:

- a) revise the business plan to reflect meeting outcomes,

- b) develop sub-groups to work on: inventories, compilation of good practices and training materials (about mass balance, selection of raw materials & fuels, and process optimization and controls) and communications, and
- c) develop a working group to understand dust shuttling.

20. **Secretariat activities on inventories, communication and financing**

Mr. David Piper presented the activities undertaken by the Secretariat in support of the Partnership but cross-cutting the partnership areas and so not included in the partnership area discussions above. He explained that UNEP's work on inventories consist of both global and national mercury release inventories. During the year in review, UNEP had completed and published an updated 2013 Global Mercury Assessment that was well received by both the INC and UNEP's Governing Council the latter requesting a further update to be produced within six years. Since the 2008 assessment, the process for estimating emissions and the collection of data have greatly improved.. In addition, the reports include, for the first time, preliminary information on releases to water. The work is presented as a summary report for policy makers; The Global Mercury Assessment 2013: Sources, Emissions, Releases, and Environmental Transport and a Technical Background Report for the Global Mercury Assessment 2013, a fully referenced scientific report which is the basis for the summary report.-He further elaborated on the maps on cement production from the Global Mercury Assessment 2013 as an example of secondary products that could be produced from the database behind the Assessment.

With regard to national inventories, the UNEP Toolkit for the Identification and Quantification of Mercury Releases was also updated in 2013. The UNEP Toolkit consists of two levels. Level 1 provides an entry level tool with fewer user-defined options and so a more standardized procedure. Level 2, provides more user-defined options allowing better discrimination of technologies used in important industry sectors.

In terms of support to developing national inventories, he explained that more than 23 countries have developed national inventories using the UNEP Toolkit but more support should be given to countries that wish to develop national inventories. To achieve this, UNEP and UNITAR were collaborating to develop 'Mercury: Learn' - an E-learning platform for the UNEP Toolkit. Furthermore, with the aim of developing a regional cadre of trainers available to support national officers undertaking mercury inventories, a training workshop for future trainers in using the UNEP Toolkit is being planned. A training seminar is scheduled in late 2013 for participants invited from the Basel and Stockholm Conventions regional centres but it is hoped to broaden participation if sufficient places available.

With funding from the Global Environment Facility, projects to develop national mercury inventories and action plans are being prepared. National projects for China and Russia have been approved and are under implementation. Additional national projects for Brazil and India are in development. A project proposal for 6 countries of the Latin American and Caribbean region (Argentina, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Peru and Uruguay) has been submitted for approval. Proposals for multi-country projects for the Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) region (including Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine), for Africa and Asia (countries to be confirmed) are in advanced stages of development.

Ms. Desiree Narvaez presented the activities undertaken by the Secretariat to foster effective outreach of the Partnership externally and enhance communication internally. Each partnership area has a three-step approach in order to meet the objectives – Step 1: Identifying issues and gaps, Step 2: Developing strategies and Step 3: Making action plans.

Work of the Global Mercury Partnership was communicated using different media according to its audience. Training documents, guidance, toolkits, reports and publications were used to reach technical professionals such as government officials, partners, and practitioners in mining, industry, healthcare, dentists and medical doctors. More reader-friendly materials such as brochures, posters, videos and newsletters were used to raise awareness of the general public, policy makers, governments and donors.

Technical documents developed during the past year included most notably the Global Mercury Assessment 2013, including both its summary report and technical background report and "A practical guide: Reducing Mercury Use in Artisanal and Small-Scale Gold Mining". Project reports including "Eliminating Mercury in Health Care: A Workbook to Identify Safer Alternatives and Storing and Disposing Excess Mercury in South America - Advancing National Initiatives in Argentina and Uruguay" were developed as a result of projects supported by UNEP.

Brochures and posters were developed with focus on providing solutions in simple languages. The brochure on “Alternatives to Mercury-Containing Products” was developed in English and Spanish, with French and Russian translations currently underway. Brochure and posters on Dental Amalgam Phase Down are also being developed.

As part of general awareness raising activity, a brochure entitled “Mercury Time to Act” was launched and disseminated at the 5th Session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Mercury. It complements the more technical materials and provides policy makers and general public with the rationale and the imperative to act on mercury with summaries from recent scientific reports and cases studies to describe the mercury story.

Stories of the Month continue to be published on a monthly basis to share information with partners. In the recent months, stories on ASGM, cement partnership, waste partnership, chlor-alkali partnership and Global Mercury Assessment (2013) were planned and partners were encouraged to submit ideas and results for future 'stories'. Partnership area leads were encouraged to submit Stories of the Month

Partnership activities were also featured in the UNEP Chemicals Branch Newsletter and UNEP Regional Office for Europe Newsletter.

Briefings to the press and permanent missions were held and presentations were given during side events in meetings including at the INC 5. Webinars and Workshops are held and UNEP website (<http://www.unep.org/hazardoussubstances/>) is being updated regularly.

As next steps, the Secretariat will increase efforts to broaden circulation of materials to larger audiences, hosting webinars and contributing to newsletters. The Secretariat also plans to develop and disseminate video materials and gather resources for communication and awareness raising activities. In the short term, podcast, webinars and project summary sheets can be produced with relatively low cost. Graphics and interactive web design can be developed more quickly but with higher cost. Enhancing communication among experts, establishing a filing system, building mainstream communications, designing partnership logo and reorganizing information on the web require further evaluation and more long term planning.

The Global Mercury Partnership requested a side event at the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Minamata Convention on Mercury that will inform parties about the work of the Global Mercury Partnership. Other venues for information dissemination are regional awareness raising workshops to encourage early ratification of the treaty; regional meetings and Open-Ended Working Group (Geneva, 2014) of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management; and project workshops for East Africa dental amalgam phase down project, coal combustion projects and artisanal and small scale gold mining projects.

Mr. Piper continued with the financing issue of the Partnership. He explained that a total of 12,770,321 USD was made available to UNEP between 2010 and 2013: 2,426,140 USD in 2013; 3,627,180 USD in 2012; and 6,727,001 USD in 2010-2011. The funding comes from four major sources: The Environment Fund; the Project Cooperation Agreement from Norway, which is distributed to the sub-programme and thereafter allocated to projects by UNEP; voluntary deposits from donors (so-called 'extra budgetary funds'); and the Global Environment Facility.

He explained that the funds have been used to support activities for artisanal and small-scale gold mining, Global Mercury Assessment and inventories, supply and storage, products and coal. Small amounts were also used to fund cement and waste partnership areas.

Mr. Piper stressed caution in considering the data as they included only those funds provided through UNEP and not those provided directly by donors. As a result, the figures presented underestimated the resources made available for the work of the Partnership.

21. The representative from the ZMWG suggested refining the UNEP toolkit using information from the various partnership areas. The representative from Balifokus said that the inventory toolkit could usefully be expanded to include mercury trade, import and export data. She also added that the Global Mercury Partnership may want to address interim storage of commodity mercury. Furthermore, she said that the Partnership may wish to consider how it can assist in the future implementation of article 16 (Health Aspects) in the treaty, and to cooperate with WHO on this. Atle Fretheim suggested that the GMP should be presented at the DipCon, and that it should be on the agenda for the discussion by the governments. Responding to the comments on the UNEP toolkit, Mr. Piper noted that it is a dynamic tool, revised periodically as new information arises; the Partnership can play a useful role in

identifying areas of the toolkit requiring revision and bringing forward the information necessary for the revision.

IV. Proposed Relationship of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership and the Minamata Convention on Mercury

22. PAG Co-chair Atle Fretheim chaired the discussion on the agenda item that seeks to identify ways on how the Global Mercury Partnership can support Governments as they address the measures set out in the Minamata Convention on Mercury. He underscored the fact that Article 14 of the Minamata Convention on Mercury mentions partnerships as an important means to deliver the capacity building, technical assistance and technology transfer needed by Parties to implement the new treaty and that the GMP was the basis for the introduction of this text. He said that the Partnership has delivered a range of on-the-ground activities that informed the negotiations of good practices in several sectors. He foresaw that the intergovernmental negotiating committee (INC) would continue during the interim period prior to entry into force and that the Partnership will have a key role both during this period and when the treaty comes into force.
23. The representative from the ZMWG said that the Partnership should start transitioning to support roles for the obligations laid out in the treaty, and that no plans or activities for future work should be duplicative of work to be undertaken by future INCs, expert committees or the Conference of the Parties (COP) unless and until the INC or the COP expressly requests it. He said that support functions should be targeted toward broadly needed capacity assistance designed to meet needs during the interim period. He added that the Partnership could demonstrate that meeting the obligations of the Convention is not necessarily expensive, i.e., the industry could contribute in kind and not necessarily cash.
24. The representative from China said the Partnership could be more proactive in informing the INC or the COP on issues relevant for Minamata implementation. He said that the Partnership could project and/or analyze the needs of the INC/COP and present how it could assist in meeting those needs. He said that the partnership should maintain its status as independent of the INC/COP.
25. The representative from Japan remarked that all partnership areas have presented their activities and future plans and requested the UNEP secretariat to consolidate in a document to be presented to the INC and/or the COP.
26. The lead of the Fate and Transport partnership stressed that the partnership is currently implementing activities in support of Article 14 (Capacity building, technical assistance and technology transfer), Article 19 (Research, development and monitoring) and Article 22 (Effectiveness evaluation). He said that the Partnership is full of resources such as technical expertise that the INC and/or COP may wish to tap. He added that the Fate and Transport Partnership area could play an important role in relationship to the Minamata Convention but it would need to avail of GEF financing to fund its various activities.
27. The delegate from Pakistan proposed having the Partnership gain a formal status and be declared a permanent body for consideration by the COP in the future. He said that the partnership has the strength of being operational and has been delivering projects in the last 5 years.
28. The lead of the ASGM partnership, UNIDO said that the treaty text on ASGM is largely drawn from the ASGM partnership business plan. Another representative from the ASGM partnership said that the Partnership can contribute to implementation of the treaty by concretely doing a research on means to formalize the sector and engage the participation of miners.
29. The Spanish representative supported the idea that the GMP can play an important role in the implementation of the new treaty. She pointed to the importance of communication, and said that the GMP has not been so successful on communications. It needs to improve, both with regard to exchanging information among partnership areas and externally.
30. The representative from the coal partnership requested UNEP secretariat to prepare a matrix that will show the links of the relevant articles in the Minamata Convention to the activities of the Partnership

areas. Co Chair Fretheim agreed to the suggestion and added that as Norwegian delegate to the PAG, he would support the PAG request for the secretariat to prepare an information document to the INC that will show the relationship of the Partnership to the Minamata Convention and demonstrate how the GMP can support the implementation of the Convention. He added that the most important time to be present would be the first INC after the DipCon.

31. Other areas not previously covered where the Partnership could potentially assist will be in article 16 (Health aspects) where the Partnership could work closely with WHO.
32. Co-chair Fretheim closed the discussion and said that further discussion on the issue of financing Partnership activities could be taken up by the PAG in other venues. He reiterated PAG 5 recommendation to have high visibility of the Partnership both at the Preparatory Meeting and the Diplomatic Conference that will take place on 7-11 October in Kumamoto, Japan.

V. Other Matters

33. David Piper, UNEP secretariat advised the PAG that there may be a need to amend the operational guidelines of the Partnership as a result of a series of changes that are being introduced across the UN, including UNEP. These changes relate in particular to engagement with partners - particularly those involving financial transactions, and new instructions in relation to publications, use of name and logos. He noted that all of these could have implications on the interaction within the partnership. He said the secretariat would request advice from the UNEP legal team and propose any amendments necessary to the operational guidelines of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership for the next meeting of the PAG.
34. **Timing of PAG 6**
UNEP secretariat suggested continuing current practice by holding the 6th meeting of the PAG in 2014 back to back with another significant event on mercury and offered to search for a suitable opportunity. The PAG agreed to the secretariat's proposal.

VI. Adoption of the Report

35. Co-chair Fretheim suggested a process to finalize the report of the meeting. He said that under the supervision of the Co-chairs, UNEP secretariat will make available the first draft of the report to the PAG on or before 30 August 2013. This will be followed by a 2 week electronic comment period. The secretariat under supervision of the Co-chairs will finalize the report no later than 30 September.

VII. Closure of the Meeting

36. The Co-chairs expressed gratitude to the PAG for leading immediate action and concrete on-the-ground projects on mercury through the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership. Co-chair Fretheim said that he has high regard and great respect for the Partnership and encouraged the PAG to continue its work especially in the light of the Minamata Convention on Mercury. Co-chair Cuna thanked the PAG for the great opportunity as its co-chair and said that the work of Partnership could facilitate ratification of the Minamata Convention.
37. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Co-chairs declared the meeting closed at 6.00 p.m. on Saturday, 27 July 2013.