

UNEP Global Mercury Partnership

Report of the Partnership Advisory Group on the work of its fourth meeting

Rome, Italy 27-28 September 2012

1. The fourth meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Mercury Partnership was held from 27 to 28 September 2012 at the Angelicum congress centre, Rome, Italy.

Background

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. 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 14:30 on Thursday, 27 September 2012 by Mr. David Piper, Deputy Head, Chemicals Branch of the UNEP 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 work of the Global Mercury Partnership has received positive feedback from Governments and has helped inform the ongoing Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee process about issues that need to be addressed. 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. Ms. Abiola Olanipekun of Nigeria presided over the meeting as Chair of the Partnership Advisory Group. Ms. Olanipekun was re-elected as chair at the third meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group in November 2011 to serve for a second term, in line with Annex 1 section 3d of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership Overarching Framework.

B. Adoption of the agenda

5. At its opening session the Group adopted the provisional agenda as set out in document PAG.4/1. 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

6. The meeting was attended by the following members of the Partnership Advisory Group: Ms. Tala Henry (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Mr. Michael Bender (Zero Mercury Working Group), Ms. Susan Keane (Natural Resources Defense Council), Ms. Marianne Bailey (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Ms. Grace Howland (Environment Canada), Ms. Jian Xiaodong (Ministry of Environment of China), Ms. Abiola Olanipekun (Federal Ministry of Environment of Nigeria), Mr. Ram Bharosey Lal (Ministry of Environment and Forests of India), Ms. Lesley Sloss (International Energy Agency Clean Coal Centre), Mr. Oumar Dit Diaouré Cisse (National Department of Sanitation, Mali), Mr. Gernot Schnabl (European Union), Mr. Vladimir Lenev (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Russia), Ms. Ana Garcia-Gonzalez (Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural Marino, Spain), Mr. Manuel Ramos-Pino (Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Medio Rural Marino, Spain), Ms. Jane Dennison (US Department of State), Mr. Juan Fernando Lugin (Uruguay), Mr. Gabriel Esquiera (Uruguay), Ms. Leonie Ruiz (Philippines), Mr. Ludovic Bernaudat (UNIDO), Mr. Philippe Fonta (World Business Council for Sustainable Development), Mr. Nicola Pirrone (Italy), Mr. Alan Kreisberg (Lafarge S. A.), Mr. Noriyuki Suzuki (Japan), Ms. Grace Halla (UNIDO), Mr. Thomas Groeneveld (United States Environmental Protection Agency), Ms. Yuyun Ismawati (International POPs Elimination Network, IPEN), Mr. Vagner Maringolo (The European Cement Association), Mr. Kevin Telmer (Artisanal Gold Council) .
7. The following individuals and organizations attended or were represented at the meeting as observers: Mr. Arseen Seys (World Chlorine Council), Mr. Dolf Van Wijk (World Chlorine Council), Ms. Emilia Vasileva-Veleva (IAEA Environment Laboratories Monaco), Ms. Alessandra Fino (Italy), Ms. Kaoru Oka (Japan), Ms. Vera Barrantes (UNITAR), Mr. Michael Bank (Harvard Center for Comparative Medicine), Mr. Eric Uram (Safe Minds), Mr. Peter Rafaj (International Institute For Applied System Analysis)

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

A. Overall progress and status of partnership areas

Presentations by the partnership area leads

8. Following the secretariat's presentation on the overview of the Partnership, the leads of the eight partnership areas reported on progress in their respective partnership areas, highlighting in particular issues from the business plans in the eight areas and progress made since PAG 3. All of the presentations were followed by a brief question and answer session.

Mercury control from coal combustion partnership area

9. The first 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 July 2012 there were 35 partners involved in the partnership area. The activities for the partnership area have been focused on the development of guidance material, emissions factors, inventories and demonstration projects. The lead noted that it is still not possible to put a numerical value on target reductions for the coal sector.
10. The partnership area has completed the inventory development for China, Russia and South Africa while India and Southeast Asia are under review. Two demonstration projects in Russia (using sorbent injection and oxidation techniques) have been completed while the project on dry process coal washing in South Africa is in pipeline. The partnership area has presented its work at various international meetings strengthening communication and outreach of the partnership.
11. Highlighting some of the challenges faced by the partnership area, the lead noted some delays in small-scale funding agreements that are necessary to initiate a project. Lack of funding was also recognized as a hindrance to move into industrial and domestic sector.
12. In the discussion that followed the presentation, the partnership area lead from the mercury fate and transport partnership asked if they had a list of coal fired power plant in every country, as this will prove helpful for the fate and transport partnership. Ms. Sloss replied that the Clean Coal Centre has a data base which is merged with the data of VGB. Furthermore, these locations are also marked on 'Google Maps'.

Mercury releases from Chlor alkali partnership area

13. The lead for the chlor-alkali partnership area, Ms. Marianne Bailey, noted that there are about 100 mercury cell facilities in about 43 countries. She noted that alternative technologies are now industry standard and old mercury cell plants are being phased out at a steady pace. The lead highlighted some of the key accomplishments of the partnership including production of an inventory of mercury cell facilities, including information on past and planned conversions to non-mercury technology; a paper on the economics of converting mercury cell facilities to membrane cell technology; and the sharing of information and publications on industry best practices (through the UNEP website among others).
14. In the future the partnership plans to update the global inventory, including additional data fields such as mercury use, release and total mercury onsite; continue information sharing activities; produce a video on best practices for managing mercury, including during decommissioning; and continue to build synergy with other partnership areas, especially supply and storage.

Mercury in products partnership area

15. In his presentation, Mr. Thomas Groeneveld, representing the lead of the mercury in products partnership area, gave an overview of the global consumption in products and the availability and efficacy of mercury-free alternatives. He remarked that there was an overall decrease from 2000 to 2005 even though most common product categories showed increase in consumption. Regardless, the feedback received from Partners is positive and encourages the partnership to pursue goals to reduce or eliminate the use of mercury in products. He noted that there was a concern regarding the continued shift of the use of mercury in products from higher-income to lower-income nations and regions. The partnership area is also working on economics of conversion to alternatives and demonstration of efficacy of these alternatives.
16. Mr. Groeneveld highlighted some of the projects by partners, in particular on health care facilities, inventories and risk management, and dental amalgam. For the future the partnership area aims at 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. The partnership area will also work to expand projects to new countries and regions and increase membership among all interested stakeholders.
17. After the presentation, the Zero Mercury Working Group noted that they have a number of ongoing country based projects. They recommended a particular focus on the collection of data to improve inventories related to mercury use in products and processes.

Mercury air transport and fate research partnership area

18. The lead of the mercury air transport and fate research partnership area, Mr. Nicola Pironne, remarked that the partnership is primarily engaged in the development of sound scientific information; enhancing sharing of such information among scientists and policymakers; providing technical assistance and training; enhancing the development of a globally-coordinated mercury observation system to monitor the concentrations of mercury species into the air and water ecosystems. The lead gave updates on the Global Mercury Observation System (GMOS) and other publications related to the partnership.
19. The partnership area has revised its Business Plan by expanding its focus and goals to include mercury transport and fate in biota and with added emphasis on collecting information of contaminated sites. In the future the partnership plans to support the Intergovernmental Negotiations Committee process with technical needs. They also plan to attend meetings like the Joint International Workshops on mercury, International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant 2013 in Edinburgh, 17th ICHMET in Guiyang etc to promote the outreach of the partnership area.
20. It was noted that the partnership area has played an important role in providing relevant data for the INC process. Responding to a question regarding the reliability of the data, the lead replied that the partnership takes measures such as data modelling and development of standard operating procedures to reduce uncertainty.

Mercury use in Artisanal and Small Scale gold mining partnership area

21. The co-lead of the partnership area on ASGM explained that the focus of the partnership area has been on developing strategic planning for reduction of mercury use in ASGM in a number of countries; on-the-ground mercury reduction activities and awareness raising; completion of technical and legal guidance documents; and selected research papers. The Partnership has also supported the improvement of the inventory of mercury use in ASGM through continued collaboration with the database mercurywatch.org.

22. In the future, the partnership is planning to organize a second Global Forum on Mercury use in ASGM. There are projects for Francophone West Africa and Ecuador and Peru already underway, and proposals for projects in the Philippines and Nigeria in preparation for submission to the Global Environment Facility. Also, there are planned capacity building, inventory improvement and training projects in Africa and Latin America.
23. Responding to a question about the possibility of transferring experience and benefits from one country to another, the partnership area lead cited the example of the strategic planning project in Philippines and Cambodia. The project resulted in drafting of a National Strategic plan for both countries and seven different countries were invited to learn from their experience, thus promoting regional capacity building. It was recognized that the issue of supply and trade of mercury for use in gold mining is a major challenge faced by the sector and the partnership should come up with ideas on how to best deal with it. One commenter also remarked on the benefits of developing projects on mercury trade for ASGM, to understand these trade flows more thoroughly.

Mercury waste management partnership area

24. The updates on waste partnership area were given by Leonie Ruiz, from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Philippines on behalf of Mr. Masaru Tanaka, Japan. The objectives of the partnership area are to minimize and, where feasible, eliminate mercury releases to air, water, and land from mercury waste. The partnership area focuses on identifying and disseminating environmentally sound collection, treatment and disposal techniques/practices; assessing environmental impacts of current waste management practices and processes and promoting public awareness.
25. The partnership area efforts have been directed at preparation of resource person list, preparation of Basel convention technical guidelines on environmentally sound management of wastes consisting of elemental mercury and wastes containing and contaminated with mercury and preparation of good practices for management of mercury releases from waste. The presenter pointed out that the major challenges of the partnership area include ensuring environmentally sound management of collected waste products and treated residues, enhancing capacities of managing municipal waste, raising awareness of governments and public.

Mercury supply and storage partnership area

26. The co-lead of the partnership area for mercury supply and storage, Ms. Ana Garcia, said that it aims to minimize and where feasible, eliminate mercury supply by considering a hierarchy of sources; and to ensure that mercury retired from the market can be sent for environmentally sound management and disposal. Key achievements of the partnership area include the ongoing mercury mining phase out project in Kyrgyz Republic; options analysis studies for the environmentally sound management of surplus mercury; and a workshop on mercury management in the Latin America and Caribbean region. Other activities include the development of an awareness raising toolkit for managing mercury waste at household and community level in China; national mercury storage and disposal projects in Uruguay and Argentina; a workshop in Montevideo, Uruguay, on the global, regional and national situation of mercury and development of draft glossary of terms.
27. Highlighting some of the lessons learnt, the lead noted that developing countries have difficulties in identifying and funding the construction of appropriate facilities for the safe and environmentally sound storage of mercury waste. It might be convenient to develop storage protocols regarding different types of mercury wastes. It is important to improve the tools to gather information on trade and supply flows related to mercury waste and products. It is crucial to involve all the relevant stakeholders to come up with realistic solutions.
28. Elaborating on the next steps, the lead noted that partnership area plans to support bilateral projects to transition away from primary mercury mining to industries or activities that are more environmentally sound and economically sustainable; encourage environmentally safe storage/disposal of mercury from major sources; encourage linkages with the chlor-alkali partnership area to gather data on estimated quantities of surplus mercury worldwide; support feasibility studies and follow-up work on mercury sequestration.
29. An update was given on a project in Philippines and Indonesia executed by Ban Toxics! and BaliFokus. The project is on environmentally sound management of mercury. The outcomes of the project are the development of national strategies for Philippines and Indonesia on environmentally sound management of mercury. The project utilized the UNEP's mercury inventory toolkit level-1 and partially level-2 to gather data and involved the participation of stakeholders from different sectors. The project report will be made available soon.

30. It was noted that the results from the workshop on mercury management in the Latin American and Caribbean region, held in Brazil, were particularly useful in the context of storage.

Mercury releases from cement industry partnership area leads

31. The representative from the partnership area on mercury releases from cement industry stated that the objective of the partnership is to minimize mercury releases to the environment from cement industry in ways that ensure reductions are globally significant.
32. The priorities set forth in the business plan include establishment of sectoral mercury inventories, identifying and encouraging techniques to minimize mercury releases to the environment, and increasing the outreach to raise awareness of the issue within the industry. It was noted that the partnership area is still seeking a co-lead, preferably a Government, and other interested partners. The partnership plans to hold a conference call to solicit interest and membership and look for opportunities to set up a meeting for the partnership.
33. The lead was asked if the partnership area is interested in working with the medical community. He replied that this will depend on the future partners and how they set priorities in the business plan. Responding to a question on sources of mercury releases from cement manufacture, the lead noted that generally most mercury comes from raw material so it might be useful to have control measures keeping that in mind. It was noted that overall there are very few mercury abatement technologies installed in the industry and some processes (like dust shuttling) can be applied to the majority of plants to reduce their mercury emissions.

IV. Overarching issues and lessons learned

34. UNEP gave an update on the "**Global Atmospheric Mercury Assessment: Source, Emissions and Transport**". UNEP is currently working to update the 2008 report, in close cooperation with the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP) Secretariat. The work is funded by the governments of Canada, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, the Nordic Council of Ministers, Japan and the EU. Inclusion of information on aquatic environment, new methodology to calculate mercury emissions, a new structured database, greater transparency, and a wider participation of experts from different regions are some of the improvements in the study. Furthermore, some emission sectors were subdivided into additional components providing more details. The presenter noted that estimates produced using the new methodology was close to national estimates usually prepared by other means. He also noted that although uncertainties remain, there has been considerable progress in improving the knowledge base for calculating emissions.
35. It was also noted that we still have significant gaps in knowledge on releases from some sectors such as production of Vinyl Chloride Monomer, emission from oil and gas production and refining, secondary metal production, manganese production and dental uses. Also there is a need by countries to produce reliable national release estimates, and provide transparency in methods used.
36. It was noted by one of the participants that the report might prove useful in effectiveness evaluation of the INC treaty. It was also noted that the emissions from contaminated sites (especially from Artisanal and Small Scale Gold mining) can be significant and should not be ignored. It was recognized that there is a lack of information on consumption of mercury products, especially from dental sector. It was also noted that both supply *and* demand should be managed when looking at the trade aspect of mercury.
37. 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 said that the INC 4 was held from 27 June to 02 July in Punta del Este, Uruguay. During the meeting considerable progress was made and the delegates completed a full review of the revised draft text. Contact groups were established to discuss specific issues of the text regarding artisanal and small-scale gold mining; storage, wastes and contaminated sites; emissions and releases; products and processes; supply and trade; implementation and compliance; financial resources and technical assistance; awareness raising, research, development and monitoring. He noted that new text developed and presented by contact groups on a number of these articles had been referred to the legal group.
38. The Chair of the INC has also been entrusted to prepare a "Chair's text", for consideration at INC5 as the basis for the negotiations. The secretariat has been mandated to prepare intersessional work on emissions and releases as well as on health aspects. In addition, the secretariat will also prepare final act resolutions. Regional consultations, subject to the availability of funding, will be held in: Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Central and Eastern

Europe. He informed the PAG that INC5 will be held in Geneva, Switzerland from 13 to 18 January 2013.

39. The chair of the INC was asked if there are any attempts to reach out to ministries other than the Environment ministry. The chair replied that the governments have started communicating internally with other ministries like health, mining, industry etc. The chair suggested that regional meetings should be utilized to communicate the results of partnership activities so that the delegations can arrive for the final session better informed.
40. There was a discussion on the future of the Partnership after the INC process has ended. It was acknowledged that the Partnership has helped the negotiation process by providing technical input required by the Governments. The partnership was recognized to bring together a group of experts which will prove to be valuable for the future as Parties to the treaty take action to implement its measures.

Independent evaluation of ASGM sector

41. The secretariat gave a presentation on the evaluation and progress of the artisanal and small scale gold mining partnership area. The purpose of the evaluation was the identification of the partnership area's main achievements, challenges and lessons learned to date. For this study, stakeholders including academics, civil society, governments, NGOs and IGOs etc. were consulted via email and face-to-face interviews. Relevant documentation and websites had been reviewed and an online survey was undertaken.
42. The study highlighted some of the successful outcomes of the partnership area including the raising awareness about the socio-economic development history and potential of sector; the emerging global database on activities and products; organizing a Global Forum on reducing mercury use in ASGM; positive communication with miners and communities; encouraging the development of National strategic plans and mercury inventories; broadened focus especially related to mining and processing dimensions and fair-mined gold label; enhanced northern government engagement and resource mobilization for Francophone Africa.
43. Some of the effective partnership processes recognized in the study include the development of an e-mail list serve for information sharing; mobilization of influential ASGM experts with field experience; action-oriented regional workshops useful for cross-ministry government participation and engagement of other appropriate stakeholders (e.g. miner associations); executing projects which provide focus at country level and mobilize key actors (particularly national governments).
44. The study noted that the governance and management structure of the partnership area was in place and a business plan had been developed and regularly updated. The study suggested that strong leadership can be maintained in the long term by exploring potential to have a full-time co-ordinator. There should be an emphasis on the need to leverage success and sell project proposals to prospective donors and identify solutions that focus more on the challenges in achieving partnership outcomes.

Communication strategy

45. The secretariat presented a communication plan which was developed in response to the dialogue that took place at the third meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group. This Plan was developed by UNEP in consultation with the partnership area leads. The purpose of this plan was to provide a general framework to help structure communications of the Partnership in 2012-2013 and to emphasize the current communication needs and gaps.
46. It was recognized that the partnership area communication needs might broadly be focused on i) General awareness raising partnership communication (to support scaling up of successful partnership actions, advocate for new partners to join the Partnership, in particular Governments, raise awareness about mercury issues); ii) Technical communication consisting of training documents, guidance, etc. to practitioners and governments and iii) Internal communication amongst partners and partner leads. It was noted that language may be considered a barrier for many audiences and communication should be in simple language and solution oriented. Also the partnership should aim to develop multi-language materials to these audiences when deemed strategic and relevant. The outreach tools used by the partnership may include using UNEP's website; conferences, workshops, webinars, and specialized briefings; press briefings and short documentaries on television channels and magazines, brochures, newsletters, radios, websites, social media, videos, and educational outreach programs.
47. It was noted that UNEP should support the continuing development and maintenance of the Partnership website, which is emerging as a platform for effective information sharing amongst partners. UNEP is working with GRID-Arendal to develop a publication on mercury which aims to provide brief and latest background information on mercury (use, release, management and

control). UNEP has initiated a Partnership ‘Story of the Month’, since January 2012. The Story is published on the UNEP website and is distributed to partners via an e-mail distribution list. The Story’s objective can be either to raise awareness generally of a topic/an issue or present a particular activity that can be considered a partnership success that is worth replicating.

48. After the presentation, the participants divided into two break out groups to discuss further improvements to Partnership communication.
49. The partnership areas highlighted some of their key publications which can be used to communicate their messages to the relevant stakeholders. A need was recognized to increase outreach and capacity building on practical solutions. Defining the target audience and identifying the key messages and dissemination of these key messages through proper means was considered pivotal for success.
50. The email group (with a single email address) used by ASGM partnership has proved successful and members are posting information and exchanging different ideas, although the lack of internet access in some developing countries can prove be a barrier.
51. A proposal was made to use avenues such as regional meetings of the Intergovernmental Negotiating committee (INC), International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) and others to share regional experience on common issues. A suggestion was made to update the UNEP’s ‘What’s new’ page more frequently. UNEP’s initiative of ‘Story of the month’ was appreciated and it was suggested to compile a list of environmental journals and include them on the distribution list for the ‘Story of the Month’. It was also suggested to revise the business plans and other outreach materials to attract new partners, highlighting the co-benefits of joining the partnership.

Funding

52. UNEP secretariat presented a summary of financing support for the Partnership provided through UNEP since late 2009. He noted that this support is made available from
 - (i) The Environment Fund;
 - (ii) Unearmarked contributions to UNEP for its Programme of Work and subprogrammes;
 - (iii) Extra budgetary contributions provided to UNEP for particular activities within the Programme of Work and subprogrammes;
 - (iv) Funding mechanisms such as the SAICM QSP and the GEF.
53. The secretariat reported that total financial support for the Partnership since late 2009 had amounted to about \$ 10.5 million of which about \$ 1.5 million was provided by the Environment Fund. Almost \$ 1 million had been allocated to the Partnership from unearmarked contributions and a further amount of almost \$ 6 million had been received as extra budgetary contributions from a number of donors. About \$2 million had been received from the GEF.
54. The secretariat noted that the UNEP costs of the Partnership amount to about \$ 1 million per year, principally for staffing. Two professional staff members are supported by the Environment Fund. Thus, over the 3 years 2010-2012 with income at about \$ 10.5 million and costs of about \$ 3 million, a balance of about \$ 7.5 million had been made available for a variety of Partnership activities.
55. In analyzing how funding had been spent between the partnership areas, the secretariat reminded participants that the analysis reflected neither the total resources mobilized for the Partnership nor the breadth and balance of activities supported because only funding made available through UNEP was considered. The secretariat noted that considerable funding continued to be available directly from other partners and donors but could not be included as there was no mechanism to gather and report on these sums.
56. The secretariat reported that UNEP had provided about 38% of its total project expenditure to work of the supply and storage partnership area – in particular for continuing work to assist Kyrgyzstan to move away from primary mercury mining, and to enhance capacity for mercury storage and disposal. A further 21% of funding had been for work on mercury emissions from coal – particularly through the EU-funded USEPA-supported work with the International Energy Agency in China, Russia, South Africa and India. UNEP had provided about 10% of its total project expenditure to support the artisanal and small-scale gold mining partnership area – in particular building national strategic planning capacity, holding the Global Forum, and developing guidance and communications materials. In addition, smaller amounts had been provided to support work on products – in particular examining the economics of conversion and demonstration projects related to the phase down of dental amalgam; and to support work to reduce mercury use in vinyl chloride monomer production in China. These actions are described

in more detail elsewhere in this report. The secretariat noted the strategy that UNEP had developed with the GEF for a series of projects. Two projects had been delivered and been approved by the GEF and a number were in development for submission late in 2012 and during 2013.

57. About a quarter of total project expenditure had been used more generally to support assessments – in particular the so-called ‘Paragraph 29 study’ and the updating of the Global Mercury Assessment both requested by UNEP Governing Council in its decision 25/5; and to support the preparation of national inventories, including through the continued development of the UNEP mercury inventory toolkit. In closing, the secretariat thanked all those donors that have contributed to the work of the Partnership and encouraged all partners to continue their efforts to mobilize resources.
58. The representative from UNIDO gave a presentation on the updates of projects supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). A regional project approved by GEF is being executed in Mali, Senegal and Burkina Faso and is carried out by Artisanal Gold Council, Alliance for Responsible Mining and UNIDO. The project will help the Governments set goals for mercury reduction, eliminate worst practices and explore innovative market-based approaches. The second approved GEF project is in Peru and Ecuador and it builds upon the US Department of State project with University of British Columbia. The project focuses on reducing mercury emissions from ASGM by mercury releases minimization, gold recovery and income enhancement strategies. The project will also focus on preventing transboundary pollution of ASGM activities in Ecuador which have an impact in Peru, promoting Fairtrade and Fairmined standards for gold and implement Communication, Dissemination and Replication (CDR) strategies at the national and regional levels.
59. Two other projects are in the pipeline. One is in Nigeria focusing on lead and mercury contamination (GEF funds are around a million US dollars combined with co-financing of \$3,050,000 from Medecins San Frontier , the National Government and UNIDO), while the other one is in Philippines which will build upon work by UNEP and Ban Toxics. The GEF funding is US \$500,000 with co-financing of \$1,081,070 from Dialogos, US DoS, National Government, UNIDO and Ban Toxics.
60. The third meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group had discussed the need for each partnership area to develop a matrix or ‘wish list’ of specific projects to attract more funding and a wider funding base. 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.
61. As a follow up to this activity each partnership area was asked to provide a funding wish list. The participants were then divided into two break-out groups for further discussion. A summary of each partnership area wish-list can be found attached as an annex A to this report.
62. A question was asked about how the project ideas and priorities are identified by the partnership area. One of the leads answered that the process is partner driven and the members of the partnership identify projects, priorities etc. It was also noted that these ideas are the partnership area needs as identified by the partners and should be continuously updated with increased interaction between the partners. All groups expressed the view that good ideas for projects existed and some were more developed than others but they needed funding.

V. Other Matters

63. It was recommended to hold the next meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group after the International Conference on Mercury as a Global Pollutant which will take place in Edinburgh, Scotland.

VI. Adoption of the report

64. 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 November.

VII. Closure of the meeting

65. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 6.00 p.m. on Friday, 28 September 2012.

Annex A

Wish list of the partnership area

Waste partnership area (potential projects)

- Collection, Treatment and Disposal plan development for mercury-containing items in Argentina
- Improvement of mercury waste inventories and its handling in the Philippines
- Compact Fluorescent Light (CFL) toxicity analysis, recovery system development, elimination program promotion in Panama
- Education on mercury waste and study of mercury in the environment in Tunisia

ASGM partnership area

- Training and building inventories to help countries in developing National Action Plan
- Support for organizing Global Forum every two years; complemented by more regular regional meetings

- Improve baseline information – improve inventory of use and emissions
- Introduce mercury reduction and non-mercury techniques: Nigeria, Philippines; Indonesia, Nicaragua,/Honduras
- CETEM (Centro de Tecnologia Mineral) - transfer technologies to miners and gold shops (\$250,000)
- Innovative market based approaches – fair trade aspects; formalization to meet due diligence requirements
- More data on occupation and public health for ASGM
- Waste management and remediation aspects
- Basic environmental science
- Look at trade issues

Coal combustion partnership area

- iPOG in practice – using national data and the iPOG to predict the most cost-effective mercury reduction approaches in target countries and to provide guidance on the estimated cost of “significant” reduction
- Support capacity building workshops in countries promoting BAT/BEP for relevant coal types
- US EPA monitoring toolkit workshops in target countries. Estimated cost \$10-20K
- Better reference and measurement standards.
- Reduction of Mercury from the residential use of coal
- Reduction of Mercury in other uses of coal (kilns, industrial boilers etc)
- Mercury reduction project in South America - Brazil and Columbia
- Emission inventories - assistance to develop up to date estimates of emissions from large coal-fired facilities in countries with no national inventory
- Inventories and measurements for industrial and domestic use of coal
- North of South Africa - Botswana and Zambia new build watching brief - inventories updated and potential for information/tech transfer at onset of project

Products partnership area

- Comparing mercury-free to mercury-containing products, funding required approximately \$50K
- Lighting Assessment, funding required approximately \$1.8M estimate for plan development
- Promoting hospital products shift, funding required approximately \$4M estimate for outreach and education
- Risk associated with using Mercury-containing products, funding required approximately \$100K
- Ending black market sales of cosmetic products, funding required approximately \$10K estimate to create materials library
- Assisting developed countries in vaccine procurement, funding required approximately \$50K estimate to gauge demand among developing countries

Chloralkali partnership area

- Produce a useful video as part of partnership using Eurochlor video; help people get better access to the products of the partnership
- Russchlor – further study and create best practices documents that would facilitate proper closure; share experience with others, especially with Eurochlor
- Tunisia have former mercury cell plant that is now membrane, and want to know how to deal with the mercury waste.. Govt has \$900,000 to cofinance

Supply and Storage partnership area

- Create better, more accessible information
- Pilot project to stabilize metallic mercury
- Pilot projects per region on storage
- Need more information about amount of mercury that needs storage

Fate and transport partnership area

- GMOS – mercury inventories of anthropogenic with natural sources – contained within a GEF proposal
- Global distribution of biotic mercury concentration and ecological health

Cement partnership area

- Currently without any concrete proposals but seeking to develop these as quickly as possible