

Distr: General
FINAL - 16 December 2010

English only



UNITED
NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT

**Global Mercury Partnership
Partnership Advisory Group
Second Meeting**
Geneva, 21-22 September 2010

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

1. The second meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Mercury Partnership was held at International Environment House II (IEH II) in Geneva, Switzerland, from 21st September to 22nd September 2010. The first meeting took place from the 31st of March to the 2nd of April 2009.

Background

2. In its decision 23/9 the Governing Council of UNEP called for the establishment of partnerships between Governments and other stakeholders as one means of reducing the risk to human health and the environment posed by the release of mercury into the environment. Subsequently, in its decision 24/3 IV, the council, while acknowledging the progress made since 2005, recognized that efforts thus far to reduce those risks had not been sufficient. It accordingly, among other things, requested the Executive Director to strengthen partnerships under the UNEP mercury programme through a number of measures including the development, in consultation with other stakeholders, of an overarching framework for the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership. The decision called for the Executive Director to consult with partners and other stakeholders and for the framework to provide for the development of partnership business plans, goals and operational guidelines.

3. Pursuant to decision 24/3 IV the Executive Director of UNEP developed a draft overarching framework and presented it to partners and other stakeholders at a meeting that took place from 1 to 3 April 2008 in Geneva. Following that meeting the Executive Director of UNEP developed a draft overarching framework and presented it to UNEP Governing Council at its twenty fifth sessions (16-20 February

2009). The Governing Council, in its decision 25/5, commended the Global Mercury Partnership Advisory Group. Consisting of up to 25 members representing governments, regional economic integration organizations and major groups and sectors, the Group is to meet at least annually. Its function and responsibilities, specified in paragraph (f) of section 3, are:

- (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 plan in order to advise the partnership areas on the consistency of their business plan with the overall goal and the operational guidelines of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnerships.
- (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 UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.

1. Opening of the meeting

4. The meeting was opened at 10:00 am by Mr. David Piper, Deputy , Chemicals Branch of the United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Technology, Industry and Economics. He welcomed and expressed his gratitude to the participants for taking the time to participate in the meeting. He noted the positive outcomes of the twenty fifth session of the UNEP Governing Council in January 2009 and the first session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee to prepare a global legally binding instrument on mercury in June 2010 and emphasized that each of these sessions bring out an obvious need and continued call for actions on mercury. He remarked that the first meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group resulted in a number of recommendations for the partnership areas to consider and the partnership areas have responded effectively to these requests. Another encouraging sign was that the partner membership had almost tripled during the last reporting period, with steady and increased involvement of developing countries. He remarked that the second meeting will be a good opportunity for reflections on the progress made to date (under the Partnership), reviewing the partnership area priorities and indicators, and reviewing what relevant partnership activities could be appropriate and valued contributions to the intergovernmental negotiating process for the future mercury treaty.

2. Organization of work

A. Election of a chair

5. Ms. Abiola Olanipekun of Nigeria was appointed as chair. Ms. Olanipekun was selected chair at the first meeting of the Partnership Advisory Group in March 2009, in line with Annex 1 section 3.d of the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership Overarching Framework which states that the Partnership Advisory Group will select a chair who will serve for a two year term.

B. Adoption of the agenda.

6. As its opening session the Group adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda set out in document UNEP (DTIE)/ Hg/ PAG.2/1

1. Opening of the meeting
2. Organization of work
 - a. Adoption of the agenda
 - b. Organization of work.
3. Review overall progress, including status of partnership areas.
4. Consider overarching issues, lessons learned and future activities.
5. Other matters
6. Adoption of the report
7. Closure of the meeting

C. Organization of work.

7. The Group agreed to conduct its work in plenary sessions and in small breakout groups. The Group agreed to work from 10:00 to 13:00 and 15:00 to 18:00 on Tuesday (21st September) and from 9:00 to 13:00 and 15:00 to 18:00 on Wednesday (22nd September), subject to adjustments as needed.

D. Attendance:

8. The meeting was attended by the following members of the Partnership Advisory Group:

Ms Sergia de Souza Oliveira (Ministry of the Environment, Brazil), Mr. Rithirak Long (Cambodia), Ms. Grace Howland (Environment Canada), Mr. Nicola Pirrone (Institute of Atmospheric Pollution Research, Italy), Mr. Manoranjan Hota (Ministry of Environment and Forests, India), Mr. Sun Yangzhao (Foreign Economic Cooperation Office of Ministry of Environment Protection of China), Mr. Masaru Tanaka (Tottori University of Environmental Studies, Japan), Mr. Juan Miguel T. Cuna (DENR, Philippines), Mr. Gustavo Solorzano Ochoa (Center for Environmental Training and Research, Mexico), Mr. Vladimir Lenev (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation), Ms. Abiola OLANIPEKUN (Federal Ministry of Environment, Nigeria), Mrs Milena Horvat (Department of Environmental Sciences, Slovenia), Mrs. Elisabeth Fadum (Climate and Pollution Agency, Norway), Mr. Greg Scott (Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa), Mr. Zaigham Abbas (Ministry of Environment, Pakistan), Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (Federal Office for the Environment, Switzerland), Ms. Susan Egan Keane (Natural Resources Defense Council, USA), Mr. Gerald Sawula (Uganda), Mr. Ken Davis (US Environmental Protection Agency), Mr. Thomas M. Groeneveld (US Environmental Protection Agency), Ms. Jane Dennison (US State Department), Mr. Ludovic Bernaudat (United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)), Mr. Gernot Schnabl (European Commission), Mr. Michael Bender (Zero Mercury Working Group), Mr. Kevin Telmer (Artisanal Gold Council).

9. The following states were represented at the meeting as observers: Czech Republic, Jordan, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Peru, Philippines, United States of America, and Uruguay.

10. The following individuals and organizations attended or were represented at the meeting as observers:

Mr. Wojciech Jozewicz (Arcadis), Mr. Joshua Karliner (Health Care Without Harm), Mr. Elmar Jung (IAOMT Europe), Ms Mariann Lloyd-Smith (IPEN), Mr. Matthias Kern (UNEP Basel Convention), Mrs Francesca CENNI (UNEP Basel Convention), Mr. Hamoudi SHUBBER (UNITAR), Ms. Vera Barrantes (UNITAR), Mr. Arseen Seys (World Chlorine Council), Mr. Julian Fisher (World Dental Federation), Mrs Elena Lymberidi-Settimo (Zero Mercury Working Group), Mijke Hertoghs (UNEP ROE)

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

11. As a prelude to the Group's consideration of agenda items 3 and 4 a representative of the secretariat, at the request of the chair, described briefly the progress of work within the Global Mercury Partnership Programme and how the partnership has seen steady growth, latest report being 70 official partners. The Global Mercury Partnership currently operates through 7 partnership areas, these being: emission from coal, artisanal and small scale gold mining, products, waste management, mercury cell chlor alkali production, air transport and fate of mercury releases as well as mercury supply and storage. The partnership areas are led by different organizations, with UNEP as the Secretariat. She commented that each partnership area has drafted a business plan and these business plans are outlined in PAG document 2/3.

Presentations by the partnership area leads

12. The leads of the seven partnership areas reported on progress in their respective partnership areas, pointing out some of the important issues and challenges faced by them.

13. The lead for the Chlor-alkali partnership area, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, presented a response to the recommendations made at the 2009 PAG meeting. The presenter brought to the attention of the Advisory Group that the partnership area has assembled a comprehensive inventory of mercury-cell facilities throughout the world and made materials on best practices for operating chlor-alkali mercury cell facilities and storing excess mercury publically available through the UNEP web-site. The partnership area will aim to increase linkages with the areas of supply, storage, trade and waste in the future, particularly as more mercury-cell plants go off-line. Gathering more information on regulatory policies for mercury cell facilities and providing more technical information on conversions to non-mercury cell technology are also in the plans for future. Lastly the partnership is trying to provide assistance to countries and facilities who wish to convert to non-mercury technology by helping to identify possible and appropriate funding support to undertake conversion and sequester excess mercury.

14. The co-leads of the Artisanal and small scale gold mining ASGM partnership area, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization and the Natural Resources Defense Council, shed light on some of the major activities. The presenters briefly described the ASGM National Strategic Plan formulation process that some government partners have been undertaking. They briefed the Group on the outcomes of a series of strategic planning workshops in Francophone Africa, Asia and South America. An outcome of these meetings is the acknowledgement of the advantage of using regional approaches to complement national strategies; it is also evident that different situations and contexts will require different approaches. Overall these workshops are enhancing regional cooperation and promoting the successful

start for national strategic planning exercises. A similar project in Anglophone West Africa is still in its early planning stages. Other recent activities of the partnership include input on Standard Zero, the development of technical guidance and legalization/ formalization guidance documents and the upcoming development workshop with the World Bank in Tanzania on mercury and ASGM. In reference to the INC 2, two documents are being prepared by the partnership area, namely a global ASGM inventory of projects and a document outlining methods for determining exposure in people involved in ASGM.

15. The partnership area on Mercury-Containing Products, led by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, presented ways the partnership area is addressing emerging product areas (e.g., batteries, dental amalgam, non-medical measuring devices, lighting, pharmaceuticals, and cosmetics). They have started expanding projects to new countries and regions, and the presenter discussed the future plans to develop projects and relationships in nations and regions that have been underrepresented to date within the partnership area. The same emphasis will be placed on expanding projects to new products sectors, such as lighting, batteries, cosmetics, and dental amalgam. Future focus will also be on improving baseline data, as well as monitoring and measurement tools. It will be a priority to increase the number of partnership members among all interested parties, including manufacturers and governments of countries where manufacturers are located.

16. The representative of Coal Combustion Partnership Area lead, Environment Canada, highlighted the progress on the Mercury Emissions from Coal Progress Optimization Guide (POG). She explained some of the recent developments in preparing the document, for example, the strong input from partner countries is building a useful tool and bringing the common issues forward while strengthening the communication network. Currently the partnership is working to improve the inventories of emissions and plants, this work is going on in China, Russia and South Africa. The partnership will continue to assist with the inventory work at the national level and plans to do another round of target country seminars once the POG is finished. The partnership has initiated two demonstration projects in Russia (one of sorbent injection and the other on wet scrubber technology), it has also proposed a dry process coal washing demo in South Africa and concepts have been developed for a demo in India. If funds permit, the partnership will try to develop the POG into an online interactive web-tool. Finally, the partnership area will continue its activity of communications through conference presentations on partnership activities and journal papers, as well as through partnership teleconferences and meetings.

17. The lead of the Mercury Air Transport and Fate Research partnership area, CNR Italy, informed about the Global Mercury Observation System (GMOS). This project was recently approved for funding by the European Commission over 5 years and will be a major contribution to the partnership area for the next years. The main objective is to establish a Global Observation System capable of providing ambient concentrations and deposition fluxes of mercury, by combining observations from ground-based stations and from oceanographic and tropospheric measurement campaigns. The data will be used to validate regional and global scale atmospheric mercury modelling systems able to predict the temporal variations and spatial distributions of atmospheric mercury, and mercury fluxes to and from terrestrial and aquatic receptors. The data will further be used to evaluate and identify source-receptor relationships at country scale and their temporal trends. The presenter indicated that more effort should be dedicated to deposition networks with large spatial coverage and also emphasized a need to better understand the atmospheric chemistry and source receptor relationship of mercury. For the future, the partnership aims to work in close cooperation with GMOS, and the UNECE Hemispheric Task Force to ensure effective and efficient

information sharing, capacity building and advancement of science. Expanding the focus of the Mercury Air Transport and Fate Research partnership area to include aquatic transport and fate as well as exposure is also in the future agenda of the partnership.

18. The partnership lead on waste management, Environment Ministry of Japan, highlighted the importance of the mercury life-cycle management approach and emphasized the importance of collaboration with the Mercury containing products partnership area. The presenter also brought to attention of the group some of the recent activities done by the partnership area including the development of Best Available Technology and Best Environmental Practices (BAT/BEP) Guidance and organizing of a second waste management partnership area meeting in March 2010 in which participants from 41 countries participated. The future plans for the partnership area include the finalization of BAT/BEP Guidance, the formulation and implementation of projects that utilize the BAT/BEP guidance and further coordination with Basel Convention in preparing BAT/BEP guidance.

19. The Mercury Supply and Storage Partnership area interim lead, the Zero Mercury Working Group, noted that as the anticipated life of the partnership is short (until 2013), the focus is on near term priority activities. The partnership activities focus on the Kyrgyz Republic Primary Mercury Mining Project, regional projects aimed at providing storage options of excess metallic mercury and technical support to INC process (development of a glossary of terms and framework document assisting decisions on sequestration needs). Identifying a government co-lead, the current activities, collaboration on funding opportunities (as they arise) and finalizing framework document and glossary of terms prior to INC 2 are the top priorities for the future. In conclusion the presenter remarked that there are limited sources which produce large quantities of mercury, allowing targeted actions and that in order to limit the global supply of mercury, transparency of trade remains of pivotal importance in the near term.

Discussion

20. After the presentations, the group agreed that it would discuss progress of the partnership areas in four breakout groups: mercury containing products with waste management, supply and storage with chlor-alkali, mercury fate and transport with coal, and finally artisanal and small scale gold mining.

21. In reporting back from the breakout groups, the Advisory Group noted that the partnership areas had generally responded effectively to the requests made at the first Partnership Advisory Group meeting in April 2009 and that the business plans had been updated.

22. Further to this, some of the break out groups suggested that the partnership areas consider updating their business plans in follow-up to the PAG meeting and in light of other recent developments, such as information needs of the intergovernmental negotiating committee.

23. For the most part, partnership areas noted that they were 'on course' to meet objectives, targets and timelines identified in the business plans. The majority of the partnership areas agreed that the identified objectives were ambitious and realistic and aligned with the overall goal of the Global Mercury Partnership.

24. In general, partnership areas noted that the objectives and targets were measurable, although additional measurable metrics could usefully be added to some partnerships' business plans. Limited changes were proposed to the Draft Report on Activities - Document UNEP (DTIE)/Hg/PAG.2/2.A final version of this report will be released as an output of the Advisory Group Meeting.

25. The Advisory Group recommended that additional indicators for all partnership areas might be developed to reflect better the successes of the partners. For example, targets for awareness raising could be accounted for in some areas. Also, the current indicators are not always providing information on the global results; instead, they focus on specific project information.

26. Partnership areas noted that the impacts of the partnership areas are already measurable also bringing to attention that partners can play a more active role in measuring progress. For mercury storage, participants noted that it will be difficult to measure progress until resources become available for countries to construct new storage facilities. Participants however recognize that the awareness raised on the need for the storing excess mercury supply is one area of progress made by the partnership area.

27. Generally, the partnership areas noted that they are working on attracting the participation and support they need to advance their work.

28. During the discussion that followed, concern was expressed for the capacity of developing countries and NGOs to engage in partnership area activities. Limited funding was noted as a concern to attend and participate in meetings. It was requested that partnership areas and UNEP find strategies to help support participation of such partners in their work.

29. It was observed that the Global Mercury Partnership should utilize the INC process to circulate and request information from partners and stakeholders.

30. One observer identified a gap in the current partnership approach to be that certain source categories are not currently covered by the Global Mercury Partnership. In response to this point, the secretariat noted that work proceeds in China related to Vinyl Chloride Monomer production and that the Secretariat would work with China to make results of the project publically available. The delegate from China noted the recent proposal developed by China on activities related to Research and Development of alternatives to the mercury catalyst. With regard to cement, the coal partnership area's business plan mentions activities related to mercury emissions from cement manufacturing. Some related work is underway in South Africa.

31. For artisanal and small scale gold mining, the partnership area noted that it has worked on the formulation of strategic action plans in 4 regions. This was recognized by the partnership area as being a good initial step, but the need to concentrate on the practical implementation and replication of projects was also noted.

32. The products partnership area has sought opportunities to include more products in the scope of the partnership, such as batteries, dental amalgam, lamps and cosmetics. It was also suggested that the partnership engage the private sector, especially where the concept of extended producer responsibility was concerned, it was recommended that they take into consideration the suggestion of how they can make the partnership more attractive to potential partners who may not fall into traditional product sectors or pilot projects to further promote extended producer responsibility.

33. The fate and transport group responded by noting the improvements made in emissions estimates, maps and source-receptor relationships. The partnership noted that monitoring in different regions can be improved.

34. For the coal partnership area, numeric mercury emission targets have not been developed. Participants noted that it may be appropriate to maintain targets that are based on deliverables for this partnership area, such as demonstration projects / technologies as well as developing and sharing information and guidance such as the Process Optimization Guidance.

35. For the Chlor-alkali partnership area, the World Chlorine Council has helped to collect data which will be useful for the partnership area. The difficulty of obtaining information and data from non world chlorine council member countries was noted as a challenge. World Chlorine Council is also working on a paper containing information on conversions of mercury-cell facilities to non-mercury technology. The paper will address the cost, energy efficiency, and technical considerations for conversions, and will be helpful resources for countries and facilities that are considering conversions.

36. It was noted by an observer that the chlor alkali inventory should further be elaborated to include more information, refer separately to individual plants by country, indicate mercury consumption etc. and other details to make it more complete.

37. For supply/storage partnership, concern was noted that they have not been able to attract a country lead or co-lead, as this was thought to be needed to attract other country participants and support needed in order to advance more effectively.

38. The partnership area on waste noted that in the light of the first PAG meeting the business plan and draft of BAP/BEP was revised. Concerns were raised by several NGO observers about promoting waste incineration as a BAT/BEP approach to mercury waste, especially if this BAT/BEP document is published as a partnership product.

4. Overarching issues, lessons learned and future activities

39. Introducing agenda item 4, the chair reminded the participants that one of the responsibilities assigned to the PAG was to communicate overarching issues and lessons learned while promoting synergy and collaboration across partnership areas. In that connection, she drew attention to the proposed draft report to the executive director of UNEP on overall progress that had been prepared by UNEP for consideration by the group (UNEP (DTIE) /Hg/ PAG/.2/4, annex1), saying that the group's main task at the current meeting would be to provide input to that report.

40. The group agreed that it would undertake its work on the draft report in three breakout groups. The breakout groups reviewed the different partnership areas together, as follows:

- A. Storage-supply and waste management
- B. Fate and Transport, coal and ASGM
- C. Products and processes.

The break out groups reported back to the Advisory Group in plenary on the results of their work, first taking up the issues set out in paragraph 68 of Document PAG .2/4.

41. In opening, an overall general comment was made that the Partnership should continue to play a complementary role in the INC process, as requested by the negotiating parties. In addition, it was noted that there are clear timing and resource implications for the partnership areas when requests are made from the INC. This was identified as a challenge for the partnership areas to respond to, but also an

opportunity, citing the inventories being prepared by the ASGM and chlor alkali partnership areas as examples where the partnership areas are contributing to the INC process.

42. Mostly, the business plans were described as on track. There was a suggestion to revisit some language in the business plans to make minor modifications, for example some of the priority actions may have shifted now that the treaty negotiations have commenced.

43. A number of issues were highlighted related to communication and the Global Mercury Partnership which highlighted that communications and relationships with stakeholders might need to be considered in an overarching way across the partnership areas in the future.

44. Some of the participants indicated that there have been some difficulties with telecommunications platform serving the partnership areas. They indicated that this problem needs to be resolved to better support the engagement of developing countries in the Partnership. It was also mentioned that when new partners join, UNEP should provide them with more information on how the partnership operates.

45. In addition, a need to communicate better progress of the Partnership was noted. In this regard, it was suggested that all partnership areas could consider issuing accomplishment factsheets along the way or press releases and that individual countries could undertake targeted outreach. Individual partners could also share information about their partnership activities with target audiences; and UNEP Chemicals should distribute progress more frequently and to all interested parties (e.g., SAICM focal points). An additional comment was made that others may also have the capability to support the Partnership in outreach efforts by putting together information for general audiences, such as the University of United Nations (and others).

46. It was agreed that the partnership areas should use the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership Web site more effectively as a clearinghouse for documents. UNEP updated its web-site in May 2010 as part of the response to the recommendation made at the first Advisory Group meeting. To improve outreach the partnership areas need to actively provide and prioritize information for UNEP to post the information. In this regard, it was suggested that a notification system could be developed to alert interested parties when new developments are released.

47. In terms of publishing partnership guidance documents, it was clear that one process or approach may not fit in every situation, and individual consideration of the situation and factors could be appropriate in the publishing process. Some suggestions were made to establish protocol on guidance documents and who should publish them.

48. Recruiting key stakeholders was discussed, including expanding the sphere of influence of the partnership areas to identify stakeholders and elicit a response. A structured process for reaching out (actively identifying) and recruiting key stakeholders was suggested. Some observed that providing better outreach will help recruit stakeholders. It was recommended that the Partnerships continue to diversify membership, including private sector entities and evaluate existing elements of the Business Plans (e.g., goals, objectives) to make participation attractive to interested parties.

49. Some of the members discussed the requests for additional activities/projects from partners. It will be necessary for increased contributions from member Partners, donor countries and stakeholders, including in-kind and funding resources.

50. Some discussion around leadership was brought forward. Partnership leads bring particular areas of interest of their own organization to the partnership. This can lead to difficulty in the partnership area with respect to considering and accepting tasks of priority of others. Hence, the partnership areas could consider co-leads in order to provide more balance to their overall leadership capacity in the future. The ASGM partnership area was noted as a model for expanded capacity with a co-leadership model.

51. The waste partnership area indicated they would continue the BAT/BEP guidance as currently planned and would update its business plan in response to INC developments. In addition, the waste partnership area plans to present case studies in the BAT/BEP guidance

52. A comment was made that the Storage Partnership also consider activities beyond the export ban and could consider voluntary initiatives that can occur prior to the INC implement, such as chlor-alkali plants that could be encouraged to agree not to put their mercury on the open market place. There is a need to look at balancing both the supply and demand sides to most effectively manage the issue more holistically (consider traders and users of Hg). Domestic and international examples of illegal trade and lack of trade transparency were cited and are also important issues to consider. It was also mentioned that the Supply/Storage Partnership area may not need to exist beyond the INC, assuming the INC addresses these issues.

53. It was noted that there is a need to clearly define and build common understanding of definitions pertaining to waste, disposal, and storage concepts. A glossary of terms is under development by the storage partnership to clarify definitions that will be provided to the INC.

54. There was an additional discussion about how to properly incorporate the issue of By-Product mercury within the existing context of the Global Mercury Partnership. In this area particularly, it seems clear that certain activities go beyond voluntary efforts and some actions, for example export restrictions, need political will and resources to accomplish and this may be addressed by the INC process.

55. It was suggested that the coal partnership needs to look at lifecycle analysis and consider it as an assessment rather than just on atmospheric emissions. It was discussed that the issues of small boilers and residential burning on coal should be considered.

56. For the fate and transport partnership area, it was suggested that the partnership area can promote partners to publish information in peer reviewed literature in order to encourage scientists to engage in the partnership process. The partnership also proposed to revise the business plan to include ocean and contaminated sites. It was noted that the partnership faces problems with global coverage because of lack of communication with key stakeholders.

57. For the ASGM partnership it was discussed that as there is a need for long term investment in the sector and also the partnership needs to identify resources to conduct short term pilot projects to demonstrate results that can be replicated elsewhere.

58. For the products partnership it was recommended that the partnership consider revisiting its business plan in light of new interest in emerging product sectors and potential cross-cutting issues. The partnership should consider shaping new projects and objectives to be responsive to information needs for the INC.

59. The chlor-alkali partnership area requested for information document of occupational health effects of exposure to elemental mercury in chlor-alkali plants (and ASGM practitioners) but noted that this will not go into the business plan of the partnership, as it applies to all sectors. It was suggested that this process could be an overall partnership information gathering activity.

D. Thought starter on possible options for the future partnership approach.

60. The Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) requested UNEP to develop and provide to the second meeting of INC an analysis of possible options for using partnerships to help achieve the goals of the future instrument on mercury, including the option of integrating partnerships into the instruments. In this regard the secretariat introduced document UNEP (DTIE)/Hg/ PAG.2/5 which included in its annex a thought starter on possible options for the future partnership approach.

61. In the discussion, participants generally noted that the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership is viewed as a vehicle for immediate actions on mercury while the negotiations are underway and that they viewed some long term role for voluntary initiatives on mercury once the treaty is in force. They also noted that progress is needed while negotiations are underway.

62. Some participants acknowledged that while there may be some long term role for voluntary initiatives on mercury once the treaty is in force these efforts would be complementary and would not replace legal obligations. Concern was also raised about how they would be financed, noting that partnerships could compete with resources for the financial mechanism under the treaty.

63. Some participants noted the need for formal relationship of any treaty with any voluntary initiative, in order to have a comprehensive and coordinated approach.

64. It was also observed that currently the UNEP Mercury Partnership has not been sufficiently delivering because resources have not been committed. When the Treaty is in place with its financial mechanism, it could be assumed that all or most resources available will be under the governance of the COP (and/or agreed financial mechanism), making the possibilities limited that additional resources would exist under a separate umbrella for the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership.

65. Some participants questioned the future structure of and need for the UNEP Global Mercury Partnership once the Treaty is in place, noting that committees to the COP or the COP itself would be responsible for whatever (voluntary or mandatory) ongoing work on a particular area is undertaken. It was also suggested to consider the link between other existing partnerships and conventions, such as the Basel Convention Partnership Programme and its link to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes.

5. Other matters:

66. The delegate from India reported in on the meeting of the Task Force on Consumer, Environmental Protection and Recycling of energy efficient lighting held on Monday (21st September 2010). He reported that the task force participant agreed on the following next steps:

1. Gathering of data on market prices of mercury containing lamps and the alternatives such as light emitting diodes
2. Pilot testing of the Basel Convention guidelines on the environmentally sound management

(ESM) of end of life mercury lamps

3. Sharing of best practices of the ESM of lamp such as recycling

4. Information sharing on relevant legislation such as the EU Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoHS)

5. Information sharing on mercury dosing requirements and techniques in lamps

Further, conference calls and face to face meetings will be convened to follow up on the steps taken.

67. The products partnership area lead gave an update on results of dental amalgam discussions that took place on the margins of the meeting and drew attention to the important discussions during the meeting, including strategic planning needs with UNEP, WHO, NGOs, industry, and other stakeholders on the "phase down approach" for dental amalgam. The outcome of those discussions is reflected as follows:

The partnership area recognizes the following with respect to the 'phase down approach' for dental amalgam:

- i) The importance of preventing disease and encourages governments to foster and ensure appropriate prevention of dental decay.
- ii) Phase-down of amalgam use may be pursued where appropriate and where affordable alternative materials exist.
- iii) Acceptable mercury handling, management and pollution prevention practices should be utilized.

68. UNEP announced it would host a waste/storage meeting on the 23rd of September (Thursday) and a meeting report would be released in follow up.

6. Adoption of the report:

69. The partnership advisory group agreed to a process to adopt the present report through the chair and rapporteur, Ms. Abiola Olanipekun.

7. Closure of meeting

70. Following the customary exchange of courtesies the Chair declared the meeting closed at 5:45 p.m. on Wednesday, 22nd September 2010.