



Distr.: General
17 January 2019

English only



United Nations Environment Programme

Third Meeting of the Governing Board
Specific International Programme to support capacity-building and technical assistance
Minamata Convention on Mercury
Geneva, 14 and 15 February 2019
Item 3 of the provisional agenda
Adoption of the Report of the Second Meeting

Report of the second meeting of the Governing Board¹

I. Opening of the meeting (agenda item 1)

1. The second meeting of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme was opened at 9.00 a.m. on Tuesday, 2 October 2018, by the Co-Chairs of the Board, Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi (Ghana) and Mr. Reginald Hernaus (The Netherlands).
2. As host of this meeting, Board member Mr. Atle Fretheim, welcomed all participants to Oslo on behalf of the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment. Mr. Fretheim recalled the priority Norway has placed on promoting the sound management of chemicals and waste over many years, and particularly its support to further international agreement and cooperation on mercury. He spoke specifically on the need to find all ways to support the reduction of releases of mercury and the phase out of the use of mercury in products. Turning the attention of the Board members to the new Ministry building where the Board was convening, Mr. Fretheim took the opportunity to share with the Board some insights into the organisation of Norway's environmental policy making, indicating that legal and technical expertise work closely together, and further that officials working on international environmental matters also follow national ones so as to ensure a seamless link.
3. Ms. Rossana Silva Repetto, Executive Secretary, Minamata Convention on Mercury, added her warm welcome to all participants, thanked the Government of Norway for hosting this meeting, and all the donors for making this First Round possible. She further recalled that it was a mere four month ago, that the Board met last to agree on its Rules of Procedure and to prepare the launch of the First Round of applications to the Specific International Programme. She outlined that this round was open for 90 days and that 19 applications were received by the deadline of 31 August 2018. Of these 19 applications 5 were from Africa, 5 from the Asia-Pacific region, 2 from Central and Eastern Europe, and 7 from Latin America and the Caribbean. Of these 2 applications were received from Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and four from Least Developed Countries (LDCs). She congratulated the Board for operationalising the Specific International Programme before the second meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP2), so that the first approved projects can be reported on at COP2. She drew attention to the fact that it had been a race against time both for the applicants to prepare their applications, as well as for the Secretariat to review and appraise the applications for consideration by the Governing Board in October. Timing of the First Round, with the application deadline a month prior, would not allow the Secretariat to adhere to the 4-week rule on documents, of which the Board was aware when it decided to go ahead to launch the First

¹ This document has not been formally edited.

Round. She hence thanked the Board for their understanding and commitment to fully operationalise the Specific International Programme so as to be able to report on this accomplishment at COP-2.

4. Speaking on behalf of both Co-Chairs, Mr. Hernaus welcomed all Board members to the meeting, recognising specifically that this time Mr. Atle Fretheim (Norway) and Mr. Younous Adoum Abdallah (Chad) were present in person. He also extended a warm welcome to Ms. Nalini Sharma of the Special Programme and Mr. Anil Soekdoo of the Global Environment Facility, who, at the invitation of the Board, were attending the Board meeting as observers, noting that their contributions would be particularly valuable to the deliberations of the Board in its considerations of the project applications.

5. The full list of participants is attached as Annex I.

II. Organizational matters (agenda item 2)

a. Adoption of the agenda

6. The provisional agenda (UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/1) was adopted.

b. Organization of work

7. The Board agreed to work from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm, and from 1:00 pm to 6:00 pm daily, with the possibility of extension into later hours if necessary. The meeting would be conducted in English.

c. Request for disclosure of any personal and/or financial conflict of interest

8. The Co-Chair recalled Rule 23 of the Rules of Procedure of the Governing Board, which states that “in cases where a member of the Governing Board is from the same country that has submitted a project to the Board for consideration, that member shall be excused from participating during the deliberations of the decision-making by the Governing Board in relation to the project in question.” He further recalled that the Rule also states that “members and possible observers at the meeting, have an obligation to promptly disclose to the Board, at the commencement of the meeting, if that person may have a personal and/or financial interest in any aspect of the project presented for decision and approval by the Board”.

9. As project applications from their countries would be considered at this meeting, the Board members from Argentina and Armenia would step out of the room during the deliberation on these projects. The Board member from Sri Lanka indicated that his country had also submitted a project. However, as this application was unfortunately not received in time by the Secretariat, it would not be deliberated on at this meeting.

III. Approval of the report of the First Meeting of the Governing Board held on 15 to 16 May 2018 in Geneva, Switzerland (agenda item 3)

10. The Secretariat presented document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/2, the draft report of the first meeting of the Governing Board. In the absence of comments to the report, the Board proceeded with its adoption.

11. The report will be made available on the website of the Minamata Convention.

IV. Report from the Secretariat on the operations of the Specific International Programme (agenda item 4)

12. The Secretariat introduced document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/3, which contained the draft advance report on the Specific International Programme to the upcoming COP2. The report outlined the work of the Governing Board, the operations of the Specific International Programme, and the pledges and contributions received to its Trust Fund.

13. The Secretariat clarified that funds in the Specific Trust Fund were to be used for the projects, and further needed to cover the non-staff costs of the Programme, that is the meetings of the Board, and any other items the Board deemed necessary for the operations of the Programme. Such additional items may include making documents available in languages, or support to communication on the Programme.

14. The Secretariat further informed the Board that it would approve projects against funds confirmed as received by the UN Environment Programme, namely, as at 3 October, 1,029,000 USD.

15. On the issue of additional items that may be funded for the operation of the Programme, the Co-Chair invited the representative of the Special Programme to share experiences in that regard. The representative explained that the Special Programme Executive Board sets aside funding for the translation of its application guidance into French and Spanish, as well as funding to develop and implement a communication strategy for the Programme. The Special Programme trust fund also includes funding for staff costs (four posts in total) to support the work of the Programme.

16. A member of the Board underlined that it would be very useful for the application guidelines of the Specific International Programme to be available in all UN languages, stating that in her region those closest to the work to be done at the national level are not necessarily proficient in English. Consideration of additional language support during the application process to developing countries that do not have English as their first working language, was also noted by another Board member.

17. A member of the Board also noted with concern the significant pressure on the limited secretariat staff to support the application cycle of the First Round and prepare the appraisal of the projects for the Governing Board's consideration, while also preparing the upcoming meeting of the Conference of Parties. The representative of the Special Programme indicated that the cycle from application to appraisal to decision by its Executive Board was longer than the one that applied to the First Round of the Specific International Programme. Furthermore, for the Special Programme, the review and appraisal phase includes the support of an Internal Task Team consisting of representatives from the BRS secretariat, the Minamata secretariat and from the SAICM secretariat.

18. The Special Programme representative also indicated that following the approval of projects, its secretariat further supports the national inception workshops of the successful projects and based on experience over its past rounds also makes provision to provide further technical support to successful applicants for the implementation of their projects if needed.

V. Consideration of complete and eligible applications to the First Round of applications (agenda item 5)

19. The Co-Chair opened this agenda item noting that it was very encouraging to receive so many applications in the First Round. He also thanked the Secretariat for the appraisals prepared and invited the Secretariat to present the projects.

20. Referencing document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/4 the Secretariat first gave an overview of the applications submitted in the First Round which opened on 5 June 2018 and accepted submissions until 31 August 2018. She noted that by the deadline 19 applications were received from 18 Parties (one Party submitted two projects). Almost all applications reached the Secretariat on the last day. A few were immediately deemed complete, while several applications had missing elements. The representative of the Secretariat further explained that after the initial review for completeness and eligibility, the Secretariat sent follow-up requests to incomplete applications for the missing elements, setting Monday, 24 September 2018 as the final deadline. By that deadline, seven applications were unfortunately still deemed incomplete. The incomplete projects were set aside, and no further review or assessment was made of the projects.

21. She outlined further that the twelve complete projects were appraised in detail by the Secretariat against the criteria set by the Board. The secretariat was also able to count on the review and insights from the representatives of the Special Programme and of the Global Environment Facility. The complete appraisal package for the twelve projects was shared with the Board members through an online link. The package consisted of: (a) the applications forms and all supporting documents received from the applicant countries, (b) a summary overview of each application prepared by the secretariat, and (c) an appraisal form for each application with the Secretariat's review and appraisal of the project against the criteria set by the Board.

22. She also noted that two projects were not reviewed at all by the Secretariat. One application reached the Secretariat 19 days after the deadline, and further that the Secretariat was just made aware of another application submitted electronically by the deadline, but that the electronic copy was not received by the Secretariat due to technical issues. And further that the paper copy was also not received by the deadline. The overall number of applications sent to the Secretariat therefore amounted to 21 projects.

23. The representative of the Secretariat provided some reflections on the experience of appraising the applications, including to note that at times it was hard to extract information from the applications against the criteria set for appraisal. She also noted that in reviewing the projects it was not entirely possible to draw a strict line between projects that can be funded by the Specific International Programme, versus projects that can be funded by the GEF. A differentiation could however be made in terms of avoiding duplication of funding, and of different scale of funding available in the two. Furthermore, the Secretariat noted for future rounds that more time would be needed to allow a deeper technical review of applications.

24. Before beginning a detailed consideration of the twelve projects a number of Board members shared some general reflections. A Board member noted that he was happy that many good projects were submitted even though applicants had a relatively short time window. He also noted that the total amount requested by the twelve projects to be considered was about 2,3 million USD, thus far exceeding the funds available. The Board member thus underlined the need to raise resources for the Specific International Programme and to bring this need to the attention of donors.

25. Given that more funding was being applied for, than available for approval, another Board member raised the question of how to deal with projects that were complete and eligible but could not be funded in this Round. The representative of the Special Programme was invited to share how the Special Programme dealt with such a problem. The representative clarified that the Special Programme could also only approve projects against cash available and that its Executive Board had to prioritise projects against funding available. If eligible and complete projects cannot be funded in one round, such applicants are invited re-submit their application in the next round. Projects that were deemed incomplete or not ready to be supported, were returned to the applicants with written comments for possible resubmission to the next round.

26. A Board member noted that it was important that the Specific International Programme supports projects from all regions, noting that numerous projects had been received from all regions. A Board member asked how the Board would address the prioritization of applications from Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs). Another Board member emphasised that the objective of the Specific International Programme was to support country-driven approaches. Recalling the need to be attractive to donors, one Board member also placed importance on selecting projects that could be best-practice or showcase examples.

27. Following the general remarks the Governing Board proceeded to review each application, starting with the four applications from Africa, followed by the three applications from Asia-Pacific, two applications from Central and Eastern Europe, and then three applications from Latin America and the Caribbean, as listed in Annex II.

28. As agreed at the beginning of the meeting, for the consideration and decision-making on the projects submitted by Argentina and Armenia, the respective board members stepped out of the room. The observers were not present in the room at the time of decision-making.

29. Following a detailed discussion on each of the twelve projects, the Governing Board approved five projects, to the value of 961,663 USD. The approved projects reflected regional balance as well as consideration of the special needs of least developed countries. The approved projects were:

Country	Project Title	Amount
Argentina	Capacity Building Programme for the implementation of the Minamata Convention	USD 250,000
Armenia	Strengthening capacity to promote phasing-out of mercury-added products (lamps) in Armenia	USD 162,000
Benin	Improvement of management framework for mercury-containing products and wastes	USD 249,113
Iran	Implementing of Minamata Convention on Mercury Management in Chlor-Alkali Plants in the Petrochemical Industry	USD 100,000
Lesotho	Strengthening institutional capacity in the development of a phase-out and phase down strategy for mercury added products in Lesotho	USD 200,550

VI. Reflections on the First Round and the proposed schedule and guidelines for the Second Round of applications (agenda item 6)

30. Noting that this First Round was a pilot round to operationalise the Specific International Programme, the Co-Chair invited the Board to reflect on the experiences so far. The following observations were collected on the applications, and on the process of review, appraisal and decision-making for this First Round:

- (i) A number of Board members echoed the early comments by the Co-Chairs about the many good projects received, and commended the applicants in this regard.
- (ii) In reviewing the applications, on numerous occasions Board members wondered if the budget caps, and stipulations on personnel and contractual arrangements in the Guidelines best suited the aims of the Specific International Programme. More clarity on how to prepare the budget part of the applications, was deemed to be helpful to future applicants.
- (iii) The Board reflected on whether it may wish to consider if a country can submit more than one proposal in one round.
- (iv) The Board welcomed the submission of a regional project and hoped to be able to support projects with regional dimensions in a future round.
- (v) The Board underlined that the Specific International Programme should not fund items that are already funded by the Special Programme or the GEF (through a Minamata Initial Assessment, or a National Action Plan, or other enabling activities projects).
- (vi) The Board reflected that it was very happy to have been able to support projects from each of the regions for the current round, but that this is not to imply a practice of binding regional balance for future rounds. This comment was made as there may be cases in future rounds where only a limited number of projects are submitted from a region.
- (vii) A number of Board members noted that given the early stage of implementation of the Minamata Convention, it was not surprising that many applications included requests to support monitoring and data collection.
- (viii) While it is understood that the Specific International Programme is established to support obligations (so-called “shall” provisions” under the Convention), some Board members felt that some provision could be made for “may” clauses, such as for requests to support national implementation plans, or monitoring and data collection, as these measures and activities are often needed in the early implementation stages at the national level. It was also however pointed out that countries with MIAs could draw on the outcomes of these assessments for national implementation plans, and also that in many cases MIAs included funding for inventories.
- (ix) The Board also recognised there may be future cases when it would like to support a project pending changes by the applicants. In the Special Programme changes of no more than 10% can be made to a budget category, pending approval by the Co-Chairs of the Executive Board. For the Global Environment Facility changes up to 20% can be made within certain conditions. It was noted that should it be necessary to modify a project proposal, one opportunity may be when the Board considers a project and before it approves it. Some Board members though worried about how agreement could be sought from the applicant in this regard. Another option is to conditionally approve a project at a Board meeting and request the adjustments to the project prior to the conclusion of the legal agreement with the United Nations Environment Programme for fund dispersal to the successful applicant.

- (x) A Board member commented that while many applicants put forward comprehensive applications for the highest amount available, he appreciated that the Specific International Programme also received applications for specific interventions that a country places high priority on, and that this approach should be encouraged as it may allow more countries to benefit from the resources available for specific endeavours.
- (xi) On the issue of supporting documents necessary for the application to be deemed complete, a Board member commented that it was important to have evidence of national ownership of the project application through the national focal point of that country. Board members though also commented that while it is important that all required supporting documents are included in timely application submissions, it may be necessary to revisit the exact checklist of supporting documentation required so that the process does not open itself to criticism in the future that technically sound projects that are timeously submitted are not excluded unnecessarily by administrative formalities.
- (xii) On submissions, the Board members wondered if submission of originals (that is paper copies) was necessary. Also, Board members underlined the importance of safeguarding the receipt of submission, and the importance of acknowledgements of receipt to avoid the loss of submissions. The Secretariat clarified further that for the processing of applications it was imperative to receive all documents in electronic version.
- (xiii) One Board member remarked that the experience of the Special Programme shows that detailed review of submitted applications and, if necessary, assistance to countries in their application process required a commensurate qualified staffing complement at the secretariat. The Secretariat clarified that it is foreseen that the P-4 officer on technical assistance and capacity-building (under recruitment) will spend part of their staff time on the Specific International Programme.
- (xiv) On decision-making the Board underlined the importance of reaching consensus on the approval of projects.
- (xv) Further the Board deliberated on what to do with complete and eligible projects that were not approved in this round, and decided that those applicants will be invited to submit their applications to the next round. This will also allow new applicants the chance to have equal access to the funding available in the next round.
- (xvi) Lastly, the Board also looked at its provisions to safeguard for any potential conflict of interest if sitting Board members come from applicant countries. In the current round the respective Board members left the room during the discussions of and decisions on their countries' projects. For the current round the two Board members were from two different UN regions. The Board wondered how to provide for the possibility of needing to consider applications from the countries of Board members from the same region, considering the issue of quorum for decision making. And related to that, how to manage a situation where more applications are potentially received from the same countries as Board members. A Board member requested the Secretariat to seek out the experiences of other boards to inform this Board of possible practices and arrangements. Another Board member also indicated that explicit legal advice is necessary in this regard from the Law Division and/or the Corporate Services Division/Legal Unit of the United Nations Environment Programme.

31. Regarding the proposed schedule and guidelines for the Second Round, the Board decided to entrust the Secretariat to produce a draft schedule based on the outcome of deliberations at COP2, assuming that it would be clarified at the meeting if the Swiss funds currently held in trust could be released.

VII. Remaining matters in the Rules of Procedure for the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme (agenda item 7)

32. The Co-Chairs opened the agenda item on the Rules of Procedure noting that the Board had developed and adopted its Rules at its first meeting, but that a limited set of matters were not concluded on at the time. One of the pending matters related to Rule 3, which sets out that the Board shall consist of “10 members [from] [nominated by] parties”. The Board agreed that it would await the decision of the upcoming Conference of the Parties on the matter to address the brackets in this text.

33. The Co-Chairs then invited the Secretariat to introduce the matters that this meeting of the Board could address. The Secretariat presented document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/5 and outlined that Rule 2 contained brackets around the inclusion of “signatory” in its list of definitions. The Secretariat noted there were two other items that the Board could address at this meeting. The first, the current placeholder to describe the exact term of the members (Rule 3), and second, the timing of the election of the Co-Chairs of the next Board (Rule 9). According to the terms of reference contained in decision MC-1/6 the members of the current Board are to serve until the third meeting of the Conference of Parties.

34. A member of the Board expressed his hesitation to elect the new Co-Chairs at the third meeting of the Conference of Parties or at any subsequent COPs as this would mean that these individuals needed to be present in person at the specific COP. He also proposed that for purposes of continuity, the current Chairs could continue to work with the Secretariat until the new Chairs are elected. Another Board member referred to the practice of other committees where the chairs of the previous session are invited to the first meeting of the next session for continuity. The Board agreed that the option of the current Co-Chairs attending the next session of the Governing Board as observers was therefore a possibility. Another Board member also indicated that the option of re-electing Board members, including one or both of the Co-Chairs to the next Board could also be considered. The Board also discussed the use of handover notes and meeting through electronic means, as required, to ensure continuity from one Board to the next.

35. Following the deliberations, the Board agreed to reflect in Rule 9 of its Rules of Procedure that the Co-Chairs elected at the first meeting of the Governing Board shall continue until the election of the new Co-Chairs at the commencement of a meeting to be held after the third meeting of the Conference of Parties, and that thereafter the election of Co-Chairs shall take place at the first meeting of the new term of the Governing Board. This means that the Secretariat will work with the current Co-Chairs in preparation of the first meeting of the next Board.

36. The Co-Chair also drew attention to the need to finalizing the text in Rule 3 on the term of Board members. He noted that while decision MC-1/6 indicated that the first Governing Board members shall serve until COP3, the overall issue of the term or terms of the Board members needed to be further spelt out. He requested the Secretariat to speak to this item. The representative of the Secretariat indicated that while the Governing Board was requested to draw up its own Rules of Procedure, based on the guidance given through decision MC-1/6 in instances where there is no such guidance from the Conference of the Parties, the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of Parties itself would apply. She therefore indicated that it may be useful to refer to the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties on the issue of terms of officers. Accordingly, she read out that Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties, says in paragraph 3: “The offices of the President and rapporteur shall normally be subject to rotation among the United Nations regional groups. No elected officer may serve on the Bureau for more than two consecutive terms.”

37. A Board member pointed out that the composition of the Board respected the representation of all United Nations regions and is codified in paragraph 1 of Rule 3. Another member noted that setting a term limit of no more than two consecutive terms was good practice. The Board therefore decided to include that “No member may serve on the Governing Board for more than two consecutive terms” in its Rules of Procedure as paragraph 3 of Rule 3. Furthermore, the Board noted, that as the function of the Board is to appraise and decide on the allocation of funds for projects, the Board would balance representation of both donors and recipients in electing its officers.

38. The Co-Chair further asked the Secretariat to speak to the issue of the brackets around including the term “signatory” in the list of definitions. The Secretariat clarified that this was the exact definition as contained in the Rules of Procedure of the Conference of the Parties. The Board resolved to simply accept the inclusion of the definition in its Rules on that basis, without bias to the

decision the Conference of the Parties would take at its second meeting on whether only Parties or also Signatories would be eligible to apply to the Specific International Programme. The brackets were therefore lifted. The cleaned Rules of Procedure with only the bracket remaining in paragraph 1 of Rule 3 are attached to this report as annex III.

39. Document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/5 also included reference that the Board may need to consider the issue of the schedule of meetings of the Board, and the cycle of work in relation to the application rounds and the Conference of the Parties schedule. The Co-Chair noted that the date for COP3 would be set at COP2 and that this would set the frame within which the next Round would be launched. A Board member also noted that the launch of the next Round would depend on funds pledged and received for that round. Another Board member made reference to the 1 million Swiss francs that was being held in trust for the Specific International Programme pending the secretariat decision to be taken at COP2. A number of Board members also noted that there would need to be some review of the current application guidelines by the Board before the next round could be launched. The Board members resolved to await the COP2 decision on the date of COP3 and also the COP2 outcome to be able to set the schedule of work to be completed for the Third meeting of the Conference of Parties. The Board requested the Secretariat to prepare a proposed schedule (including suggestions on when the Governing Board ought to meet next) following the outcomes of COP2.

VIII. Consideration of the elements for a resource mobilization strategy for the Specific International Programme (agenda item 8)

40. The Co-Chair opened the discussion on this agenda item, noting that the mobilization of sufficient funding for the Specific International Programme is fundamental. He called on the Secretariat to introduce document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.2/6. on "Elements for a Resource Mobilization Strategy for the Specific International Programme". The representative of the Secretariat noted that this was the same document made available to the Board at its prior meeting, and that the Board had decided to consider at this meeting due to lack of time at the previous meeting. She outlined the chapters of the document and specifically took the Board to the areas of discussion raised in its second part, including to consider: the resource target, how to define resources, the approach taken to mobilization, the possibility of a pledging event, how to use partnerships, if innovative financing can play a role, how to cooperate and collaborate, what the specific role of the Board and the Convention's parties is, and how to ensure donor visibility.

41. A member of the Board indicated that it was his understanding that the role of the Board was to advise the Secretariat on how to draft the strategy. Another Board member indicated that he understood that the owner of the strategy would be the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme.

42. The Co-Chair sought clarification from the Secretariat as to the timeline of the development of the strategy. The Secretariat clarified that there was no deadline to finalise the strategy, and no expectation was indicated by the Conference that the strategy was to be presented to the Conference of Parties. However, as the overall Specific International Programme is a 10-year programme she indicated that this time frame has to be kept in mind for the development of the strategy, in addition to the expectation of Parties that adequate funding would be available for application to the Programme on an annual basis.

43. A Board member indicated the strong need to use all opportunities to raise awareness of the Specific International Programme, including JUSSCANZ meetings and the upcoming Conference of the Parties to encourage donors to contribute to its trust fund. He noted that for the Programme to make a difference, securing resources is imperative. He also noted the link between the Specific International Programme and the Implementation and Compliance Committee, and that contribution to the Programme was a compliance issue for developed countries.

44. Another Board member drew attention to the high interest shown by applicants in this First Round and that the Board can expect many applications in the next round too. This highlighted the high interest of recipient countries, and consequently the importance of a financially robust Programme.

45. One Board member noted that it may be valuable to consider an ambassador role for a noted and knowledgeable person on mercury.

46. On the issue of the funding target, a Board member noted that this issue will also need to be considered for the overall review of the Financial Mechanism as requested by the Convention at the third meeting of the Parties. Further, on the question of the funding target, the representative of the Special Programme explained that for that Programme she worked on various projections of funding needs, to define the ambition level of the Programme, and to set fundraising targets and tracking against that.

47. The Board member returned to the defined timeline for the Specific International Programme as 10 years (with the possibility of extension by a further seven years) and underlined that as this marked a time-limited period, it was imperative to have a strategy in place to fulfil the expectation that created the Programme in the first place.

48. Another Board member also recalled that currently the Board only had at its disposal about a third of the resources requested from the submitted projects to this First Round, and that this signifies large needs.

49. The representative of the Global Environment Facility was also invited to reflect on resource mobilization by the Facility. He explained that showing potential donors the Facility's strategy has been very important to show what donors are "buying". He explained that for fundraising for the Least Developed Countries Fund, for example, donors are shown what results are possible with what increasing levels of investment. He also indicated that the Conference of Parties of the Minamata Convention on Mercury's guidance to the Facility may too be a very useful starting point to outline a strategy for the Specific International Programme.

IX. Date and venue of the next meeting (agenda item 9)

50. The Co-Chair noted that as discussed earlier in the meeting, the next date at which the Board will meet shall be set following the outcome of COP2.

X. Preparation of the report to the Second Meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Minamata Convention (agenda item 10)

51. The Co-Chair requested the Secretariat to speak to this item. The representative of the Secretariat explained that document UNEP/MC/COP.2.9 provided the Conference of the Parties with the overall report on the operations of the Specific International Programme, including on the activities of the Board, the status of contributions, and the launch of the First Round of applications. She further noted that the Co-Chairs would be invited to address the Conference under the agenda item on the financial mechanism to report on the Programme, and to update on the outcome of this meeting of the Board. Given the high interest of applicant countries to know the outcome of the Board's deliberations, it was further decided that the Co-Chairs would issue a Joint Statement to announce the projects selected for this First Round. This statement would allow the outcome to be quickly shared with regional groups, as the regional meetings were beginning the following week.

52. The Secretariat will make the Joint Statement available on the Minamata website.

XI. Any other business (agenda item 11)

53. No other matters were raised.

XII. Closure of the meeting (agenda item 12)

54. The Co-Chairs declared the meeting closed at 19:05 on Wednesday, 3 October 2018, thanking the members for their hard work over the past two days, and the Secretariat for the preparation of the meeting.

Annex I: List of participants

GOVERNING BOARD

<p>AFRICA Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi Director Chemicals Control and Management Centre Environmental Protection Agency Starlet 1991 Accra Ghana Tel.: +233 30 266 4697/8 Fax: +233 30 266 2690 Email: adukumisam@yahoo.com sam.adu-kumi@epa.gov.gh</p> <p>ASIA AND THE PACIFIC Mr. W.T.B. Dissanayake Additional Secretary (Environment Policy & Planning), Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment, "Sobadam Piyasa", 416/C/1, Robert Gunawardana Mawatha Battaramulla, Sri Lanka. Tel: +94 11 2034127 Fax: +94 11 2879952 Mobile: +94 71 8014998 Email: dissaforest@yahoo.com</p> <p>CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE Mr. Kaupo Heinma Head of Department Environmental Management Department Ministry of the Environment Narva mnt 7 10117 Tallinn Estonia Tel.: +372 626 2921 Email: kaupo.heinma@envir.ee</p> <p>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN Ms. María Florencia Grimalt Secretario de Embajada Dirección General de Asuntos Ambientales (DIGMA) Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores y Culto Esmeralda 1212 1007 Buenos Aires Argentina Tel.: +54 11 4819 7405 Fax: +54 11 4819 7413 Email: ogx@mrecic.gov.ar</p>	<p>AFRICA Mr. Younous Adoum Abdallah Point Focal de la Convention de Minamata sur le Mercure Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Pêche Direction de la Lutte Contre le Changement Climatique, Pollutions et les Nuisances Quartier Béguinage 447 N'djamena Chad Tel.: +235 6364 8300 Email: abou_idjab08@live.fr</p> <p>ASIA AND THE PACIFIC Mr. Prasert Tapaneeyangkul Chair, Subcommittees of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, under the National Environment Board Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Phahonyothin Road Bangkok Thailand Tel.: +66 89 813 6045 Email: ptap14011@gmail.com</p> <p>CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE Ms. Anahit Aleksandryan Head of Division Hazardous Substances and Wastes Policy Division Ministry of Nature Protection Governmental Building 3, Republic Square 0010 Yerevan Armenia Tel.: +374 11 818 519 Fax: +374 11 818 519 Email: anahit.aleksandryan@yahoo.com</p> <p>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN Mr. Nero Cunha Ferreira Second Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs Chemin Louis-Dunant 15, 6th Floor 1202, Geneva Switzerland Tel.: +41 22 332 5023 E-mail: nero.ferreira@itamaraty.gov.br</p>
--	--

<p>WESTERN EUROPE AND OTHERS Mr. Reginald Hernaus Lead Negotiator Chemicals and Wastes International Affairs Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment Rijnstraat 8 The Hague The Netherlands Tel.: +31 70 456 6485 Email: reggie.hernaus@minienm.nl</p>	<p>WESTERN EUROPE AND OTHERS Mr. Alte Bernt Fretheim Consultant Kaptein Gløersensvei 24 Norway Tel.: +47 950 68 313 Email: atle.fretheim@kld.dep.no and ar-freth@online.no</p>
---	---

SECRETARIAT OF THE MINAMATA CONVENTION ON MERCURY

<p>Ms. Rossana Del Carmen Silva Repetto Executive Secretary Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury International Environment House 1 Geneva, Switzerland Telephone: +41 22 917 8638 Email: rossana.silva-repetto@un.org</p> <p>Ms. Stephanie Laruelle Legal and Policy Officer Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury International Environment House 1 Geneva, Switzerland Telephone: +41 22 917 8638 Email: stephanie.laruelle@un.org</p>	<p>Ms. Claudia ten Have Senior Policy Coordination Officer Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury International Environment House 1 Geneva, Switzerland Telephone: +41 22 917 8638 Email: claudia.tenhave@un.org</p>
---	---

OBSERVERS

<p>Ms. Nalini Sharma Programme Officer Secretariat of the Special Programme Economy Division United Nations Environment Programme Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 8343 Email: nalini.sharma@unep.org</p>	<p>Mr. Anil Sookdeo Coordinator Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Global Environment Facility 1818 H St. NW 20433 Washington, DC United States of America Tel.: 1-2024580683 Email: asookdeo@thegef.org</p>
---	--

Annex II: List of Projects Received in the First Round by the deadline*

1. Projects Reviewed by the Governing Board			
	Country	Project number	Project title
1.	Antigua and Barbuda	2018/01/LAC/ATG	Facilitating capacity-building with technical assistance and technology transfer for managing mercury in the Caribbean
2.	Argentina	2018/01/LAC/ARG	Capacity Building Programme for the implementation of the Minamata Convention
3.	Armenia	2018/01/CEE/ARM	Strengthening capacity to promote phasing-out of mercury-added products (lamps) in Armenia
4.	Benin	2018/01/A/BEN	Improvement of management framework for mercury-containing products and wastes
5.	China	2018/01/AP/CHN	Capacity strengthening for interim storage of mercury and mercury compounds other than mercury wastes in China
6.	Iran I	2018/01/AP/IRN I	Implementing of Minamata Convention on Mercury Management in Chlor-Alkali Plants in the Petrochemical Industry
7.	Lesotho	2018/01/A/LSO	Strengthening institutional capacity in the development of a phase-out and phase down strategy for mercury added products in Lesotho
8.	Moldova	2018/01/CEE/MDA	Support to post-ratification of the Minamata Convention to the Republic of Moldova by building phase down capacities and reducing risks associated with mercury
9.	Nigeria	2018/01/A/NGA	Capacity strengthening for implementation of Minamata Convention on Mercury in Nigeria
10.	Panama	2018/01/LAC/PAN	Strengthening inter-institutional capacity for the implementation of the Minamata Convention
11.	Viet Nam	2018/01/AP/VNM	Strengthening national capacity of mercury management by developing and executing the National Implementation Plan of Minamata Conventions in Viet Nam
12.	Zambia	2018/01/A/ZMB	Build capacity in mercury monitoring in humans, biota and environment

2. Projects deemed incomplete, and therefore not considered by the Governing Board			
<i>Deemed incomplete even after the extended deadline for submission of missing elements.</i>			
	Country	Project number	Project title
1.	Bolivia	2018/01/LAC/BOL	Strengthening of Capacities and Technical Assistance for the Implementation of the Minamata Agreement in the Plurinational State of Bolivia
2.	Cuba	2018/01/LAC/CUB	Strengthening national laboratory for the analysis and evaluation of mercury in the environment
3.	Ecuador	2018/01/LAC/ECU	Strengthening national capacity for identifying sources of emissions and mercury releases from different mining activities and management evaluation of mercury compounds and mercury-added products in Ecuador
4.	Iran II	2018/01/AP/IRN II	Capacity Building, Identification and Quantification of Mercury Sources for National Inventory of Mercury
5.	Mexico	2018/01/LAC/MEX	Early implementation of Minamata Convention in Mexico
6.	Niger	2018/01/A/NER	Reduction/Elimination of utilisation mercury added products
7.	Syria	2018/01/AP/SYR	Switch to the use of alternatives to the products listed in Annex A of the Minamata Convention

* This list does not include two projects that were received much after the deadline

Annex III: Rules of Procedure as revised by the Governing Board at its second meeting

Rules of procedure of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme of the Minamata Convention on Mercury

I. Objective

Rule 1

The present rules of procedure shall apply to the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme to support capacity-building and technical assistance of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

II. Definitions

Rule 2

For the purpose of the present rules:

(a) “Convention” means the Minamata Convention on Mercury, adopted at Kumamoto, Japan, on 10 October 2013.

(b) “Party” means a party as defined in article 2 (g) of the Convention.

(c) “Signatory” means one of the States and regional economic integration organizations that signed the Minamata Convention on Mercury at Kumamoto, Japan, on 10 and 11 October 2013, and, thereafter, at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 9 October 2014.

(d) “Conference of the Parties” means the Conference of the Parties established by article 23 of the Convention.

(e) “Regional economic integration organization” means an organization as defined in paragraph (j) of article 2 of the Convention.

(f) “Programme” means the Specific International Programme to Support Capacity-building and Technical Assistance of the Minamata Convention on Mercury.

(g) “Board” means the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme.

(h) “Members” of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme means the 10 members nominated through the respective Bureau representatives, with each region nominating two members.

(i) “Meeting” means meetings of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme. Meetings can be face-to-face, and, if so decided by the Board, can be held through electronic means.

(j) “Secretariat” means the secretariat established by paragraph 1 of article 24 of the Convention.

(k) “Members present and voting” means members present at the meeting in which voting takes place. For face-to-face meetings, “present” means physically present. For meetings through electronic means, “present” means participation through teleconference, videoconference or other electronic means as decided. “Voting” means casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members abstaining from voting shall be considered as not voting.

(l) “Co-Chairs” means the Co-Chairs of the Governing Board as elected in accordance with Rule 9.

III. Membership

Rule 3

1. The Board shall consist of 10 members [from] [nominated by] parties. Each of the five United Nations regions shall nominate two members through their respective Bureau representatives.

2. The first members of the Board shall be nominated no later than 31 December 2017 and will serve until the third meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Minamata Convention. Thereafter, the members shall be nominated every two years by regional groups and their membership confirmed by the Conference of the Parties. To this end, the two nominations from each United Nations region should be submitted to the secretariat no later than the second last day of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

3. No member may serve on the Board for more than two consecutive terms.

4. If necessary, a member may designate an alternative representative for a particular meeting of the Board. Written notification of the designation of the alternative representative shall be submitted to the secretariat before the start of the meeting in question.

5. If a member resigns or is otherwise unavailable to complete his or her term or perform the required functions, that member may be replaced for the remainder of the term. Written notification of the designation of the replacement member shall be submitted by the relevant Bureau members to the secretariat in due time to allow the replacement member to attend the next meeting of the Board.

IV. Observers

Rule 4

The Board may invite observers to its meeting, or segments thereof, except when the Board decides on applications. The secretariat will extend invitations to observers upon request and on behalf of the Board. Participation of observers will in principle be at their own expense.

V. Venue, dates and notice of meetings

Rule 5

1. The Board will in principle meet once a year to approve project applications and review progress under the programme on the basis of reports from the Minamata Convention secretariat, as well as other relevant information provided to them on implementation of the programme.

2. The secretariat shall make appropriate arrangements for meetings in consultation with the Co-Chairs.

Rule 6

The secretariat shall notify all members of the venue and date of a meeting at least six weeks before it is due to commence. The secretariat shall also publish the meeting details on the website of the Minamata Convention.

VI. Agenda

Rule 7

1. The secretariat shall prepare a provisional agenda for each meeting in consultation with and under the guidance of the Co-Chairs. Any member may request the secretariat to include specific items in the provisional agenda.

2. The provisional agenda shall be communicated to members at least four weeks before the meeting is due to commence.

3. Between the date of communication of the provisional agenda and the date of adoption of the agenda by the Board, members may propose supplementary items for inclusion in the agenda, provided the items are of an important and urgent nature.

Rule 8

At the beginning of each meeting, the Board shall adopt the agenda for the meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda and any supplementary items proposed in accordance with paragraph 3 of Rule 7.

VII. Officers

Rule 9

1. The Board will have two Co-Chairs, elected from among the members of the Board, reflecting the composition of the Board and the purpose of the programme.
2. The Board shall elect two Co-Chairs at the commencement of its first meeting.
3. The term of the Co-Chairs elected at the first meeting of the Board shall continue until the election of new Co-Chairs at the commencement of a meeting to be held after the third meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Minamata Convention. Thereafter, the election of Co-Chairs shall take place at the first meeting of each new term of the Board members.

Rule 10

1. In the absence of consensus, elections of the Co-Chairs shall be decided by secret ballot.
2. If, when a Co-Chair is to be elected, no candidate obtains a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the members present and voting in the first ballot, a second ballot shall be held, restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes, with the decision taken by simple majority. If in the second ballot the votes are equally divided, the Co-Chair shall be decided by drawing lots between the candidates.
3. In the case of a tie in the first ballot between three or more candidates obtaining the largest number of votes, a second ballot shall be held. If a tie results between more than two candidates, the number shall be reduced to two by lot and the balloting, restricted to them, shall continue in accordance with the procedure set out in paragraphs 1 and 2.

Rule 11

1. In addition to exercising the powers conferred upon them elsewhere in these rules, the Co-Chairs shall:
 - (a) Declare the opening and closure of each meeting;
 - (b) Preside at meetings of the Board;
 - (c) Ensure the observance of these rules;
 - (d) Request disclosure of any personal and/or financial conflict of interest;
 - (e) Accord the right to speak;
 - (f) Put questions to the vote and announce decisions;
 - (g) Rule on any points of order;
 - (h) Subject to these rules, have complete control over the proceedings and maintain order.
2. The Co-Chairs may also propose:
 - (a) The closure of the list of speakers;
 - (b) A limitation on the time to be allowed to speakers and on the number of times a participant may speak on an issue;
 - (c) The adjournment or closure of debate on an issue;
 - (d) The suspension or adjournment of a meeting.
3. During the intersessional period, the Co-Chairs shall assume the responsibility, with support of the secretariat, for the approval of project amendments, when necessary, and inform the members of the decision on the amendments.
4. The Co-Chairs, in the exercise of their functions, remain at all times under the authority of the Board.

Rule 12

1. If a Co-Chair cannot preside at a segment of the meeting, the other Co-Chair shall fulfil his or her functions.
2. If a Co-Chair cannot preside over a meeting, the Board shall agree on a member to be appointed to fulfil his or her functions.

3. If a Co-Chair resigns or is otherwise unable to complete his or her term, the Board shall elect a replacement from among its members to complete the original two-year term.

VIII. Secretariat

Rule 13

1. The secretariat of the Minamata Convention shall provide secretariat services to the Specific International Programme and for the functioning of its Governing Board.

2. The secretariat shall receive applications to the Specific International Programme, screen project applications for completeness and eligibility and appraise applications for consideration and decision by the Board.

3. In the appraisal preparation process, the Secretariat shall consult with the Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility and the Secretariat of the Special Programme² to ensure complementarity and avoid duplication.

4. The secretariat shall make all the necessary arrangements for meetings of the Board, including the preparation and distribution of documents at least four weeks in advance of the meetings.

Rule 14

The Secretariat shall further:

(a) Receive, reproduce and distribute other documents for the meetings of the Board;

(b) Prepare a report of each meeting and make it publicly available;

(c) Make information available on the Specific International Programme on the website of the Minamata Convention, with the exception of the applications received, the appraisals of the applications and other documents as decided by the Board;

(d) Arrange for the custody and preservation of the documents of each meeting in the archives of the secretariat;

(e) Perform such other tasks as the Board may require in relation to its functions.

Rule 15

The secretariat shall report on its activities to the Board and through the Board to the Conference of the Parties. The secretariat will be accountable to the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme for administrative and financial matters.

IX. Conduct of business

Rule 16

The Co-Chairs shall declare a session of the meeting open and permit debate to proceed when at least six members participating in the meeting are present, including members from each of the five United Nations regions. The same presence of members so participating shall be required for any decision to be taken.

Rule 17

1. The Co-Chairs will grant permission to the members and observers to speak at a session of the meeting in the order in which they signify their desire to speak, taking into account that observers should normally speak after members unless otherwise decided by the Co-Chairs. The secretariat shall maintain a list of speakers. The Co-Chairs may call a speaker to order if the speaker's remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

2. The Board may, on a proposal³ from the Co-Chairs or from any member, limit the time allowed to each speaker and the number of times each participant may speak on a question. Before a decision is taken, two members may speak in favour of and two against a proposal to set such limits.

² "Special Programme" refers to the Special Programme to support institutional strengthening at the national level for implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, the Minamata Convention and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management.

³ "Proposals", under the Conduct of Business section of these rules, refer to points of consideration and deliberation. The term "proposals" in the context of reference to the conduct of business does not refer to "project proposals".

When the debate is limited and a speaker exceeds the allotted time, the Co-Chairs shall call the speaker to order without delay.

Rule 18

During the discussion of any matter, a member may at any time raise a point of order, which shall be decided immediately by the Co-Chairs in accordance with the present rules. A member may appeal the ruling of the Co-Chairs. The appeal shall be put to a vote immediately and the ruling shall stand unless overruled by a simple majority of the members present and voting. A member may not, in raising a point of order, speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Rule 19

Any motion against the competence of the Board to discuss any matter or to adopt a proposal or an amendment to a proposal shall only be accepted if it is supported by a two-thirds majority before the matter is discussed or a vote is taken on the proposal or amendment in question.

Rule 20

1. Subject to Rule 18, the following motions shall have precedence over all other proposals or motions, in the following order:

- (a) To suspend the session;
- (b) To adjourn the session;
- (c) To adjourn the debate on the question under discussion;
- (d) To close the debate on the question under discussion.

2. Permission to speak on a motion falling within paragraph 1 (a) to (d) shall be granted to the proposer and, in addition, to one speaker in favour of and two against the motion, after which it shall be put immediately to a vote.

Rule 21

A proposal or motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has begun, provided that the proposal or motion has not been amended. A proposal or motion thus withdrawn may be reintroduced by any other representative.

Rule 22

When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same meeting, unless the Board decides in favour of reconsideration by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to the mover and one other supporter, after which it shall be put immediately to a vote.

Rule 23

1. In cases where a member of the Board is from a country that has submitted a project to the Board for its consideration, that member shall be excused from participating during the deliberations of and decision-making by the Board in relation to the project in question.

2. Members and possible observers at the meeting have an obligation to promptly disclose to the Board, at the commencement of the meeting, any potential personal and/or financial interest in any aspect of a project presented for discussion and approval by the Board. In such cases, the Board shall apply the same stipulation as in the paragraph above.

X. Adoption of decisions

Rule 24

1. The Board will take its decisions by consensus. If all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted and no agreement has been reached, the decision shall be taken by a three-quarters majority of its members present and voting.

2. The Board may decide on a matter of procedure by a majority vote of the members present and voting.

3. Where there is disagreement as to whether a matter to be voted on is a substantive or procedural matter, the matter shall be decided by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

Rule 25

Voting shall normally be by show of hands, except for the election of the Co-Chairs, which is governed by Rule 10. A roll-call vote shall be taken if one is requested by any member. It shall be taken in order as determined by lot drawn by the Co-Chairs.

Rule 26

The vote of each member in a roll-call vote shall be recorded in the report of the meeting.

Rule 27

After the Co-Chairs have announced the beginning of voting, no member shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting. The Co-Chairs may permit members to explain their votes, either before or after the voting, and may limit the time allowed for such explanations.

Rule 28

Each member shall have one vote.

XI. Language**Rule 29**

Meetings shall be held in English. Meeting documents and meeting reports will be in English only.

XII. Amendments to rules of procedure**Rule 30**

Amendments to these rules of procedure shall be adopted in accordance with Rule 24.