



Distr.: General
25 September 2019

Original: English



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Conference of the Parties to the
Minamata Convention on Mercury
Third meeting**

Geneva, 25–29 November 2019

Item 5 (e) (ii) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference
of the Parties: financial mechanism: Specific
International Programme to Support
Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance**

**Governing Board of the Specific International Programme to
Support Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance**

Note by the secretariat

The annexes to the present note set out information relevant to the work of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme to Support Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance. Annex I contains the report of the third meeting of the Governing Board, which took place on 14 and 15 February 2019, and annex II presents an overview of the project applications received in the first round of applications (2018). Annex III presents the outcome of the fourth meeting of the Governing Board, which took place from 18 to 20 September 2019.

* UNEP/MC/COP.3/1.

Annex I

Report of the third meeting of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme to Support Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance¹

I. Opening of the meeting (agenda item 1)

1. The third meeting of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme to Support Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance was opened at 9.30 a.m. on Thursday, 14 February 2019, by the Co-Chairs of the Board, Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi (Ghana) and Mr. Reginald Hernaus (the Netherlands).

2. Speaking on behalf of both Co-Chairs, Mr. Hernaus warmly welcomed all Board members to the meeting, informing them that Mr. Kaupo Heinma (Estonia) would join them on the second day of the meeting and that unfortunately Mr. Nero Cunha Ferreira (Brazil) was unable to attend the meeting.

3. Following a round of reflections by the Board members, the Co-Chair invited the Executive Secretary of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, Ms. Rossana Silva Repetto, to deliver her welcoming remarks.

4. The Executive Secretary welcomed the participants, noting that it had been a pleasure for the secretariat to prepare and organize the third meeting of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme. She introduced the secretariat team, noting that its small size meant that all members had contributed to the preparations from their individual areas of focus and expertise. She remarked that given the rapid progress of the Specific International Programme, it seemed easy to forget that the Programme had already been fully operationalized by the first half of 2018. She thanked the Governing Board for that important achievement. The Co-Chairs had been able to report to the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting, in November 2018, that five projects had been approved under the first round of applications, based on the funding in hand in cash at the time. She informed the Board that following the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the secretariat had worked on clearing and finalizing the approved projects with the applicant Governments for implementation. That had included the preparation of the legal documents required for the disbursement of funds to the relevant Governments. She recalled that the Co-Chairs had requested feedback on the first round at the second meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and that the Executive Secretary had reiterated that call to all parties through her letter of 3 December 2018. As a result, the secretariat had received feedback in mid-February. She noted that, at its third meeting, the Governing Board would be considering the feedback and lessons learned from the first round and the way forward for the next round. She thanked the donors (Denmark, Norway and Switzerland) for the approximately \$2.2 million pledged and received for the second round, which was a strong indication of donor confidence in the Specific International Programme.² In closing, she said that she anticipated an interesting discussion and a productive meeting, reiterating the secretariat's pleasure at working with such a distinguished group.

5. Thanking the Executive Secretary, the Co-Chair mentioned that he had received positive feedback on the work of the Programme and its Board from both recipient and donor countries. He said that he looked forward to reporting to the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting, in November 2019, emphasizing that it would be a key setting in which to showcase the Programme's work. Directing the Board's attention to the schedule of work for the current meeting as outlined in the annotated agenda set out in document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/1/Add.1, he thanked the secretariat for the well-prepared documents submitted well in advance of the meeting.

6. The full list of participants is set out in appendix I to the present report.

¹ This report has been electronically adopted ad referendum and will be formally adopted by the Governing Board at its fourth meeting, to be held in Washington, D.C., from 18 to 20 September 2019.

² Further pledges and contributions to the Programme were subsequently received from Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

II. Organizational matters (agenda item 2)

A. Adoption of the agenda

7. The Board adopted the provisional agenda (UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/1) and took note of the provisional annotated agenda as contained in document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/1/Add.1.

B. Organization of work

8. The Board agreed to work from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 2 to 5 p.m. daily, with the possibility of amending the schedule as agreed to suit the arrangements of the Board. The meeting would be conducted in English.

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

9. The Co-Chair recalled that, in accordance with paragraph 1 of rule 23 of the rules of procedure of the Governing Board, members and possible observers had an obligation to promptly disclose to the Board, at the commencement of the meeting, any potential personal or financial interest in any aspect of a project presented for discussion and approval by the Board. He noted that the Board had decided that the matter would be a standing item on the Board's meeting agenda. As the Board would not consider or appraise projects at the current meeting, the Co-Chair proceeded to the following agenda item.

III. Approval of the report of the second meeting of the Governing Board, held on 2 and 3 October 2018 in Oslo, Norway (agenda item 3)

10. The representative of the secretariat presented document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/2, containing the draft report of the second meeting of the Governing Board. The Co-Chair thanked the secretariat for accurately reflecting the meeting's proceedings.

11. In the absence of comments on the report, the Board adopted the report as set out in document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/2. It was agreed that the report would 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 representative of the secretariat introduced document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/3, containing an update on the operations of the Specific International Programme. The report outlined the status of pledges and contributions to the Specific Trust Fund, as well as the estimated expenditures to date, and the activities of the Programme (including the work of the Governing Board). The representative of the secretariat clarified that total pledges to the trust fund received as at 14 February 2019 amounted to \$2,178,000 based on new receipts (up from the \$2,148,169 reported in document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/3).

13. The representative of the secretariat informed the Board that as part of the implementation of Umoja, the United Nations Secretariat had introduced a new online tool for implementing partners, which would have to be used for approved projects from the first round onward. The secretariat would follow up when additional training was required by partners to use the system. A member of the Board inquired about the nature of reporting in the new system. The representative of the secretariat clarified that periodic reporting was required and would be specified in the relevant legal agreements for the implementation of approved projects.

V. Consideration of a resource mobilization strategy for the Specific International Programme (agenda item 5)

14. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair called on the representative of the secretariat to present the "Elements for a Resource Mobilization Strategy for the Specific International Programme", as contained in document UNEP/MC/SIP.1/5. The representative of the secretariat noted that the document had initially been presented to the Board at its first meeting, in May 2018. The same document had been discussed at the second meeting of the Board in October 2018, as reflected in section VIII of the report of that meeting (UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/2). Based on those discussions, for the third meeting, the secretariat was requesting guidance from the Board on specific considerations,

including: (a) setting a funding target for the Specific International Programme, which was set up as a 10-year programme (with the possibility of extension for 7 years); (b) how to better articulate the activities donors could fund and parties could apply for; and (c) how to better “match” the funding envelope available with the requests for support. The representative of the secretariat explained that while there was no deadline for the development of the resource mobilization strategy, it was required by the terms of reference for the Programme, as set out in decision MC-1/6.

15. The Co-Chair noted that significant information on country needs was coming forward through the Minamata initial assessments (MIAs), and that a sound approach by the Board and the Conference of the Parties to resource mobilization for the Specific International Programme was important given the needs being expressed and considering the time-bound nature of the Programme. He noted that the Programme must be attuned to both its needs and its duration.

16. A Board member reflected that resource mobilization was a complex issue and that the secretariat had produced a well-written document that raised important issues. He hesitated to identify a funding target at the current stage and indicated that it may be better to await the conclusion of the second round, as that would give the Board more information. He suggested focusing on traditional donors initially, as the possibility of raising significant funds from other donors at the current time was uncertain. Furthermore, he suggested exploring whether there was scope for the Global Mercury Partnership to contribute more to Capacity-Building and technical cooperation through the Programme.

17. Another Board member emphasized that the Programme was very important to progress on the issue of mercury. She acknowledged that while the size of the grants (between \$50,000 and \$250,000) did not allow for a complete intervention at the national level, the special value of the grants was their ability to fund Capacity-Building activities at the national level and to initiate pilot projects for larger scaling if/where needed. She saw the Programme’s projects as “first stage” projects, to allow parties to prepare for larger projects funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) or other donors. She also noted that a particular advantage of the Specific International Programme was that it did not require co-financing as a pre-requisite, unlike GEF and other financial mechanisms.

18. One member thanked the secretariat for preparing the thorough document and the donor countries for their financial contributions to the Programme. Based on her country’s experience, she noted the importance of the integrated approach to mercury management, as well as chemicals and waste management overall. She stressed the need to work with actors across sectors and include the private sector and non-traditional donors. She also highlighted the need to communicate and publicize the work of the Programme, including the progress of the approved projects from the first round.

19. The Co-Chair also drew attention to the priorities identified in the MIAs as the tangible needs of countries that could be used to elaborate the overall global resource requirements at the national level in support of activities to meet obligations under the Convention. He also noted that it was imperative to make the linkages to health and to vulnerable persons on a continuous basis, and further that there were multiple streams of funding to address health-related concerns. In that regard, he expressed the hope that non-traditional donors, including foundations, could envisage contributing to the Minamata Convention through the Programme.

20. Reflecting on the various comments made by the other Board members, the Co-Chair emphasized the importance of framing the issue so that mercury was seen not only as an environmental issue but as a broader societal concern. From a policy perspective, he also stressed that mercury must be contextualized within each country’s efforts to attain the Sustainable Development Goals. He joined his fellow Co-Chair in inviting contributions from non-traditional donors, especially the private sector and research and academia.

21. The Executive Secretary concurred with the Board members that resource mobilization needed to be underpinned by communication and advocacy to both traditional and non-traditional donors. She anticipated that once project implementation was under way, showcasing results would need to be a priority. She also proposed the development of a portfolio of projects for resource mobilization, citing a recent meeting of the secretariat with a national environmental funding facility that was eager to fund work on mercury but had a co-financing requirement. She noted that there might well be other donors, too, that could make funding available based on such a portfolio approach. Differentiated strategies would therefore need to be designed for the Programme to access varied funding sources.

22. The Co-Chair noted that a portfolio of projects was a good idea, and said that the Programme could approach, for example, regional development banks or even the European Commission.

23. The Board members also discussed the varied needs of different regions and countries with respect to action on mercury using their country and regional experiences. The Co-Chairs suggested

that regional identification of challenge areas could help the secretariat to further refine the resource mobilization strategy. One Board member raised the possibility of advancing South-South cooperation through the resource mobilization strategy, including through the low-cost option of having the secretariat connect national experts to needs expressed by countries. Another Board member stressed that North-South cooperation remained important, too. The Co-Chairs noted that intersectoral committees on mercury at the national level could also be engaged, and that stakeholder coordination and awareness-raising should be part of identifying national and regional elements of the strategy.

24. The representative of the secretariat thanked the Board for the thoughtful discussion and wealth of advice. She agreed that with increasing numbers of MIAs being finalized it was possible to better map national and regional needs. She noted that while the Global Mercury Partnership was not a formal part of the Convention, it served as a close companion on the Minamata journey and there was much scope to enhance the relationship further. She acknowledged that while current contributions to the Programme were indeed only from parties, the terms of reference mentioned non-traditional funding sources, and so the aim was to explore all potential funding sources. Responding to the question from a Board member on resource mobilization activities by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), she noted that the secretariat could invest further in donor briefings, at the level of both the Executive Secretary of the Convention and the Executive Director of UNEP. She closed by asking the Board for guidance on which areas to prioritize in terms of resource mobilization.

25. One Board member said that given the current size of the staffing of the secretariat, it was important to take a realistic, step-wise approach to resource mobilization for the Programme, and to concentrate first on the most direct funding sources. He noted that there were roughly six sources of support for mercury implementation available to developing countries: GEF, the Specific International Programme, 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, the secretariat's own capacity in terms of development and technical assistance, the Global Mercury Partnership and direct bilateral activities. In that web of support, it was imperative for the Programme to be clear on its aims and its specific value-added, to differentiate itself and to be of unique appeal to donors. In that regard, he supported a strong communication outreach for the Programme.

26. Summing up the discussion and considering the interventions, the Co-Chair suggested that there was no need at present to draft an overall resource mobilization strategy, but instead that for the near-term the secretariat should identify two or three tangible areas of effort that would support the mobilization of resources through strategic communication. He emphasized the importance of showing donors the value of their investment in order to retain their support as donors and motivate new donors to join the Programme. He further noted the importance of framing the progress made under the Minamata Convention toward the Sustainable Development Goals. He also highlighted the importance of maintaining the branding and identity developed for the Minamata Convention, including the well-received Minamata tagline – Make Mercury History – and the golden fish. He reiterated the idea of identifying an ambassador for the Minamata Convention to spread the Convention's message to varied audiences. He also asked the secretariat to further reflect on the matter in case there were further areas apparent for quick and fruitful action.

VI. Review of the financial mechanism of the Minamata Convention on Mercury: consideration of the request by the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting for input from the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme (agenda item 6)

27. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair noted that the Conference of the Parties had requested input from the Specific International Programme on the review of the Convention's financial mechanism. Introducing document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/4, the representative of the secretariat provided an overview of the matter. In particular, she noted that the Conference of the Parties had only agreed on terms of reference and other guidance for the Specific International Programme, as one component of the Convention's financial mechanism, at its first meeting, held in September 2017. Drawing on the terms of reference and other guidance, the Governing Board had been established early in 2018 and convened its first meeting in late May 2018 to consider the documentation prepared by the secretariat to operationalize the Programme. The first round of applications to the Specific International Programme had been launched on 5 June 2018, and by the 31 August 2018 submissions deadline the secretariat had received 19 applications. At its second meeting, the Governing Board had been able to approve five projects based on the funding received. At the current meeting, its third, the Governing Board was to agree on the guidelines for the second round of applications, which would be launched

after the meeting. The Governing Board was expected to meet for the fourth time in September 2019, in time to be able to report to the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting, in November 2019. She commented that in comparison to GEF (the other component of the Convention's financial mechanism), which had experience of multiple years of investment in support of mercury activities, the Specific International Programme was a rather new entrant. She further recalled that at its second meeting, the Conference of the Parties had requested the secretariat to compile information to be provided by GEF, the Specific International Programme, parties and other relevant sources, as identified in paragraph 11 of article 13 of the Convention, for the review of the financial mechanism of the Convention, and to present such information for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its third meeting. She directed the Board to paragraph 6 of document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/4, which described the information required.

28. Reflecting on the Conference of the Parties' request, the Co-Chairs outlined the four areas that the review was to address, namely:

- (a) The level of funding of the Programme;
- (b) The guidance provided by the Conference of the Parties to the Programme;
- (c) The effectiveness of the Programme;
- (d) The ability of the Programme to address the changing needs of developing country parties and parties with economies in transition.

29. The Co-Chair requested more detail on the proposed timelines for submission and the secretariat's deadlines for document preparation to meet the document deadlines for the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The representative of the secretariat clarified that the deadline for submissions for the review of the financial mechanism was given as 15 May 2019 in the Executive Secretary's letter of 3 December 2018. She also noted that the Board had agreed to set a deadline of 14 June 2019 for submission of applications for the second round. She asked whether it might be worthwhile awaiting the submission of second round applications to have a more nuanced view of the needs expressed by parties than could be obtained by drawing solely on the information available from the first round. The Board would only review the second round applications at its next meeting, scheduled for September 2019, by which time it would be too late to prepare the Programme's input to the review, as the secretariat had to send all the documentation for the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Division of Conference Services of the United Nations Office at Nairobi by 9 August 2019 to ensure timely preparation and publication for the regional meetings, scheduled tentatively for October 2019.

30. Following some deliberation among Board members, the Co-Chairs concluded that the input by the Specific International Programme to the Conference of the Parties on the review of the financial mechanism would need to be a short factual document, based primarily on the information from the first round and a summary of submissions received for the second round. The Board felt that, given only one full round of applications, it was premature for the Board to produce an assessment of the level of funding, the effectiveness of the Programme and the ability of the Programme to address changing needs.

31. The Co-Chairs requested the secretariat to prepare the Board's input, given its dual function as secretariat to the Minamata Convention and provider of secretariat services to the Programme. Furthermore, the secretariat was requested to make a subsequent update on the outcomes of the Board's decisions in September on applications to the second round available as part of the official documentation for the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

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

32. Introducing the item, the Co-Chair invited the secretariat to provide an overview of document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/5. The representative of the secretariat recalled that the Board had developed and adopted its rules of procedure in May 2018, but that at the time the Conference of the Parties had not yet reached agreement on two remaining sets of brackets in decision MC-1/6. The Conference of the Parties had cleared the brackets at its second meeting, deciding that only parties were eligible to apply for support from the Specific International Programme and that members of the Board were to be nominated by parties. Given that decision, the Board could now consider clearing the bracketed text in paragraph 1 of rule 3 of its rules of procedure.

33. Accordingly, the Board finalized rule 3, paragraph 1, as follows: “The Board shall consist of 10 members from parties. Each of the five United Nations regions shall nominate two members through their respective Bureau representatives.” The finalized rules of procedure are set out in appendix II to the present report.
34. Following the finalization of the rules in line with the clean text of the annexes to decision MC-1/6, the Co-Chairs drew attention to the issue of conflict of interest raised at the end of the previous Board meeting with respect to the review of applications from countries represented by members of the Board. The Co-Chair called on the secretariat to outline the information obtained from other similar bodies and advice from the Legal Unit of the UNEP Corporate Services Division in Nairobi on how to manage such situations, as had been requested by the Board.
35. The representative of the secretariat said that rule 23, paragraph 1, which stated that “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”, had been judged fully satisfactory from a legal point of view by the Legal Unit of the UNEP Corporate Service Division. She outlined further information obtained from the secretariat of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and from the GEF secretariat on conflict of interest mitigation practices for their formal project decision-making processes. Based on the information and advice obtained, she explained that to “be excused” from a discussion due to a potential conflict of interest could mean that the person physically left the meeting room (as had been the case at the Board’s second meeting), but could also mean that the person remained in the room to hear the discussion but did not speak on the application or participate at all in deliberations affecting the application from his or her country. A Board member from an applicant country could request the other Board member representing the region (or a Board member from another region) to speak on the application if needed. In both Multilateral Fund and GEF meetings, members from applicant countries could be present in the meeting but did not speak with respect to their own country’s application at all.
36. The Board members deliberated on whether to continue the Board’s practice of requesting that a Board member not be present in the room during the consideration of an application submitted by his or her country. Following the discussion, the Co-Chairs said that the Board would seek to arrive at the short list of prioritized projects to fund in cases where the total funding request exceeded the cash available, in the full spirit of cooperation and transparency, and that it would remain the prerogative of the Co-Chairs at the time of deliberation to decide if at any point a Board member with a potential conflict of interest would be allowed to be present in the room or not, in the light of the overall discussion. The Co-Chairs also stressed that it was most likely that the Board would repeatedly face a situation where the total funding requested exceeded the funding available, in which case the Board should work cooperatively and transparently to agree on the applications to be prioritized for approval. That also implied that applications were not to be judged through a regional approach, and that as a consequence perhaps not all regions would be covered equally based on the applications received for that round.
37. The representative of the secretariat further outlined that the head of the UNEP Corporate Services Division’s Legal Unit had also suggested that the application guidelines for all future rounds should include wording making it clear to prospective applicant Governments that if their country was represented on the Board when their application was considered, their Board member would be asked to recuse herself or himself from all deliberations and decision-making relating to that particular application.
38. Lastly, one Board member enquired how a meeting would be conducted if a Co-Chair were from a country that had submitted an application. The Executive Secretary clarified that the rationale for having two Co-Chairs was that should one come from a country that had applied for funding, the other could conduct the related session of the meeting. She also drew attention to paragraph 2 of rule 23, which stipulated that the rules of procedure made provisions for cases where there might be issues of conflict of interest beyond whether a Board member was from an applicant country, namely in case of “any potential personal and/or financial interest in any aspect of a project presented for discussion and approval by the Board”.
39. The Co-Chairs concluded the agenda item, thanking the secretariat for the advice sought and the Board for the productive discussion on an important matter.

VIII. Consideration of feedback and lessons learned from the first round for the review of the guidelines for the launch of the second round of applications to the Specific International Programme (agenda item 8)

40. The Co-Chair opened agenda item 8 and requested the secretariat to introduce the item. The representative of the secretariat said that considerable time had been set aside at the current meeting to allow the Board to review the lessons learned from the first round of applications to the Programme. Based on the discussion on the matter, the secretariat would revise the application form, the application guidelines and any processes for the second round as required. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to several documents prepared by the secretariat to aid the Board in its discussion:

(a) Document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/6, containing the feedback received on the first round, issues for consideration by the Governing Board and the secretariat's proposal for translating the agreed criteria from the first round into a framework for the review and appraisal of projects for the second round;

(b) Document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/INF/4, providing a summary of projects submitted during the first round to give an overview of the needs expressed by applicants and a sense of the kind of projects that could be expected in the second round;

(c) Document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/INF/5, providing an overview of the type of support that parties and signatories could obtain from GEF;

(d) Document UNEP/MC/COP.2/INF/16, containing the application guidelines used for the first round.

41. Expanding further on document UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/6, the representative of the secretariat noted that following the request made by the Co-Chairs to the Conference of the Parties at its second meeting, the Executive Secretary had reiterated the call for feedback on the first round of applications in her letter of 3 December 2018. Four countries had responded to the call, and their feedback had been reproduced for the Board as received. She noted that the secretariat had also put forward some suggestions, based on reflections and lessons learned, for translating the Board's agreed criteria into a concrete review and appraisal framework.

42. The following key issues were discussed by the Governing Board based on the feedback received and lessons learned from the first round:

(a) *Language*: Board members reflected on their region's language assistance needs for submitting applications. One Board member reported that several countries from her region had not been able to comply fully and in a timely manner with the application criteria set for the first round due to language constraints. Board members from two other regions felt that applications in English were not too burdensome given the detailed application guidelines made available, while another Board member expressed the hope that additional time could be granted in cases of applications by countries in his region for which English was not an official language. Following the deliberations, the Board agreed that, given the terms of reference stating that English was to be the Board's working language and in the absence of specific funding for translation or additional time available between submittals and appraisals, applications to the second round needed to reach the secretariat in English by the mandatory deadline. The Board also requested the secretariat to make the application guidelines available in English, French and Spanish. The Board further agreed that official letters from applicants could be submitted to the secretariat in any of the six official languages of the United Nations. Lastly, the Board agreed to request the secretariat to provide additional assistance during the application period (March to June 2019) to clarify requirements and respond to any other questions. The secretariat offered to provide information sessions at the upcoming Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm convention regional preparatory meetings, as well as a dedicated information session at the 2019 meetings of the conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, "clinics" in English, French and Spanish in the margins of those meetings to assist prospective applications, and webinars on request.

(b) *Complexity*: The representative of the secretariat noted that some of the feedback from parties cited concerns with the complexity of the application forms of the first round, some with difficulty filling in the logical framework and one with the construction of the theory of change (while another found it helpful). She also noted that from the secretariat's perspective, it had been challenging to match the information from the submitted application forms against the stated criteria for appraisal

for the first round. She indicated that while the logical framework is a requirement for UNEP projects, the construction of the theory of change was not mandatory, although highly recommended as best practice in project design. Some Board members also said that it was difficult for some applicants to submit all the required annexes in full (e.g., draft terms of references for consultants, description of their recruitment process, draft details and costs of all planned workshops and meetings). The representative of the secretariat explained that the details in the annexes were intended to be indicative to assist sound project planning, especially financial planning, but that the absence of a specific annex from an otherwise complete application would not necessarily constitute failure to submit a complete application. The representative of the secretariat indicated that the guidelines would state that these elements could be in draft form and indicative for the purposes of application submission. Some of the annexes, however, would need to be completed if the application were approved for funding, prior to the signing of the legal agreement required for fund dispersal. To assist applicants unfamiliar with the logical framework and results-based management, the Board requested the secretariat to pay special attention to the matter in its outreach, webinars and other training opportunities.

(c) *Budget:* The Board members discussed the feedback received on the difficulties faced by applicants in following the budget caps on some budget lines as set out in the application guidelines for the first round. The secretariat indicated that while some technical and legal issues had to be kept in mind on all budget matters, there was some flexibility for the Board considering the feedback and experiences from the first round. Based on the discussion, the Board agreed to raise the personnel and contractual services costs from 50 per cent to 65 per cent of the total budget. The Board decided to keep specialized and technical equipment costs at 10 per cent of the total budget but agreed that 25 per cent could be decided upon by the Board in exceptional cases provided that full details were annexed to the application. The Board kept the cap of 5 per cent for administrative costs, as standard on UNEP projects, and agreed that monitoring, review/evaluation and audit, as applicable, should not exceed \$15,000 in total. The Board also deliberated on eligible versus ineligible costs as they related to, for example, office equipment and set-up. Several Board members indicated that in some countries, such office equipment and set-up costs would be essential for the overall project to be an enabler for Capacity-Building. It was also pointed out that in funding provided by a large regional economic integration organization, such items could be included if proven necessary for the success of the project. It was also noted that the Executive Board of the Special Programme to support institutional strengthening had recently made provision for basic set-up costs. The Governing Board therefore decided that office equipment and set-up (including, if required, internet access) could form part of the 10 per cent cap on specialized and technical equipment or the 5 per cent administrative cap, but that the exceptional 25 per cent cap for specialized and technical costs could only be applied to very special and specialized equipment, not to basic office set-up needs.

(d) *Submission timeline:* The representative of the secretariat noted that the first round of applications had been open for 12 weeks (between 5 June and 31 August 2018). She also indicated that almost all the applications had reached the secretariat on the last day of that period. For the second round, taking the experiences of 2018 into account, the Board decided to open the applications for 14 weeks and to allow more time for the secretariat to screen and appraise the applications. The Board therefore set the mandatory deadline for submissions for the second round as Friday, 14 June 2019.

(e) *Online submissions:* The representative of the secretariat noted that the request for online submissions came from a party that had had an unfortunate experience with its email submission in 2018. She also explained that there was a move in all United Nations secretariats to switch to electronic means, and described how the Multilateral Fund had achieved the move to electronic submissions. She also commented that from the experience of 2018, it did not seem necessary to request applicants to send hard copies of their applications, but that the Board would need to decide on that, as it had been a requirement for the first round. A further item on which the secretariat required the Board's guidance was whether the letter of transmittal accompanying the application would need to be sent in hard copy given the three signatures it contained (national official in charge, Minamata national focal point and GEF operational focal point). A Co-Chair mentioned that if all submissions could be done electronically, it would save both expense and time for the submitting party. The Board subsequently agreed that all submissions were to be made electronically (Word and PDF), that (duplicate) hard copy submissions were no longer necessary, that a scanned copy of the triple-signed letter of transmittal would suffice and that it was up to the applicant country to keep a hardcopy of its full application. The original signed letter of transmittal would need to be retained by the applicant for submission to the secretariat in the event that the project was approved by the Board for funding.

(f) *Technical support:* The representative of the secretariat noted that the quality of applications in the first round had been quite varied. She requested clarification from the Board regarding whether for the second round the secretariat should provide technical support to applicants

(including through the Global Mercury Partnership, UNEP regional offices and the secretariat itself). She cautioned that applicants would need to reach out to the secretariat as soon as possible, as it would not be possible to provide such support closer to the submission deadline. Some Board members expressed concern that the secretariat could be drawn too far into the preparation of applications. The Co-Chair clarified that the role of the secretariat during the submission phase was that of a “help desk”, a role that had to be differentiated from the role of application screener and appraiser. One Board member also cautioned against requesting anything more from the secretariat, noting that it would have to undertake the appraisal work for the second round while the same staff members were busy preparing documents to meet the document submission deadlines for the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

(g) *Reporting*: The Board also discussed the issue of progress and final reporting of approved projects. It was agreed that six-month periodic reporting would need to be done in English so that the Board could review project implementation. Based on a follow-up question from a Board member, the Co-Chair noted that the role of the secretariat was to signal implementation challenges (as apparent through progress reporting) of approved projects to the Governing Board for its consideration and decision-making as required. Regarding final reports, it was decided that the main report at that time would be in English, while attachments could be submitted in the other United Nations languages.

(h) *Sample projects*: The Board cautioned against making sample projects available due to concern about duplication of project applications, noting that purpose of the Specific International Programme was to fund a specific need identified at the national level, and that those needs might well differ from one country to the next. Rather than assisting potential applicants directly, the secretariat was requested to translate, as much as possible, the specific needs identified (for example, in MIAs) into measures in the logical framework of their applications.

43. Turning to the proposed reformulated criteria for review and appraisal of the second round applications, the Co-Chair invited the secretariat to outline the proposal it had drafted based on the experience of the first round (see UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/6, p. 5 onward). The representative of the secretariat recalled that the Governing Board had agreed on 17 criteria for the overall evaluation of applications. She further recalled that while each criterion was individually valid and important, when using the criteria to review and appraise the applications, the secretariat had found it challenging to match information from the application forms against the criteria. In addition, the criteria did not readily lend themselves to helping the Board to prioritize among the projects being appraised. Therefore, for the second round, the secretariat proposed an appraisal framework where the 17 criteria were reformulated into an overall framework grouped into (a) criteria for completeness; (b) criteria for eligibility; (c) criteria for prioritization. The intent of the proposed framework was to provide the Board with more comparable information to assist in its decision-making, and especially to enable the Board to prioritize among applications when there was more funding requested than funding available.

44. One Board member raised the issue of the different letters required for an application to meet all the criteria for completeness. During the discussion that followed, it became clear that requesting multiple letters, as had been done in the first round, was too cumbersome for many applicants and did not assist the appraisal substantively. The Co-Chair summed up that the original aim of requesting the letters had been to ensure that there was evidence of coordination at the national level on the application, and that the application reached the secretariat through the correct channels. As such, the Board requested the secretariat to prepare a draft letter of transmittal for the second round that included sign-off from the official that would lead the project, the Minamata national focal point and the GEF operational focal point. That letter with its three signatures would form a mandatory part of a complete application.

45. On the criteria for eligibility, the Board agreed that applicants had to be a party to the Minamata Convention on the date of their submission or, at the latest, by the deadline of the second round. The Board also considered that as the Specific International Programme must avoid funding duplication, the information from the GEF secretariat and the Special Programme secretariat on funding that an applicant had received (or was about to receive) for Minamata-related implementation was pertinent to the overall consideration of that application in the second round.

46. Following discussion of what the secretariat had initially indicated as “additional eligibility criteria” in the above-mentioned document, the Board decided to rather term those criteria as indicating coherence with the overall aims of the Programme, and invited the secretariat to further refine their formulation in line with the respective original 17 criteria.

47. The Co-Chair then invited the Board to consider the proposed criteria for prioritization in detail. The representative of the secretariat outlined the five proposed criteria for prioritization (UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/6, pps. 8–9). One Board member noted that from her perspective, the most important criteria would be the evidence of need and the scale of potential impact. Another Board member considered the scale of potential impact to be most important, closely followed by the sustainability of impact. Following further discussion, the Board agreed to use the proposed criteria for prioritization and requested the secretariat to clearly identify them in the application guidelines so that applicants were made aware of the basis on which their submissions would be assessed.

48. As the last matter under the agenda item, the Co-Chair invited the secretariat to present the suggested workplan of the Specific International Programme for the second round (UNEP/MC/SIP.GB.3/6, p. 10). The Co-Chair noted that the Board agreed with the overall flow of the workplan, that the secretariat would launch the second round as soon as possible, that the agreed mandatory deadline for submission was 14 June 2019 and that the implementation of the first round of projects should also be reflected in the workplan.

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

49. The Co-Chair recalled that the next face-to-face meeting of the Governing Board would be focused on the approval of projects from the second round of applications. The representative of the secretariat noted that the workplan for 2019 activities included a proposal to meet in the week of 16 September 2019. She proposed Washington, D.C., or New York as potential venues for the meeting, depending on whether the Board wanted a technical or donor focus. For both cities, a host could be identified. One Board member recommended that the agenda be kept slim to allow the Board maximum time to focus on the approval of projects. Another Board member raised the issue of the duration of the meeting, suggesting that a three-day rather than two-day meeting might be required. Following the round of comments, the Co-Chair indicated a preference for Washington, D.C., as it was also the seat of GEF and so could present the Board with a good opportunity to benefit from various information exchanges. He further requested the secretariat to reach out to the GEF secretariat in that regard and to finalize the dates for the next meeting in the week identified in the workplan, based on the number of applications received by 14 June 2019.

50. The Co-Chair raised the importance of agreed feedback from the Board on the applications it would review at that meeting. That applied both to projects the Board would approve and applications that would not be approved for funding in the second round. He mentioned it as an important lesson learned from the first round, where, due to various considerations during decision-making for the approval of projects and time and capacity constraints, detailed feedback had not been provided to the unsuccessful applicants. The secretariat confirmed that for the second round, it would make every effort to get the Board's feedback at the end of its meeting in order to share it with the applicants. The secretariat fully recognized that the legitimacy of the decisions of the Board rested on communicating the Board's rationale for decision-making.

X. Any other business (agenda item 11)

51. The Co-Chairs asked the Board members to inform their respective constituents of the upcoming launch of the second round of applications, advise them to submit their applications well in advance of the deadline, invite them to make full use of the secretariat's offer of outreach and assistance during the submission period and encourage all potential donors to support the Programme.

XI. Closure of the meeting (agenda item 12)

52. The Co-Chairs declared the meeting closed at 5 p.m. on Friday, 15 February 2019, thanking the Board members for their hard work over the past two days and the secretariat for the sound, substantive preparation of the meeting. The Executive Secretary, for her part, thanked the Co-Chairs and the Governing Board for their excellent work and said that the secretariat looked forward to implementing the Board's decisions.

Appendix I

List of participants¹

GOVERNING BOARD

Present	
<p>AFRICA Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi Director Chemicals Control and Management Centre Environmental Protection Agency Starlets 1991 Street Ministries Accra Ghana Tel.: +233 30 266 4697/8 Fax: +233 30 266 2690 Email: adukumisam@yahoo.com Email: 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>WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES 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>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 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>WESTERN EUROPEAN AND OTHER STATES 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>

¹ Appendix I is presented without formal editing.

Regrets	
<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>	

SECRETARIAT OF THE MINAMATA CONVENTION ON MERCURY

<p>Ms. Rossana Silva Repetto Executive Secretary Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury International Environment House 1 Geneva, Switzerland Telephone: +41 22 917 8394 Email: rossana.silva-repetto@un.org</p> <p>Ms. Madeeha Bajwa Programme Officer for Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury International Environment House 1 Geneva, Switzerland Telephone: +41 22 917 2583 Email: madeeha.bajwa@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> <p>Mr. Eisaku Toda Senior Programme Officer Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury International Environment House 1 Geneva, Switzerland Telephone: +41 22 917 8187 E-mail: eisaku.toda@un.org</p>
---	---

Appendix II

Rules of procedure as finalized by the Governing Board at its third meeting

Rules of procedure of the Governing Board of the Specific International Programme to Support Capacity-Building and Technical Assistance

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.

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 Convention 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.

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

(h) “Members” means the 10 members of the Board, with each region nominating two members through their respective Bureau representatives.

(i) “Meeting” means meetings of the Board. 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 Board as elected in accordance with rule 9 of these rules of procedure.

III. Membership

Rule 3

1. The Board shall consist of 10 members from 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 the Parties. Thereafter, the members shall be nominated every two years by regional groups and their membership confirmed by the Conference of the Parties. To that 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 from 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 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 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 the Parties. 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 the 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 Convention shall provide secretariat services to the Programme and for the functioning of the Board.
2. The secretariat shall receive applications to the 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 on the Programme available on the website of the 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 a member 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

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

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. 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

Once 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.

³ The term "proposal", under the Conduct of Business section of these rules, refers to a point of consideration and deliberation, not to a project proposal.

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 the Board 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 the rules of procedure

Rule 30

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

Annex II

Applications received in the first round of applications (2018)*

1. Projects approved by the Governing Board in the first round			
	Country	Project number	Project title
1.	Argentina	2018/01/LAC/ARG	Capacity-Building programme for the implementation of the Minamata Convention
2.	Armenia	2018/01/CEE/ARM	Strengthening capacity to promote phasing out of mercury-added products (lamps) in Armenia
3.	Benin	2018/01/A/BEN	Improvement of the management framework for mercury-containing products and wastes
4.	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
5.	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	2018/01/AP/IRN I	Implementing of Minamata Convention on Mercury management in chlor-alkali plants in the petrochemical industry

2. Other applications considered by the Governing Board in the first round			
	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.	China	2018/01/AP/CHN	Capacity strengthening for interim storage of mercury and mercury compounds other than mercury wastes in China
3.	Nigeria	2018/01/A/NGA	Capacity strengthening for the implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury in Nigeria
4.	Panama	2018/01/LAC/PAN	Strengthening inter-institutional capacity for the implementation of the Minamata Convention
5.	Republic of 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
6.	Viet Nam	2018/01/AP/VNM	Strengthening national capacity for mercury management by developing and executing the national implementation plan for the Minamata Convention in Viet Nam
7.	Zambia	2018/01/A/ZMB	Build capacity in mercury monitoring in humans, biota and the environment

3. Applications deemed incomplete and therefore not considered by the Governing Board in the first round			
	Country	Project number	Project title
1.	Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	2018/01/LAC/BOL	Strengthening of capacities and technical assistance for the implementation of the Minamata Convention in the Plurinational State of Bolivia
2.	Cuba	2018/01/LAC/CUB	Strengthening the 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 (Islamic Republic of)	2018/01/AP/IRN II	Capacity-Building for the identification and quantification of mercury sources for a national mercury inventory
5.	Mexico	2018/01/LAC/MEX	Early implementation of the Minamata Convention in Mexico
6.	Niger	2018/01/A/NER	Reduction/elimination of the use of mercury-added products
7.	Syrian Arab Republic	2018/01/AP/SYR	Switching to the use of alternatives to the products listed in annex A of the Minamata Convention

* This list does not include two applications received after the mandatory deadline, one submitted by India and the other by Sri Lanka.

Annex III

Outcome of the second round of funding applications to the Specific International Programme Trust Fund of the Minamata Convention on Mercury for 2019

1. The Governing Board of the Specific International Programme Trust Fund of the Minamata Convention on Mercury met from 18 to 20 September 2019 in Washington, D.C. to consider the 20 applications received during the second round.
2. On the basis of detailed appraisals prepared by the secretariat of the Minamata Convention in consultation with the secretariats of the Global Environment Facility, the Special Programme and the Global Mercury Partnership, the applications were assessed in the light of the coherence and prioritization criteria agreed on by the Governing Board. The Board gave in-depth consideration to each application.
3. The Board approved 10 applications, totalling \$1,974,164, for second-round funding from the Specific Trust Fund to support Capacity-Building and technical assistance in support of the implementation of States' obligations under the Minamata Convention. The applications approved for funding in the second round are listed in table 1.
4. The Board declined to approve second-round funding for the applications in table 2 for one or more of the following reasons:
 - Activities were not described in line with the obligations of the Convention.
 - Activities were not described in line with the mandate of the Specific International Programme.
 - Activities had been covered under existing GEF projects and programmes and therefore presented the risk of duplication.
 - Activities could be better covered under GEF projects and programmes planned or under development.
 - Activities were not described as complementing existing GEF projects or programmes.
 - Descriptions, log frames and budgets require revision, and in some cases redesign, in line with the guidelines for application to the Specific International Programme.
 - The Programme cannot fund technology substitutions.
 - The application did not sufficiently demonstrate potential impact, sustainability, evidence of need, national ownership or innovation.
5. The Board also determined that in the future more consideration could be given to communality of activities through regional and sub-regional endeavours.
6. Finally, Guyana and Madagascar were informed that their applications had not been considered by the Board because they had been received after the mandatory deadline.

Table 1
Applications approved for funding in the second round

	Country	Project number	Project title	Project budget (US\$)
1.	Antigua and Barbuda	2019/02/LAC/ATG	Facilitating Capacity-Building with technical assistance and technology transfer for managing mercury in the Caribbean	210,000
2.	Ecuador	2019/02/LAC/ECU	Project to strengthen capacities in the implementation of the Minamata Convention in Ecuador	250,000
3.	Ghana	2019/02/A/GHA	Strengthening Ghana's health sector for the implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury	250,000
4.	Indonesia	2019/02/AP/IDO	Improving health risk control of mercury exposure in artisanal and small-scale gold mining and surrounding areas by developing the "participatory approach" model	140,340
5.	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	2019/02/AP/IRA	Capacity-Building for effective implementation of the Minamata Convention focusing on mercury inventory	149,400
6.	Moldova (Republic of)	2019/02/CEE/IRA	Support to post-ratification of the Minamata Convention to the Republic of Moldova by building phase-down capacities and reducing risks associated with mercury	219,765
7.	Nigeria	2019/02/A/NIG	Capacity strengthening for the implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury in Nigeria	250,000
8.	Peru	2019/02/LAC/PER	Strengthening capacities to control emissions and releases of mercury in Peru	126,000
9.	Sri Lanka	2019/02/AP/SRL	Strengthening national capacity for phasing out mercury added products and environmentally sound mercury containing waste management in Sri Lanka	178,659
10.	Zambia	2019/02/A/ZAM	To strengthen the institutional capacity for Zambia to implement the obligations of the Minamata Convention by reducing the presence of mercury in vulnerable populations as provided for under articles 16 and 18	200,000
	Total			1,974,164

Table 2
Applications not approved for funding in the second round

	Country	Project number	Project title	Project budget (US\$)
1.	Botswana	2019/01/A/BTW	Strengthening capacity in implementation of the Minamata Convention	249,929
2.	Burkina Faso	2019/01/LAC/DRP	Strengthening of the legal and institutional frameworks for the sound management of mercury-added products in Burkina Faso	250,000
3.	Dominican Republic	2019/01/LAC/DRP	Enabling activities for the development of the nation plan for mercury management	250,000
4.	Eswatini	2019/01/A/ESW	Enhancing national capacities to facilitate Eswatini's transition from use of mercury added products to safer alternatives	250,000
5.	Guinea	2019/01/A/GUN	Improving legal and institutional frameworks and technical capacity building for the management of mercury-containing products	250,000
6.	Mongolia	2019/01/AP/MON	Strengthening the national capacity to achieve the obligations under the Minamata Convention	250,000
7.	Niger	2019/01/A/NGR	Strengthening of the regulatory, institutional and technical frameworks for the sound management of mercury-added products	250,000
8.	Syrian Arab Republic	2019/01/AP/SYR	Switch to the use of alternatives to the products listed in annex A of the Minamata Convention	111,000
9.	Togo	2019/01/A/TOG	Phasing out the import and reducing the use of mercury-added products	250,000
10.	Uganda	2019/01/A/UGA	Strengthening institutional and artisanal and small-scale miners' capacity in reducing mercury use and emissions at artisanal and small-scale gold mining sites in Uganda	250,000