



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

IPEN's 2010 General Assembly was held in Almaty, Kazakhstan from October 18-22. It was the first time in the history of IPEN when its General Assembly was hosted by an Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asian (EECCA) country. With simultaneous Russian-English translation throughout the week, IPEN was able to deepen the ties with and knowledge about IPENers from the EECCA region, and the challenges they face today. Moreover, the General Assembly provided guidance for future activities related to new POPs, lead in paint, the mercury treaty, e-waste and monitoring chemicals in products and communities.

The IPEN GA was attended by 60 people from 31 countries including 51 IPEN POs and representatives of the United Nations Development Programme's Small Grants Programme (UNDP SGP) from Africa, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Kirgizstan.

The goal of the IPEN GA was to: strengthen relationships among IPEN colleagues; share experience and knowledge on priority and emerging chemicals safety issues; and highlight opportunities for future IPEN action.

Meeting participants were updated on IPEN international policy developments, including IPEN campaigns such as the Mercury-Free campaign and Eliminate Lead from Paint Campaign, as well as work related to Chemicals in Products, New POPs, and Stockholm Convention effectiveness evaluation / POPs monitoring. IPEN POs received an opportunity to share their views on SAICM implementation in their countries, nanotechnology issues, NGO involvement in projects under the UNDP SGP, public participation in international fora on chemical safety, and the importance of PRTR development as a valuable information tool on chemicals emission and release.

IPEN participants shared their concerns regarding such hot issues as new POPs; electronic waste; toxic chemicals in consumer goods (for example, children's products); hot spots and disposal; and biomonitoring. New ideas were raised concerning the negotiations on the global mercury treaty. IPENers emphasized the need to focus on issues such as the management of mercury containing lamp waste, incineration of mercury containing waste, mercury contaminated sites, and the need to substitute mercury in consumer products and promote alternatives and substitutions.

2011 Action Items include:

- Campaigning on New POPs: Addressing the loopholes of the 9 new POPs added in 2009, and promoting the addition of new POPs. This includes developing activities around Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs) recycling, applying the San Antonio Statement on BFRs as a policy tool, and advancing alternatives to POPs (*ie* POPs-free products);
- Endosulfan Action: Together with leaders from PAN, IPEN developed initial concepts for action leading up to and at COP5 in April 2011;
- Promoting the Mercury-Free Campaign: Several IPENers have deep experience in mercury pollution issues at their local or national level, and are interested in Mercury-Free activities to apply their experience and perspective to the IPEN mercury treaty positions. The release of the IPEN Mercury Book is of critical importance as well as the preparation work for INC2 in January 2011;
- Expanding the Eliminate Lead from Paint Campaign: The Eliminate Lead from Paint Campaign currently encompasses 14 countries, and there is a goal to provide monthly updates on the progress in these countries, plus develop a multi-year project to expand the number of countries where the Campaign is active;
- SAICM Chemicals in Products Process: A draft report/study on information available for chemicals in products- specifically: building materials, toys, electronics and textiles- will be released in December and then finalized in March 2011. IPEN will need to comment on the report and possibly highlight gaps by the August 2011 SAICM Global Meeting;
- SAICM E-waste Process: IPEN will need to ensure the Regional SAICM Statements on E-waste are fully addressed in the March 2011 E-waste Workshop. Both this process and the Chemicals in Products process may influence the pending 2011 IPEN International Chemicals in Products Report;
- BioMonitoring: IPEN's Community Monitoring Working Group will focus on the WHO release of the POPs in breastmilk report, and aim to integrate IPEN activities in relationship to the report release and COP5;
- Dioxin: The Dioxin Working Group will focus on a non-combustion technology fact sheet, cement kiln technical guidelines, Low POPs content Report and fly ash sampling;
- Generate Information/Data on Chemicals in Products: IPEN is acquiring a device (an XRF Analyzer) that can provide instant data related to POPs type substances and heavy metals in products. In 2011 IPEN will conduct a sampling study/survey and then produce a report on products containing toxic substances. In brief, IPEN plans to take "Right-to-know" into our own hands by using the XRF Device; and empowering groups with information about toxic substances in their local markets;
- Developing the Nano Working Group: The Nano Working Group will enter a "base building exercise" focusing on developing information tools to educate and orient NGOs about the Nano issues and concerns;
- Small Grants Program & IPEN Partnership: As SGP is the largest funder for NGO POPs projects in Developing/EIT countries, SGP's effectiveness to support POPs projects is important to IPEN. At the meeting, SGP representatives announced that they aim to expand their work beyond POPs and

into Sound Chemicals Management. Moreover, in every country IPENers were very interested in POPs issues but only a few have received support from SGP. The need to improve cooperation between SGP national coordinators and IPEN Hubs was raised. There was discussion of a new IPEN-UNDP SGP communiqué, which would help to find new solutions on how to cooperate with the SGP. So far NGOs face big difficulties trying to access this program on POPs, and we hope to avoid such problems if the SGP mission is to broaden.

IPEN GA-2010 was a very successful meeting. Positive feedback received from IPEN POs showed the importance of such events and the need to meet in person and share views, ideas, knowledge and experience for the future. This year the IPEN GA was a unique opportunity for IPEN EECCA POs to present main outcomes of their projects, and collect comments and ideas for the next steps.

Below please find a detailed narrative report from the IPEN GA. All presentations are available upon request to [ipen@ipen.org](mailto:ipen@ipen.org).

## REPORT-BACK: Days 1-5 Narrative

---

### [Day One, 18 October, 2010](#)



The first day of the IPEN General Assembly, began with a "Welcome to Almaty" from Lidia Astanina of the organization "Greenwomen" Public Association/ Environmental News Agency. Greenwomen is based in Almaty and was indispensable as the local organizer and host of the Assembly.

*Lidia Astanina and Svetlana Dylevskaya from "Greenwomen"*

IPEN Co-Chair Olga Speranskaya opened the meeting with an orientation on the evolution of the chemical safety movement in the Eastern Europe, Caucasus & Central Asian (EECCA) region. She emphasized the role of IPEN in strengthening the capacity of the EECCA NGOs and their involvement into international fora on chemicals.

Thereafter, the overall meeting agenda/program was reviewed and adopted.

Next IPEN International Coordinator (IC) Björn Beeler guided the Assembly through introductions of all participants. In total there were 51 participants from 43 NGOs in 31 countries (later in the week some

*Olga Speranskaya and Björn Beeler*



United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Small Grants Programme representatives joined the meeting and the total participants increased to approximately 60). Simultaneous translation Russian-English was provided to facilitate communication among the participants. Unfortunately, numerous IPEN representatives were unable to attend due to visa issues within the Kazakh government.



*Far left: Jonida Mamaj (EDEN Centre, Albania), Zara Nabizade (Ruzgar, Azerbaijan), Abdelhay Sghaier (AREMEDD, Tunisia), and Elena Zubcov (ECOTOX, Moldova) in the background*

*Middle left: Mohamed El Banna (Day Hospital, Egypt)*

*Middle right: Imogen Ingram (Island Sustainability Alliance, Cook Islands)*

*Far right: Gia Sopadze (Ecovision, Georgia), with Jitka Strakova (Arnika, Czech Republic) in the background*

After introductions were completed, IPEN IC Björn gave a brief overview and update about IPEN's composition, work-areas and ongoing activities, and how IPENers can get more involved in IPEN's structure activities.

Björn also gave an overview of the SAICM Global Outreach Campaign, and IPEN's follow-up response, the development and launch of the International SAICM Implementation Program (ISIP).



*Björn Beeler (IPEN IC)*

### POPs Policy Updates

This session included a series of short presentations, to provide an overview and update on specific international policy processes. More in-depth/detailed presentations and discussions on international policy work were organized for DAY 3. Presentations included:

#### New POPs: Pam Miller (ACAT, US)

*Pam spoke about the recent POPs Review Committee (POPRC) meeting that just culminated in Geneva, and where various chemicals are in the review process (for example, in the meeting the Committee agreed to adopt the Risk Management Evaluation for endosulfan and recommend to the COP that it be listed under Annex A with time limited exemptions to be negotiated at the COP).*

#### Dioxin: Jindrich Petrlík (ARNIKA, Czech Republic)

*Jindrich talked about the Dioxin Toolkit, which will hopefully be updated by COP5, and introduced the new member (Jitka Strakova) of the Dioxin Working Group coordination team.*

#### Monitoring: Sharyle Patton (Commonweal, US)

*Sharyle talked about recent work on breastmilk biomonitoring, including a project that was carried out with numerous IPEN Participating Organizations around the world.*



*David Azoulay*



*Pam Miller and Alex Caterbow*



*Joe DiGangi*

## SAICM Policy Updates

The following SAICM policy updates were presented/discussed:

### Nanotechnology: David Azoulay (CIEL, Switzerland)

*David reviewed what nanotechnology is and the resolution about it that was adopted at ICCM2. He mentioned that other resolutions were more recently adopted at various regional SAICM meetings, talked about an upcoming nano workshop that is scheduled for 2011, and a report on activities that should be prepared for ICCM3.*

### Chemicals in Products: Olga Speranskaya (Eco-Accord/IPEN, Russia)

*Olga talked about the UNEP-led Chemicals in Products (CiP) Project, what its mandate is, who are involved and how NGOs can participate. Currently there is a study underway about information systems available for toys, construction material, electronics and textiles. In March the study will be released at the SAICM CiP meeting. Prior to the release, NGOs can be involved by commenting on the drafts.*

### E-waste: Joe DiGangi (IPEN, US)

*Joe talked about regional government e-waste resolutions that were adopted at various regional SAICM meetings (Asia-Pacific, CEE, Africa & GRULAC) and an upcoming e-waste meeting that is scheduled for March 2011, in Vienna, Austria. The SAICM e-waste process offers a unique opportunity to place key e-waste concerns on the agenda, as the Basel Convention has proven ineffective and unable to address the subject.*

### Lead in Paint: Jack Weinberg (IPEN, US)

*Jack talked about the Global Alliance (hosted by UNEP and WHO) on Lead in Paint and the desire to engage more NGOs in the Campaign to remove lead from paint. It took one year for the first Partnership/Alliance meeting to take place in May 2010, and it has since become clear that defining what is or is not "lead free" is going to be a challenge.*

### Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) Rio+20: Alex Caterbow (WECF, Germany)

*SAICM is identified as the policy framework in which to address the Development and Chemical Safety Agenda. Alex talked about IPEN and WECF's participation in CSD-18 in New York in May, how chemicals are currently a focus of the CSD, and how groups can become involved. It was not clear if or how the CSD process may or may not fit into the Rio+20 process; nor was it clear whether IPEN should invest in the CSD Regional Information Meetings (CSD RIMs). Currently Rio+20 prep is defined within the two UN frames of either Green Economy and International Environmental Governance.*

Leveraging International Policy to Contribute to National Chemical Policy & NGO Engagement: The skillshare sessions began with introductory presentations about how to use international policy to support NGO engagement in national chemical policy from Eugeny Lobanov (Belarus experience) and Lidia Astanina (Kazakhstan experience).

Eugeny highlighted that in Belarus the Government for the first time opened up financial resources for NGOs to access to conduct chemical safety activities. In part the SAICM process helped create such a mechanism, noting more and more NGOs are becoming active in the national chemical policy process in Belarus.



*Eugeny Lobanov, Center of Environmental Solutions, Belarus*

Lidia described the role played by NGOs in the implementation of SAICM in Kazakhstan. She briefly presented the National NGOs Action Plan on SAICM implementation developed by Greenwomen, which was circulated to all stakeholders and discussed at the Asia-Pacific Ministerial Conference held in Astana from September 27-October 2, 2010.

---

## [Day Two, 19 October, 2010](#)

Day Two focused on substantive matters, with presentations on various priority themes from IPENers around the world.

Session 1 focused on Hot Spots: POPs Waste, Obsolete Stockpiles & PCBs. The 3 panel speakers presented their NGO's experiences on hot spot identification, registration and national inventory efforts and safe disposal.

Presenters:

Obsolete Stockpiles- Elena Manvelyan (Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment)

PCB Hot Spots- Dmitry Levashov ("ECO-SPES", Russia)

Obsolete Stockpiles- Dilbar Zaynutdinova (Armon, Uzbekistan)

In addition, Nurlan Yeskendirov from the UNDP in Kazakhstan spoke about a UNDP project on PCBs.



*Nurlan Yeskendirov (Kazakhstan), Dmitry Levashov (Russia), Dilbar Zaynutdinova (Uzbekistan), Elena Manvelyan (Armenia)*

Session 2 focused on generating data (monitoring and sampling), and we heard the speakers talk about their NGO's experiences related to monitoring/sampling fish, food and/or toxins in the body.

Presenters:

Food/pesticide Monitoring- Elena Vasilyeva (Volgograd-Ecopress, Russia)

Arctic Monitoring- Pam Miller (Alaska Community Action on Toxics, US)

Human Monitoring- Manana Juruli (Georgian Assoc. of Environmental & Biological Monitoring)



*Elena Vasilyeva (Russia), Pam Miller (US), Manana Juruli (Georgia)*

At the end of this session, Oleg Segeyev (*pictured at right*) from Chapaevsk Medical Association in Russia also joined the panel to share some additional information about biomonitoring procedures.



Session 3 focused on chemicals in products and the four panelists presented their NGO's experiences on consumer products, toys and heavy metals awareness-raising.

Presenters:

Consumer Products/Toxics Patrol- Manny Calonzo (GAIA/EcoWaste Coalition, Philippines)

Medical Devices- Fernando Bejarano (CAATA, Mexico)

E-waste- Penchom Saetang (EARTH, Thailand)

BPA in Russian Children and Food Containers- Oleg Sergeyev (Chapaevsk Medical Association, Russia)

Toys- Olga Tsygulyova (Mama-86, Ukraine)



*Left photo: Fernando Bejarano & Maria Eugenia Acosta, CAATA/RAPAM, Mexico*

*Right photo: Penchom Saetang, EARTH, Thailand and Manny Calonzo, GAIA/EcoWaste, Philippines*

For Session 4, we discussed POPs pesticide bans and efforts to address highly hazardous pesticides. The speakers focused on their NGO's experiences phasing out hazardous pesticide and promoting alternatives.

Presenters:

FAO Code of Conduct- Sarojeni Rengam (Pesticide Action Network Asia and Pacific, Malaysia)

Priority Pesticide Bans- Meriel Watts (Pesticide Action Network Aotearoa, New Zealand)

Illegal Trade- Muazama Burkhanova (Foundation to Support Civil Initiatives, Tajikistan)



*Muazama Burkhanova (Tajikistan), Sarojeni Rengam (Malaysia), Meriel Watts (New Zealand)*

At the conclusion of Day 2, Tom Longley (*pictured at right*) from the organization Tactical Tech gave a brief introduction to his organization and a short talk about communication skills. He would also give a longer presentation and workshop about this later in the week.

Following Tom's presentation, the participants left the hotel for a group dinner at a restaurant about 20 minutes away.







*(Left –right) Alex Caterbow, Pam Miller, Imogen Ingram, Alan Watson.....Bjorn Beeler, Fernando Bejarano, María Eugenia Azosta*



*Khurshed Kholov, Muratbek Koshoev, Oleg Pecheniuk, Gia Sopadze, Dmitry Levashov--Elena Kolpakova, Elena Manvelyan, Elena Zubcov, Igor Prokofyev*



*Lisette van Vliet, Sharyle Patton, Sarojeni Rengam, Meriel Watts*



*Scott Clark, Zuleica Nycz, Jindrich Petrlik, Penchom Saetang, Jitka Strakova..... Joe DiGangi, David Azoulay, Ram Charitra Sah, Tom Longley, Piyush Mohapatra*



*Naji Kodeih, Zargalam Nabizade, Dilbar Zaynutdinova, Manana Juruli, Muazama Burkhanova, Abdelhay Sghaier*

Upon returning to the hotel, many of the participants joined Gergely Simon (Clean Air Action Group, Hungary) for a presentation and question/answer session about the disastrous toxic flood that recently occurred in Hungary.

Gergely (*pictured at right*) has been doing a lot of work on the flood lately and has participated in many news reports about it, and had a lot of interesting information for the group.



*Photo from Hungary that shows the wall that collapsed, releasing the toxic mud. Here you can see the size of the devastation (as compared to trucks at the bottom of the photo)*

---

### [Day Three, 20 October, 2010](#)

Day Three was an information session on emerging chemical safety issues and IPEN initiatives. This included:



#### Info Session 1:

Brominated Flame Retardants (BFRs), Products, Waste and the POPs Treaty.

This session, presented by Alan Watson (IPEN Scientific Advisor / Public Interest Consultants, Wales), focused on the developments relating to penta and Octa BDE (as they were listed as POPs at COP4) and the challenges of controlling these POPs in products.

This was followed by a question and answer session, as well as strategizing amongst the group.

Alan (*pictured above left*) felt that the following actions on BFRs are essential:

- COP5 must adopt the POPs Review Committee (POPRC) recommendations that recycling of materials containing PBDE should be rapidly stopped. This would reverse the resolution from the last COP when an exemption allowing recycling of these POPs was granted. At the POPRC meeting the week before the General Assembly, recommendations had also included requirements for countries to establish national control schemes to deal with waste substances that contain these BFRs, including effective screening and separation system. If these systems are not rapidly implemented, the POP-BDE will end up being diluted into other products.
- There are more than a million tonnes of DecaBDE in the environment yet this BFR degrades into Penta-BDE. Chemicals that produce POPs need to be regulated by the Stockholm Convention
- Delays on setting a low POPs limit should be avoided (but we need to ensure that any limits are protective – unlike the current 'provisional' limits for other POPs which are set too high).

He also noted the following very desirable actions:

- Restriction of the newer BFRs which are being used to replace PBDE.
- The listing in Annex C of PBDD/DF

**Consideration:** The POPRC has stated that countries that are “in a position to do so” should recommend to the COP that recycling materials with BFRs in them be stopped. However, this means that countries could just say that they are not in a position to do so.

**Action item:** IPENers should put countries under intense pressure to recommend this. We have a pressure point where poor countries can ask if rich countries will meet their obligations under the Convention.

**Contact point for this action:** If you are in a position to talk to your government delegates about this recommendation, please contact: [ipen@ipen.org](mailto:ipen@ipen.org)

**Consideration-** The “San Antonio Statement” that has recently been circulated over the IPEN listserv and was published in Environmental Health Perspectives talks about thinking about BFRs as a class of chemicals.

**Action item:** This statement is a good tool for us. It should be shared with government delegates and circulated to additional scientists to garner further support. It is so far available in English, Russian, Spanish and Chinese (see: <http://ipen.org/ipenweb/poprc/san%20antonio%20statement.html>)

**Contact point for this action:** If you are available to voluntarily translate the San Antonio Statement into additional languages, and/or if you need guidance about how to share the Statement, please contact: [ipen@ipen.org](mailto:ipen@ipen.org)

**Consideration:** The group also discussed the very important need to be able to find a way to explain the problems with BFRs in a way that is accessible to a wide audience.

**Action item:** There is a need to develop educational materials about BFRs that are very simple and easy to understand.

**Contact point for this action:** If you would like to be part of a team that develops these materials, please contact: IPEN IC [bjornbeeler@ipen.org](mailto:bjornbeeler@ipen.org) & Dioxin WG Coordinator Jitka Straková ([jitka.strakova@arnika.org](mailto:jitka.strakova@arnika.org))

**Consideration:** Actions on BFRs at COP5 are necessary and needed. In addition to having prepared materials, we could “roll out the carpet (using a carpet with recycled BFRs within)” or something similar to draw attention.

**Action item:** Ideas and participation are needed to coordinate action at COP5 on this subject.

**Contact point for this action:** If you would like to be part of a team that coordinates action for COP5, please contact: IPEN IC [bjornbeeler@ipen.org](mailto:bjornbeeler@ipen.org) & Dioxin WG Coordinator Jitka Straková ([jitka.strakova@arnika.org](mailto:jitka.strakova@arnika.org))

### Info Session 2:



### XRF Device: Generating Data on Chemicals in Products

This session generated a lot of excitement. It introduced a new technology that IPEN is acquiring, an XRF Analyzer Device. The presenter, Joe DiGangi, talked about how the XRF can be used to measure the level of different elements and chemicals in products, and how NGOs have used the device to boost chemicals in products campaigns. Joe highlighted the successes of many NGO campaigns

in the US, as the device provides data about chemicals in products within seconds.

This was followed by a question and answer session, as well as strategizing amongst the group.

There were a lot of questions, such as:

Q- Is it dangerous?

A- An x-ray is generated when you turn the device on. You cannot point it at yourself; that would be dangerous. But there is no radiation from behind.

Q- How is it calibrated?

A- The device is calibrated before you measure. It is calibrated using known standards

Q- Is it compatible with lab results?

A- The compatibility is actually quite good. There is a very good correspondence between the gun and lab results. US regulatory agencies use the device regularly.

Q- Do the results concern only the superficial area or the volume? How far does the ray penetrate?

A- You're measuring primarily the first two millimeters. You're not getting a homogenous sample, you're only getting the surface.

Q- How does it measure concentration?

A- The concentration is presumably measured by the degree of fluorescence. You are measuring the difference in energy between the inner and outer orbital of an atom. In addition, each element has its own signature, or energy, which is how the gun tells the difference.

Q- Can the device measure dust or only products?

A- Yes, elements in dust can be measured

Q- Is there an internal memory within the device to transfer results into a computer?

A- Yes

Joe explained that you can also program into the device a particular regulatory limit (i.e. the European Union's Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoHS) regulations limits), and the device will just tell you if the item it is testing “passes” or “fails.” This is a very clear way to explain to the public that something is above or below a particular limit.

There was some discussion about what kinds of materials could be tested (for example, toys) and whether or not certain things (for example, heavy metals in cement, coal ash) have been tested in the past.

Some participants noted that in their countries an obligatory condition is to carry out tests in licensed labs. Joe noted that in that case, the device could be useful for determining which items contain problematic components, and could help us to be more efficient in our own testing.

Björn outlined three different frames of consideration for the XRF device:

1st option: We could collect products from countries and ship them to the US (where the device will be housed) to test them

2nd option: We could hold a side event at COP5 using the device

3rd: Joe could travel to different countries around the world and do testing in different countries

These options are all possible and there was a very active discussion about what could be tested, what could be done, and important considerations to keep in mind (whichever action we decide upon), such as:

- Prioritizing products that are commonly used;
- Engaging other sectors on campaigns and/or results dissemination;
- Possibly including some food products, and collaborating with consumer associations and state standards agencies;
- Possibly aiming to expose double standards of industries;
- Including the economic aspect;
- Possibly using the device to identify counterfeit goods;
- How its use can help us hit policy targets and get media pick up; and
- Who we are targeting with the results.

The point was also raised that how we decide to communicate any results of testing will be extremely important.

**Consideration:** Two informal break-out groups were formed in relation to the XRF device and potential future work. One would address BFR waste and one would address chemicals in toys. They will explore initial activities in 2011, and how to generate relevant data from developing countries to highlight at the national and international levels.

**Action item:** If you are interested in participating in either of these groups, get in touch.

**Contact point for this action:** IPEN IC, [BjornBeeler@ipen.org](mailto:BjornBeeler@ipen.org)

### Info Session 3:

#### Nanotechnology

David Azoulay hosted this session, which focused on the emerging discussion on nanotechnology, highlighting the environmental health and consumer issues of concern, as well as the related international policy areas. He reminded participants that IPEN hosts a Nano Working Group and all that are interested are welcome to join (send email to David [dazoulay@ciel.org](mailto:dazoulay@ciel.org) or Jennifer [jenniferfederico@ipen.org](mailto:jenniferfederico@ipen.org)).

David noted that mandatory registers for nano do not exist and right now it is just about voluntary initiatives. He spoke about the "end of life" issue as it pertains to nano and said that it is a huge issue and they are trying to raise it in every single related forum. He noted that as far as nano materials breaking down some problematic chemical compounds, this is a benefit, but we do not yet know if we will be

breaking it down into something more dangerous. He stressed that fighting against something that has good and bad sides is very difficult.

#### Info Session 4:

### Heavy Metals: Lead & Mercury

We then went on to discuss heavy metals issues, specifically lead and mercury.



#### Info Session 4a

### Lead Paint: Children First, Eliminate Lead Paint

Scott Clark, from the University of Cincinnati in the U.S., presented this session about the problem of lead in paint, highlighted IPEN's Eliminate Lead from Paint Campaign ([http://ipen.org/ipenweb/work/lead/lead\\_paint.html](http://ipen.org/ipenweb/work/lead/lead_paint.html)), and gave examples of progress at the national level.

*Scott Clark (left) and Jack Weinberg (right)*



Both Jack Weinberg (IPEN Senior Advisor) and Scott Clark are involved in the UNEP/WHO Global Alliance to Eliminate Lead in Paint Committee, as sub-committee Co-Chairs. They see the Global Alliance as a key venue to promote lead-free paint policy initiatives at the global level.

The discussion included calls to expand the campaign into additional countries, and catalyze or advance lead-free paint policies at the national level.

#### Info Session 4b:

### Mercury Treaty & Mercury Free Campaign



This training session focused on the Mercury Treaty (presented by Joe DiGangi) and IPEN's Mercury-Free Campaign (presented by Jan Samanek, Arnika, Czech Republic). Joe talked about what an international treaty on mercury could mean, and then discussed the *IPEN Views on a Global Mercury Treaty* document ([http://www.ipen.org/ipenweb/work/mercury/mercury\\_treaty\\_report\\_r5.pdf](http://www.ipen.org/ipenweb/work/mercury/mercury_treaty_report_r5.pdf)).

Additionally, information was shared about IPEN's participation in different mercury partnerships that are a result of the treaty negotiations. Björn noted that in the run-up to the Mercury INC2, IPEN has organized leads for specific themes: air (Ragini from Toxics Link, India), waste (Shahriar, ESDO, Bangladesh), and small scale gold mining (Yuyun, Balifokus, Indonesia).

In the discussion that followed, a number of IPENers shared their national and local work on mercury, which ranges from contaminated sites to addressing industrial uses and releases. There was a lot of interest in the topic, noting there is a need for additional orientation in understanding how the mercury treaty process could be of assistance to addressing NGOs' local and national needs. The discussion re-affirmed the need for the IPEN Mercury Free campaign, and the Campaign's objectives.

Recognizing the national and international desire to address the need for stronger mercury pollution policies, there was a discussion about the need for IPEN to expand its technical capacity to address the mercury treaty.

Also discussed was a new educational booklet that IPEN has just completed: *An NGO Guide to Mercury Pollution*. This is now posted on IPEN's website. Translations of the booklet from English into additional languages are underway. Currently Russian, Spanish and Arabic are pending.



Jan (*pictured at left*) then talked about IPEN's Mercury-Free Campaign (<http://www.ipen.org/hgfree/#booklet>), highlighting work that's been done around the world to promote the Campaign, and noting how NGOs can become involved.

**Action item:** If your NGO is doing work on mercury, please tell the Heavy Metals Working Group coordinator about your work so that he can involve you in the Campaign and also add your work to our global map.

**Contact point for this action:** Jan Samanek ([jan.samanek@arnika.org](mailto:jan.samanek@arnika.org))

---

#### [Day Four, 21 October, 2010](#)

### Strategic Themes & Action Planning

The proposed fieldtrip to an obsolete stockpile in the hills outside Almaty was canceled to do rain and logistical challenges. Therefore Day Four focused on Strategic Issues and Action Planning. During organized break-out groups, the participants were asked to consider the following:

Timeline: What immediate Events or Deadlines are relevant to this Item/Theme?

Activities: What activities should be considered for development?

The break-out group themes were:

- Chemicals in Products (led by Olga Speranskaya)
- Lead in Paint Campaign (led by Jack Weinberg)
- Mercury-Free Campaign (led by Jan Samanek)
- Monitoring (led by Sharyle Patton)
- Dioxin (led by Jindrich Petrlik)
- Nanotechnology (led by David Azoulay)

The reports below were compiled following the break-out sessions:

#### [Chemicals in Products \(CiP\)](#)

IPENers are interested in the issue of chemicals in products and identified several sectors of concern including children's products, detergents, paint, building materials, textiles, etc.

Interest in all four sectors identified in the frame of SAICM CiP project (building materials, textiles, toys and electronics) was expressed by all participants.

It was noted that there are two processes currently underway – the international SAICM CiP Project and national campaigns focused on identification and elimination of toxic chemicals in consumer products.

If we want to be involved in the international SAICM CiP process, we need to be aware of and meet certain deadlines:

10 December, 2010 (CiP expert meeting attended by institutions responsible for the development of four case studies, namely toys, electronics (cell phones and computers), building materials and textiles)

March, 2011 (international CiP workshop where case studies will be presented and draft recommendations for the OEWG and ICCM3 will be developed)

August, 2011 (SAICM OEWG (ICCM-3 Prep) meeting)

May 2012 (ICCM-3)

Under these four sectors people think that the toy sector is going to generate the most interest among stakeholders and is the most accessible.

All people agreed that we could limit chemical data with chemicals under the Stockholm convention as well as those which are under the capacity of the XRF device (mercury, lead, cadmium, BFRs).

People are interested in getting information on what toxics are in products, information on health risks, alternatives, and safe disposal of products.

### TOYS

There was a proposal to have a Safe Toys Coalition as a focal point for exchanging information on toys. The following information is required by NGOs: toxics in toys, producers making toxic toys, unidentified toys on the market.

It was noted that if we generated information on toys via XRF we would try to identify types of toys that we could compare from different countries and regions focusing on identifying any double standards concerning what chemicals are in the toys.

The following activity for an international safe toy campaign was identified:

1. Use the German Toy Fair as the place for an actual start of the international safe toy campaign between IPEN in partnership with WECF using the XRF device.
2. Information will be analysed and information materials will be prepared for further OEWG in August as well as for the recommendations for the ICCM-3

### BUILDING SECTOR

Suggestions were made to try to get the US NGO (Healthy Building Network) as a focal point for building products.

### ELECTRONICS

IPENers suggested that Manny Calonzo (GAIA/ EcoWaste Coalition, Philippines) and Penchom Saetang (EARTH, Thailand) start direct communication with Chemsec regarding chemicals in cell phones and computers. IPENers provided some information for the Questionnaire on electronics suggested by Chemsec.

### NATIONAL CAMPAIGNS

The following ideas for chemicals in products national campaigns were identified:



1. Monitor the collection and waste disposal of electronics; create information campaigns on the toxicity of electronics for retailers, schools, governmental agencies;
2. Create a database of good and bad producers of toys;
3. Create a list of bad and good toys as an alternative;
4. Identify environmentally safe (organic) toy producers and invite them to a partnership;
5. Create a database of toxic toys and other children's products including construction materials;
6. Monitor state procurement and the whole system of purchase;
7. Formulate political demands to eliminate toxic chemicals in consumer products.
8. .

### Lead in Paint Campaign

The General Assembly meeting and action planning session focused on the widespread problem of lead in paint, and on next steps for IPEN's Eliminate Lead from Paint Campaign.

In the session, it was agreed to aim to expand the campaign into 50 additional countries, thus sampling more paint and further raising awareness about the issue. It was agreed that IPENers already engaged in the Campaign should send very brief monthly updates to the Heavy Metals Working Group Coordinator (Jan Samanek) on situations in their countries. These updates should be shared among participants of the Campaign via e-mails and on the Campaign website. It was also agreed that a preliminary set of contacts for NGOs that might be included in the Campaign will be developed and an invitation will be sent to them. Possible additional sources of funding to further the Campaign were also briefly discussed.

If your NGO would like to join the Campaign, and has either existing or emerging work on lead in paint, please inform Jan ([jan.samanek@arnika.org](mailto:jan.samanek@arnika.org)) so we can incorporate your work into the website.

### Mercury-Free Campaign

The mercury meeting and action planning sessions at the General Assembly focused on educating and orienting participants on the mercury issues including the Mercury Treaty process. There was significant interest expressed and deep experience illustrated among many of the participants, but there was a gap in linking the local/national expertise and experience into our international Mercury Treaty efforts. This underscored the importance of IPEN's Mercury-Free Campaign objective to build and broaden our base of engaged NGOs. It also emphasized the need to mobilize additional resources and develop/implement mechanisms to help IPENers with local and national concerns about mercury threats understand how to contribute to the development of the Mercury Treaty at the international level.

The discussion highlighted the following mercury-related areas of interest and work:

- **MERCURY WASTE**
  - Contaminated waste sites/hotspots
  - Storage, including illegal storage
  - Municipal waste collection
  - Trans-boundary movement
  - Waste incineration
    - Municipal and hazardous waste incineration
    - Open burning
    - Medical waste incineration
- **MINING**
  - Artisanal Small Scale Gold Mining (ASGM)
  - Non-ferrous metals
  - Poly-metallic mines

- Large-scale mining
- Coal mining
- MERCURY-CONTAINING PRODUCTS
  - Compact fluorescent lamps
  - Cosmetics
  - Dental amalgams
  - Medical devices
  - Vaccines
- INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES
  - Chlor-alkali
  - Cement kilns
  - Coal combustion
- PUBLIC AWARENESS-RAISING
  - NGOs
  - Policy-makers
  - Public

If you are interested in specific areas/bullets listed above, please contact Jan ([jan.samanek@arnika.org](mailto:jan.samanek@arnika.org)), as we hope to inventory who is interested in what themes, and/or can provide expertise on specific themes as well.

Action items were also discussed and outlined related to these work areas, noting the main priority remains to raise awareness at the national level about the threat/health impacts of mercury pollution, and orient IPENers about how to engage in the Mercury Treaty Process.

Preparation for INC2, the second mercury treaty meeting in Japan in January 2011, includes work to:

- Review INC2 documents and design IPEN's response (for example, a INC2 Pre-meeting Letter to Delegates), plus identify IPENers to cover specific themes (waste, ASGM, financial arrangements, etc.);
- Collect and shape information related to the impact of mercury on communities, and support the INC2 theme to honor the victims of Minamata; and
- Prepare product information and advocacy materials for INC2.

### Monitoring (*specifically breast milk monitoring*)

Break-out Group outcomes included:

> To formulate and publish an IPEN analysis of and response to the upcoming WHO human milk monitoring report (the WHO human milk monitoring Round 5 was undertaken as part of the Effectiveness Evaluation Program of the Stockholm Convention). Our analysis would include:

- Discussion of findings of the WHO report;
- Discussion of results communication protocols;
- Comparison with NGO and national POPS human biomonitoring studies with the WHO report; and
- Recommendations *re*future WHO biomonitoring work.

> To undertake activities at the time of the publication/launch of the WHO Report:

- Possibly a regional workshop in Central Asia about the importance of human milk monitoring as a tool that can help lower levels of POPs chemicals in all our bodies while supporting

breastfeeding. Such a workshop might provide a template for other regional meetings, and would invite women's health and environment advocacy groups, breastfeeding advocacy groups, researchers, medical professionals, and mothers .

The workshop would feature discussions about regional and national biomonitoring studies and the use of the resulting data in supporting implementation of toxic chemical regulations, including the Stockholm Convention mandates, that are more protective of human health; present an update on the scientific research concerned with the impact of toxic chemicals in breastmilk on human health outcomes; a survey of the science supporting breastmilk as the best food for babies; and gaps in science.

> At the COP, possibly hold a side event with scientists, communities, pediatricians, women's health and advocacy groups that discusses human breastmilk monitoring as a global report card, and the need to ensure best protocols are adopted, including public and individual results communication, for such monitoring in the future.

The political demands should be high quality breast milk monitoring in all countries and more chemicals to be monitored in breast milk.

"Zero toxics in breast milk" was proposed as one organizing principle for the group and the group decided to continue to discuss this concept and others as activities are further developed around COP5.

Regarding funding for breast milk monitoring activities, it is very limited, but there was a suggestion that there may be small amount from the EU available, and also the IPEN Community Monitoring Working Group may have a small amount available for COP5 activities.

The focal points for breast milk monitoring are Sharyle Patton [spatton@igc.org](mailto:spatton@igc.org) and Elena Vasilyeva, [valyon@online.ru](mailto:valyon@online.ru).



*Elena Vasilyeva (Volgograd EcoPress, Russia), Sharyle Patton (Commonweal, US), Elena Zubcov (EcoTox, Moldova)*

## Dioxin

The Dioxin Group focused on:

1) Technical guidelines for cement kilns

Alan will rewrite comments in a more understandable language

Jitka will resend comments to Dioxins WG, Jan to Heavy Metals WG, Alan to responsible persons

- 2) Position on Low POPs Content position re Stockholm & Basel Convention to be drafted/circulated.
  - 3) Low POPs Content Report
    - Draft of report will be finished at the end of this year by Alan (new info/materials to be integrated)
    - Need to finish it by April 2011 (Stockholm Convention COP5)
  - 4) Sampling fly /incinerator Ash
    - Sampling in Thailand - the end of November (ARNIKA with EARTH, Thailand)
    - Possibility to use Armenian samples till end of year (ARNIKA with AWHHE, Armenia)
- Possibly collect samples in UK (Bishops Cleeve) - Idea to collect eggs, meat samples, dust - Alan and Jitka coordinate
- 5) Non combustion fact sheet Pending
    - Compilation of previous list
    - There is not context of non-combustion technologies - mixed waste...
    - Final version should be at the end of this year (6 page max.)

### Nanotechnology

The nano break-out group discussion was lively and interesting with participants that were, for the most part, not yet part of the IPEN nano Working Group (WG). After introducing the IPEN nano WG and its activities (including participation in the regional awareness raising workshops organized by UNITAR in each UN regions), there was a brief discussion about the latest scientific and toxicity news on nano. The group then jumped into the most relevant part of the meeting.

During this session the group discussed the upcoming international events relevant to nano and the IPEN nano WG (e.g.: SAICM OEWG in August 2011 and ICCM3 June 2012) and the activities leading up to these (preparation of the report focusing on nanotechnologies "in particular on issues of relevance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition" and potential capacity building workshops to be organized in 2011 by UNITAR and OECD).

In this respect, it was decided that, faced with the risk that SAICM Secretariat will not have the expertise to draft this report itself and have limited funds to hire an appropriate consultant to prepare it, and our limited resources to actually have a go at drafting the report ourselves, the group would use the existing outline and resolution adopted by African and GRULAC regions and attempt to draft a few paragraphs for each section of the report that would then be circulated to the whole IPEN Working Group for enrichment (in order to be in a position to influence the content of the report as soon as its drafting starts). David would prepare the first go of this "preliminary input" and then circulate it to other partners for input.

The group also discussed other international forums particularly relevant for IPEN to be involved in. The most relevant forum identified was the OECD WPMN (Working Party on Manufactured Nanomaterials). The group identified the need to get more technical experts involved in the various subgroups (SGs) of this WPMN. In this regard, David circulated the workplan and details of the various SGs to allow all participants to identify potential implications or relevant individuals that could work with the group.

Finally, the need to prepare a booklet presenting the issue as well as awareness raising/capacity building activities that could be undertaken at national, regional or international level by IPEN POs, was identified. The group discussed the potential content of this booklet (which would mostly require integration work

of documentations available from IPEN nano WG and IPEN nano WG POs websites) and strategy/timing for dissemination and use.

The group also discussed financial resources and identified that for all these activities to be properly carried out, we need more !!

---

### Communication – Messaging Training

Tactical Tech organized an evening training session with approximately 20 participants. The exercise highlighted the power of imagery and assumptions about the audience that NGOs attempt to communicate with. It also helped IPENers re-think who their target audience may be, and what message could be most effective to the target audience to generate change towards the overall objective or ones' work/activity.

---

### [Day Five, 22 October, 2010](#)

Numerous representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Small Grants Programme (SGP) had attended certain parts of the IPEN General Assembly, and on Day Five they presented the SGP, including the structure; focal areas of work related to POPs/Chemicals; SGP Information resources; National SGP operations/obligations; and planned expansion of SGP scope of work beyond POPs to mercury and sound chemicals management (*cf* GEF-5 SGP Plans).



UNDP participants included:

Khurshed Kholov, SGP Tajikistan

Katerina Yushenko, SGP Kazakhstan

Muratbek Koshoev, SGP Kyrgyzstan

Zelege Tesfaye, SGP Ethiopia

Tatiana Filkova and Mirbek Ilyazov, UNDP / GEF project in Kyrgyzstan

SGP representatives talked about specific experiences and examples of SGP POPs projects, and then Ram Charitra Sah (*pictured at right*), from the IPEN Participating Organization CEPHED in Nepal, spoke about the experiences CEPHED has had in implementing an SGP project entitled "Public awareness and participation for elimination of POPs and its sources from Nepal." His presentation clearly showed the possibilities for other IPEN POs to access the SGP funds as well as implement a project in their area of interest, including POPs. In addition, the project experience shared by Mr. Sah received appreciation and high acknowledgement from all SGP Program



coordinators/officials and others and remains as a source of motivation for us to work for a Toxics-Free Future.

In concluding this session it was noted that the amount of POPs projects funded under the SGP was disappointing. In every country IPENers were very interested in POPs issues but only a few received support from the SGP.

Discussion of a new IPEN-UNDP SGP communiqué will help to find new solutions on how to cooperate with the SGP, but so far NGOs face big difficulties trying to access this program. The need to improve cooperation between SGP national coordinators and IPEN Hubs was raised.



Following this, Jindrich Petrlik (*pictured at left*) from Arnika in the Czech Republic gave a presentation about Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) activities, highlighting partnerships with United Nations and government agencies. The OCED website on PRTR was mentioned as an important information tool. It was also noted that data released in the PRTR gets publicity with the help of NGOs. The NGO Volgograd-Ecopress raised the issue of correlation between PRTR data and that provided by facilities regarding their environmental achievements.

Afterwards, the UNDP Kyrgyzstan office talked about PCB Projects in Central Asia, which was the final presentation of the Assembly.

Following this, a brief evaluation of the IPEN GA was held with the goal to make necessary changes and improvements in the future. In general the reaction was very positive; however, some suggestions were made, which include: more time for discussion; more time for future strategizing and planning new campaigns; and fundraising sessions.

Olga and Bjorn then concluded the Assembly, thanking everyone for their attendance and participation.



\*\* A big thank you to everyone that provided pictures for this report! \*\*