



Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4)
Bucharest, Romania, 29 August – 2 September 2022

Report of the 6th Latin America and the Caribbean regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

Note by the secretariat

1. The secretariat has the honour to circulate, in the annex to the present note, the document entitled “*Report of the 6th Latin America and the Caribbean regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management*”. The document presented in the annex has been developed by the SAICM secretariat in consultation with the SAICM Regional Bureau Member and the SAICM Regional Focal Point. It has been submitted by the SAICM secretariat and has not been formally edited.

Annex: Report of the 6th Latin America and the Caribbean regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, held on 6 – 7 May 2022, Montevideo, Uruguay

1. Opening of the meeting

1. The sixth Latin American and Caribbean regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) was opened by Mr. Francisco Barbieri GRULAC Regional Focal point and Ms. Valentina Sierra, ICCM5 Bureau member representing for GRULAC, Co-Chairs of the meeting at 9.00 a.m. on Friday 6 May 2022 at Radisson Montevideo Victoria Plaza Hotel, Plaza Independencia 759, Departamento de Montevideo, Uruguay.

2. Mr. Adrián Pena, Minister of the Environment of the Government of Uruguay, provided opening remarks. He highlighted the voluntary and multi-stakeholder nature of the SAICM framework, and its comprehensive dimension which allows the consideration of issues that are not addressed by the BRS conventions. He stated that the exchange between government, private sector, academia, and civil society enriches the environmental debate by addressing environmental issues through an integrated approach. He informed participants that Uruguay will host the International Conference on Water in 2023 and that chemical-related issues such as Persistent Organic Pollutants, Anti-Microbial resistance and nanomaterial will feature prominently during the Conference. He referred to the progress made since the Dubai Declaration in 2006 and expressed his expectations that the 'ICCM5 objectives, means of implementation and recommendations' will allow for continuous progress toward a sustainable, safe, and healthy environment.

3. Opening remarks were provided as well by Ms. Anita Breyer, President of the Fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) who thanked the host government of Uruguay for hosting the regional meeting. Ms. Breyer highlighted how the GRULAC meeting was the first in-person meeting of a series of regional meetings to be held since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020. She thanked the Co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) for their availability to present the work done in their respective groups and share the outcomes with the regional meeting participants. She expressed her keen interest in meeting the participants and listening to their concerns and expressed her full commitment to exchange views in the lead up to ICCM5 to ensure a successful outcome. She lastly thanked the SAICM Secretariat for their valuable work in preparing the meeting.

4. Ms. Nalini Sharma, SAICM Coordinator, thanked the government of Uruguay for hosting the meeting, as well as the Basel and Stockholm Conventions Regional Centre located in Uruguay (BCCC-SCRC Uruguay) for organizing the meeting. She highlighted the ICCM5 Bureau decision and rationale, as well the objectives, for holding the regional meeting and the main elements of the road map towards IP4 and ICCM5 as presented in document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/2. She provided organizational and practical announcements regarding the schedule of the meeting in accordance with the detailed programme as set out in Annex 2 of the annotated provisional agenda (SAICM/RM/LAC.6/1/Add.1).

2. Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

5. The Co-chair noted that the provisional agenda for this meeting was circulated on 21 April 2022. She invited the meeting to raise any additional points that they may have under AOB. The agenda was adopted as set out in document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/1 without any requests from the floor. The Co-chair informed the meeting to limit speaking time to no more than 2-3 minutes per intervention to ensure that all are given the opportunity to speak and that all agenda items are accorded the necessary attention. The list of participants is presented in the Annex to this report.

(b) Objectives and expected outcomes of the SAICM GRULAC regional meeting

6. The Bureau representative for GRULAC provided an overview of the overall objectives and the expected outcomes of the regional meeting. She highlighted the great opportunity at this meeting to get familiarized with the work done under the intersessional process and to get well prepared for IP4. As GRULAC's Bureau representative, she expressed her expectations that the region will play a leadership role in the process leading to a successful IP4 meeting.

7. The President of the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) provided her perspectives on the expected outcomes of the regional meeting in the context of both the IP4 and the ICCM5. She underlined both the COVID 19 pandemic which exacerbated deeper environmental global crises of toxic pollution, climate change and biodiversity loss and the ongoing Russian aggression against Ukraine, which has triggered major global food and energy disruptions. She stated that the "beyond 2020" SAICM instrument is the only international instrument that can potentially deliver what the world needs to "build back better" and the just transition that is inherent to the overall vision of the SDGs. She emphasized that making real progress requires to address "the outside world", she encouraged participants to be open to compromise and courageous to formulate clear and easy to understand messages that are required to secure support from political leaders. She stressed that the outcomes of the VWGs were not intended to replace formal face-to-face deliberations at IP4 and/or negotiations at ICCM5 but rather aimed to further build understanding and prepare delegates for these negotiations for which co-facilitators are available to provide any needed clarifications. In this context, she noted the comparison document could help to capture the evolution of the recommendations on key issues including the outcomes of the VWGs, and to build a common understanding on how the text evolved during the intersessional process in preparation for IP4.

8. She expressed her appreciation for the very positive developments and decisions taken in the first months of this year, including the UNEA5 decision to convene an open-ended working group to prepare for the establishment of a science policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution. Argentina supported the remarks made by the President of ICCM5 underlining the importance to build on the work undertaken by the VWGs and called on countries to actively engage in IP4 and ICCM5. He highlighted several salient issues such as financing, articulation and increased sectoral and stakeholder engagement, and consideration of the needs and aspirations of developing countries.

9. Brazil emphasized that while not legally binding, SAICM remains very important and highlighted the findings of the SAICM evaluation report, including the shortcomings with regards to the support to developing countries as well as on financing and capacity building support. In this context, he expects to see more ambition from developed countries and other SAICM stakeholders. He asked whether an OEWG is envisaged before ICCM5.

10. The ICCM5 President responded that dates selected for ICCM5 will accommodate a possible fourth meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group if agreed to be held.

3. Update from the BRS Conventions and Minamata Convention Secretariats and IOMC members

11. Ms. Francisca Cenni, the representative of the BRS Convention Secretariat, provided an overview of the upcoming 2022 meetings of the conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. She reported on the key outcomes of the 12th meeting of the Basel Convention Open-ended Working Group related to a set of prioritized agenda items for which progress was made in advance of COP-15. She reported on the preparatory regional briefings and highlighted the upcoming high-level segment of the meetings of the conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions to be held on 1 June 2022 in Stockholm, Sweden, in connection with the Stockholm+50 meeting, as an opportunity to raise awareness of the contributions of the BRS Conventions to the 2030 Agenda and to tackling the earth's triple planetary crisis. She presented the organizational matters, schedule, and participation modalities of the face-to-face segment to be held in Geneva from 6 – 17 June 2022. She provided practical information on COVID related measures, on the election of officers and an overview of the side events, exhibitions and other events, including preparatory webinars that are scheduled to take place. She highlighted the main issues of the Basel convention COP-15, Rotterdam Convention COP-10 and Stockholm Convention COP-10 and concluded her update on the joint issues to be considered by all three COPs.

12. Ms. Claudia Ten Have was given the floor to present an update on behalf of the Minamata Convention Secretariat. The presentation included the advances made on Annex A and B, explaining all phasing out happening with mercury-added products, as well as the dates agreed for this process. She addresses the progress made by the effectiveness evaluation group and its milestones. She finally provided the links to the videos available on YouTube from COP4.

13. Mr. Jorge Ocana from UNITAR provided a presentation on behalf of the IOMC, with a video, displaying IOMC advances, composition, and membership, as well as activities and outcomes as reflected in the IOMC toolbox, including technical guidance and information tools. Highlighting the IOMC ongoing work and interest on indicators and on promoting an integrated approach to chemicals management, he emphasized that participants comments on refining VWGs outputs were noted and that a chemical-by-chemical approach should shift to a more integrated one. He further stated that such an integrated approach should enable countries to have the basic chemicals management systems and capacities in place and aim at strengthening chemicals management in key sectors so that economic benefits and social, health, labour, and environmental issues are addressed simultaneously with a view to enable both economies and industry to flourish while reducing negative environmental, health, social and labour impacts. He concluded that the IOMC organizations, will build on the comments raised at the regional meetings and the outcomes of the different group discussions in order to enable further thinking along these lines.

14. Ms. Jacqueline Alvarez from UNEP GRULAC Office made a presentation on the outcomes of UNEA5 relevant to chemicals and waste management issues. She highlighted the omnibus resolution on chemicals and waste, the establishment of an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee with the mandate to forge an international legally binding agreement to end plastic pollution by the end of 2024, and a detailed overview of the process to establish a comprehensive and ambitious science policy panel on the sound management of chemicals and waste and pollution prevention.

15. The representative from the International Society of Doctors for the Environment (ISDE) highlighted the links between poverty and chemicals pollution, in particular, lead related contamination and intoxication, as well as a lack of reporting on chemicals' effects on health. She noted the absence of the health sector in most of the activities on chemicals and called for adequate preparation and participation of the health sector to IP4 and ICCM5. She also noted that the IOMC proposal was very interesting and would like more information on the integrated approach to chemicals management.

16. The representative of Argentina emphasized the role of the IOMC and the importance of the involvement of WHO and ILO and called for a greater involvement of the IOMC Participating Organisations (PO) in the chemicals and waste related activities at national level.

17. The representative of Panama emphasized the need to involve the academic community to better understand the risks posed by chemicals and how to better integrate this information in health education programmes. He noted that Panama is not a producing but a chemical importing country and, in this context, emphasized the need for specific chemicals management tools such as guidelines for importers and traders to be made available to importing countries.

18. The representative from Uruguay, noted the special situation of chemicals importing countries as well, highlighting the use of chemicals in households and workplaces. He noted that due to increased health impacts and effects on workplaces and communities, there is a need to provide guidelines to the general population, workers, and indigenous peoples.

19. The representative from Mexico, noted how the pandemic affected vulnerable populations and reinforced the need to consider the ecological and environmental risk factors to human health, and called for greater involvement of WHO, ILO and civil society.

20. The IOMC representative agreed that the IOMC organizations need to increase their participation and activities in the region and will work closely with SAICM in promoting chemicals management tools and promoting greater cooperation and coordination of activities between sectors at national level. He reminded participants that institutional mechanisms need to be more coordinated and flexible and that the IOMC supports the development and implementation of an integrated approach to chemicals and waste management.

21. The ICCA expressed their readiness and willingness to ensure greater participation of industry in the sound management of chemicals.

4. Substantive preparation for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

(a) SAICM roadmap towards IP4 and ICCM5, including the overview of the intersessional process

22. Ms. Judith Torres, Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process introduced document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/2: Road map leading to IP4 and ICCM5. She informed participants IP4 is scheduled from 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania. Regional and stakeholder consultations are scheduled to take place the weekend prior to IP4 from 27 to 28 August 2022. She presented the following three steps as outlined in the road map document:

- Step 1: Compile the outcomes and recommendations of the VWGs into one document as presented in SAICM/ICCM.5/Bureau.TC.11/2

- Step 2: Prepare a comparison document – evolution of text from SAICM OPS, IP.4/2 and VWG outcomes as presented in SAICM/RM/LAC.6/INF1
- Step 3: Face to face regional meetings in preparation for IP4 to be scheduled as follows:
 - GRULAC, 6 – 7 May 2022, Montevideo, Uruguay
 - CEE Regional Meeting, 12 – 13 May 2022, Prague, Czech Republic
 - Africa Regional Meeting, 27 – 29 June 2022, Accra, Ghana
 - Asia-Pacific Regional Meeting, 5 – 7 July 2022, Dead Sea, Jordan
 - WEOG / EUJUSSCANNZUK, dates to be confirmed, online

Finally, she noted that virtual briefings and online discussions may be convened to further build common understanding on key issues, and to introduce SAICM to new stakeholders, upon request

23. She stated the primary meeting document for consideration at IP4 will be SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020”. Furthermore, as agreed at the 11th ICCM5 Bureau meeting held in February 2022, the VWG outcomes will be included as addenda to this meeting document. In addition, the outcomes of the regional meetings and any stakeholder submissions prior to IP4 in 2022 as well as the comparison document (SAICM/RM/LAC.6/INF.1) mentioned above can be included as information documents. Outlining the expected outcomes of IP4, she emphasized that IP4 is expected to produce one single document for negotiations at ICCM5.

24. The representative of Brazil expressed the GRULAC position in favor of the establishment of an OEWG. The IP Co-Chair responded that such a decision will be taken after IP4 and will depend on the progress made at IP4, other regional groups’ views on the matter, and the availability of financial resources.

25. ICCA expressed its support to take into consideration the outcomes of the VWGs at IP4 and not to start from the IP3 outcomes exclusively.

(b) SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” text not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, and strategic objectives

26. Ms. Torres introduced document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/3: SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, for consideration by the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management”. She further introduced text not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, and strategic objectives in preparation for the fourth meeting of the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4).

27. The representative of Brazil asked for some clarifications on the concept of “non-toxic circularity” as referred to in the scope section. IPEN responded that the concept of circular economy fosters the use of a life cycle in its recyclable approach, which if it includes toxic substances, then run the risk of keeping these substances in a close cycle.

(c) SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” and the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups held between October 2020 – February 2021

28. The Co-Chair informed participants that under this agenda item:
- One and a half hours will be dedicated to each Virtual Working Group.
 - The Virtual working group Co-facilitator(s) will provide a 30-minute presentation, introducing the work of the Virtual Working Group, highlighting the methodology used, its outcomes and key issues that the regional group need to be made aware of.
 - The presentation will be followed by a one-hour discussion to provide further explanation and clarification with an overall aim to seek stakeholders' views, build consensus and reach a common understanding of the outcomes of Virtual Working Groups.
29. The Co-chair gave the floor to Ms. Silvija Kalnins, co-facilitator of the Virtual Working Group 1 on targets, indicators and milestones who was connected online.

i. Working Group 1: Targets, indicators and milestones

30. Ms. Kalnins presented the outcomes of the Group. She started by referring to the relevant documents in front of the meeting and introduced SAICM/RM/LAC.6/INF.1: Table comparing the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, document SAICM/IP.4/2 "Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020" and the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups and its relevant sections as presented in document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/4.

31. She introduced the mandate, methodology and process related to the technical working group established and mandated by the third meeting of the Intersessional Process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2022 (IP3) held in October 2019 that met between January and February 2020 and the outcome of its work is available in documents SAICM/IP.4/3 and SAICM/IP.4/INF/15, as well as the VWG on targets, indicators and milestones established and mandated by SAICM Bureau.

32. In presenting the main outcomes of the Virtual Working Group, she highlighted the formulations of targets based on points of convergence of views expressed by stakeholders, which include 5 strategic objectives, 25 targets (30 brackets) and over 80 indicators. She noted that the VWG had proposed the two following options for moving forward:

- Option 1) continuation of work on targets, indicators, and milestones by a policy expert group; and
- Option 2) combine the work of a policy expert group with the work by a sub-group more technical in nature which would prepare specific work on indicators.

33. Following the overview of the structure of the outcome document she highlighted the issues raised but not addressed by the group, as well as the following main considerations for moving forwards:

- The need to consider targets together with the strategic objective formulations to establish a comprehensive indicator framework for the new instrument; and
- The need to consider targets in a reiterative process and together with the indicators, in order to capture and develop a comprehensive indicator framework for the instrument, including considerations of resources and capacities for monitoring implementation.

34. Following the presentation, the floor was open for discussion. The representative of Brazil expressed his support for the overall approach and the need to agree on a set of important

issues such as waste or the name of the future instrument. He expressed his preference both for a framework rather than an instrument, and for meaningful targets closely related to the strategic objectives supported by an adequate approach to monitoring the achievements of targets. He expressed his support for option 2, i.e., having a mix of policy and technical experts in the further development of the targets, indicators and milestones. He further requested for information on the origin and sources of proposed targets in Appendix A should be provided.

35. The representative of Mexico expressed his concern regarding the lack of inclusion and participation issues related to the virtual working groups. He asked why the precautionary principle was deleted from the definition of issues of concern. He also expressed his support to have an OEWG prior to ICCM5.

36. The representatives of Panama and Argentina wondered whether the VWG process and outcomes should be validated. They expressed their concern that such a process should assess missing elements, include a wider array of actors, and identify targets and milestones that take into consideration the specific needs and capacity of countries that are not all at the same development level.

37. In response to these questions and concerns, the Co-facilitator reiterated the challenges that marked the COVID 19 period. Regarding the origin of the indicators, she confirmed that they have been officially submitted and their origin is featured on the website <http://saicm.org/Beyond2020/IntersessionalProcess/VirtualWorkingGroups/tabid/8563/language/en-US/Default.aspx>. She noted that the precautionary principle can be reintroduced within targets and indicators. Brazil took the floor again and stated that the VWG outcome should be the basis for discussion at IP4 and that a validation process is not needed, he emphasized that gaps still need to be addressed. The Co-chair, the Co-facilitator and the Secretariat emphasized that the regional meetings are an opportunity to discuss important issues, share common views and get further explanations and clarification from the co-facilitators.

38. The Co-chair thanked Ms. Kalnins for her presentation and being available for the questions and answer session. The Co-chair then gave the floor to Ms. Karissa Kovner, co-facilitator of the Virtual Working Group 2 on governance and mechanisms to support implementation.

ii. Virtual Working Group 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation

39. Ms. Kovner presented the outcomes of the Group. She presented the detailed mandate of the group, which was based on reviewing the text of the compilation of recommendations as well the on the Science Policy Interface assigned to the group. In addition, she provided an overview of the number of participants, the virtual meetings held and the requests for written submissions during the process.

40. She provided an overview of the outputs that were categorized into three parts:

- Part I: Textual recommendations based on the convergence of views among stakeholders for Sections B, C, D, E, G, and H; She highlighted the issues on which progress was made and on which more work needs to be done in each section of the outcome document.
- Part II: Recommendations for the establishment of a Science-Policy Interface. Among the main recommendations in this regard, she highlighted that further dialogue needs to take place on the functions and characteristics of a Science Policy

Interface, on the development of the potential options for its scope and placement – she noted that these recommendations were considered by UNEA5.2 in their consideration of the Science Policy Panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution; and

- Part III: Recommendations for further consideration of issues in the “Parking Lot,” a document created by VWG2 to reflect areas of work or views that could not be addressed in the context of the mandate or that needed more time for further discussion and consideration.

41. She concluded her presentation by presenting the next steps and recommendations from the Co-facilitators which include the Japanese proposal for Taking Stock of Progress and the Swiss proposal on voluntary peer review process (Section G) and Updating the Instrument (Section H) and the overlap with related sections of SAICM/IP.4/2 for which this VWG was not mandated.

42. Brazil raised the issue of the relationship between SAICM’s future framework and the Science Policy Panel, as well as UNEA’s resolution on plastics. He noted that the section on reporting is not consensual and that the reflection on the scope and structure of the future instrument or framework leads to different provisions such as voluntary or legally binding ones. He requested for more information on the Japanese proposal for Taking Stock of Progress (Section G) and Updating the Instrument (Section H). The secretariat noted that work on reviewing reporting mechanisms by other international organizations is being undertaken and this information will be shared in due course.

43. Peru in considering the participation of political or technical expert perspectives in the nomination of national focal points, highlighted the specificity of the Latin American context which should be taken into consideration in defining governance related milestones and the need to elevate the chemicals agenda to a higher level of political attention to achieve better and timely results in the sound management of chemicals at national level.

44. The Co-chair thanked Ms. Kovner for her presentation and informed the participants to make most of Ms. Kovner’s presence to ask any questions or seek clarification. The Co-chair then gave the floor to Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi and Mr. Thomas Sverre (connected online), co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Group 3 on issues of concern.

iii. Virtual Working Group 3: Issues of concern

45. The two co-facilitators Mr. Adu-Kumi and Mr. Sverre presented the outcomes of their Group. They introduced the mandate and process of their group highlighting that the group had 262 registered participants from all SAICM stakeholder groups, including a number of sectors and all UN regions who met through four virtual meetings and three rounds of electronic feedback.

46. They presented the outcome of the group referring to the comparison table as presented in document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/INF.1 and highlighted the broad agreement among the group that the emerging policy issues process has been useful in raising the profile of specific issues globally, but that a clear plan of action is needed. The co-facilitators concluded their presentation with a set of recommendations from the virtual working group including elements of an omnibus resolution on the existing SAICM EPIs and other issues of concern.

47. Brazil welcomed the work of the Group and its outcome document. He raised the issue of the relationship and possible risk of duplication with UNEA 5.2 resolution related to issues of concern. The co-facilitators referred to page 10 in document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/6 which

proposes text for an omnibus resolution to address both emerging policy issues and issues of concern.

48. IPEN reiterated their concern of the deletion of the precautionary principle from the definition of an Issues of Concern and stressed that many emerging policy issues such as HHPs and lead in paint are still unresolved and work on them should continue. The co-facilitators responded that the precautionary principle could be reintroduced into the text if stakeholders wish. They expressed the recommendation of their group to agree on an omnibus resolution at ICCM5 on the existing SAICM EPIs & other issues of concern with the intention to determine and set the path forward on the existing SAICM EPIs and other issues of concern in the beyond 2020 instrument at its next Conference and that the group had no view on stopping the work on EPI or IoC.

49. The Co-chair thanked Mr. Adu-Kumi and Mr. Sverre for their presentation and informed the participants to make most of Mr. Adu-Kumi's presence to ask any questions or seek clarification. The Co-chair then gave the floor to Mr. Jonah Ormond, co-facilitator of the Virtual Working Group 4 on financial considerations.

iv. Virtual Working Group 4: Financial considerations

50. Mr. Ormond presented the outcomes of the Group. He provided an overview of the mandate and process of the work of the group, he highlighted that 166 people registered for this VWG from all SAICM stakeholder groups, including different sectors and all UN regions and convened 4 virtual meetings and 3 rounds of electronic feedback. Presenting the outcomes of the group, he highlighted the consolidated views, recommendations and proposed cleaned redline text; and the agreement of the group to include a chapeau paragraph to section VII on Financial Considerations with proposed text highlighting the need for adequate, predictable and sustainable financing, technical assistance and technology transfer for the implementation of the Strategic Approach. He also highlighted the following outcomes:

- 1) Stakeholders unanimously supported strengthening the financing of the Secretariat with contributions from all stakeholders, although details on how these contributions should be reflected in the beyond 2020 instrument have not been agreed on;
- 2) Stakeholders provided inputs to the draft resource mobilization strategy and the review document on cost-recovery mechanisms and other economic instruments for financing the sound management of chemicals and waste. The Secretariat will use these inputs to prepare revised versions of both documents; and
- 3) The co-facilitators and stakeholders also launched an open discussion on Capacity Building and defined concrete mechanisms and actions regarding capacity building across sectors to support the beyond 2020 programme of work.

51. The representative of Argentina expressed its support for a comprehensive financing, mechanism which should correspond to the needs and aspirations of the countries. He stressed the need to submit a formal request to existing funding mechanisms to provide necessary financial resources and to sustain integrated approach efforts and policies.

52. The representative of IPEN underlined that funding for an integrated approach to chemicals management requires greater involvement of the health sector and stronger cooperation with SAICM stakeholders. In this context, he reminded participants of the IPEN/CIEL proposal on the 0.5% proposed tax on chemicals sales as countries continue to bear the negative consequences of chemicals products and that remediation efforts need to be supported.

53. The representative of ICCA expressed its interest in tracking progress and in a capacity building clearing house. The representative of LARCF highlighted the progress made in the region on capacity building related actions, promoting regional dialogues and increased capacity to reach convergent regulations. She highlighted the lack of an established mechanism for regulatory cooperation, the need for increased industry involvement, and the need for more human resources and technical expertise.

54. The representative of the Alliance of Latin America without Pollution called for an intensified commitment of civil society in SAICM and in the implementation of sound management of chemicals policies and actions in the region and the need to overcome obstacles and gaps in the management of chemicals.

55. The Co-chair thanked Mr. Ormond for his presentation and informed the participants to make most of Mr. Ormond's presence to ask any questions or seek clarification.

5. Logistical preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

56. Ms. Sharma presented an update on the preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond (IP4) scheduled to take place from 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania and is expected to have a total of 250 participants. She further noted that regional and stakeholder consultations are scheduled to take place the weekend before IP4 from 27 to 28 August 2022 and that in line with planning for the previous Intersessional Process meetings, there will be funding available for 5 GRULAC government representatives, as well as for the Bureau members. On ICCM5, she mentioned as noted by the ICCM5 President, the meeting will take place in the third quarter of 2023, in Bonn, Germany and specific dates are forthcoming.

6. Exchange of regional information and knowledge, reviewing progress towards the current SAICM objectives.

57. Co-chair invited representatives from the CEE region to share information on activities related to SAICM objectives.

58. The representative of Peru expressed her appreciation and highlighted the importance of the regional Forum of Ministers of the environment and the action plan for regional cooperation between governments and NGOs that includes 33 actions, which for some address chemicals management issues.

59. The representative of Argentina and Venezuela supported the intervention of Peru and highlighted the need for further funding. to carry out activities at the national level. He stressed that success stories in regional chemical regulations and, technical and information capacity are highly dependent on adequate funding. The submitted proposal to the UNEP regional office for funding chemicals safety in the region is still awaiting a response.

60. The representative of ISDE stressed that there is need to articulate the needs of the region on why funding is needed. Pollution issues need to be assessed prior to receiving attention and funding. She stressed the need to generate a multisectoral dialogue involving, the health sector and the productive sectors to gather data and information and generate the cost of inaction.

61. The representative of RAPAL, Uruguay highlighted the work done on highly hazardous pesticides and its report based on information from the Pesticides Action Network, which is available on their website. They also highlighted that nanotechnology is a serious concern in the region and needs to be addressed.
62. The representative of Ecuador referred to the latest COVID 19 pandemic, which reveals the importance of International Health Regulation (IHR) and other issues such as antimicrobial resistance and poor waste management. Cooperation with WHO is important in this context to generate better tools and resources to better manage the health risks. In this context, the Co-chair encouraged participants to propose a resolution at WHA on chemicals to raise these issues and send clear messages.
63. The representative of ICCA expressed the interest of her organization to join a consultation on regulations development, with different sectors in order to have better regulation and better implementation of agreed policies and actions.
64. The representative from Peru highlighted the national actions and activities on lead free paint, which involved the active participation of the health sector. In this context, she expressed her gratitude for the support from the GEF-funded SAICM project “Lead in Paint component”, which is providing expert advice to assist countries with establishing lead paint laws.
65. The representative of Brazil highlighted the experience from the Regional Center of the Stockholm Convention and the two signed agreements between the chlorine industry and manufacturing industry and the state of Sao Paulo, and that these types of voluntary agreements, to promote good practices and lessons learned, could be shared with other interested companies and parties.
66. The representative from IPEN provided an overview of the activities undertaken in the region by the NGO members of the IPEN network. He highlighted the national studies on pesticide use that reveal many pesticides prohibited in Europe are exported to the region. The report recommends reaching out to the human rights Directorate on the ground of health and human rights violations. He further informed participants on the series of webinars to strengthen discussion on a precautionary principle and risk evaluation. He emphasized the need for training for women as a cross-sectoral issue. He finally stressed the necessity to develop capacity for compliance with the law. He also stressed that the region is affected by poverty and called for rethinking the traditional approach to sustainable development. Finally, he underlined the need to ensure that experts that provide technical support have no conflict of interest with industry.
67. The representative of Taller Ecologista expressed her support for the statement made by IPEN regarding risks to women health from chemicals substances and on the precautionary principle. He noted that there is limited information on the impact of chemicals on women, which should be addressed by SAICM. Regulations on lead in paint remain very weak, particularly at household level and more control is needed.
68. The representative of Colombia emphasized that issues such as lead in paint control should be at the beginning of the process and require the commitment of the industry. In a context of limited capacity in surveillance and monitoring capacity, the responsibility of the industry is key to achieving success.
69. The Cochair called for a closed session held amongst regional representatives and observers, including the ICCM5 President and asked the VWG Co-facilitators not from the region and the Secretariat to leave the room.

7. Other matters

70. The Co-chair provided a brief summary of the regional views from the closed session as follows:

(a) Support for the proposal of the Bureau as presented in the Roadmap towards IP4 and ICCM5 as presented in document SAICM/RM/LAC.6/2 with the primary document SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” and associated Addenda presenting the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups;

(b) Stress the need for a strong financing mechanism and further consultation will be undertaken in the region with the support of the SAICM Secretariat and the UNEP ROLAC office to prepare their positions in advance of IP4;

(c) Coordinate efforts with UNEP on the Science Policy Panel to avoid duplicating efforts.

(d) Support the convening of an additional Open-Ended Working Group in advance of ICCM5;

(e) Will submit the 5 nominations for GRULAC regional representatives to be funded to participate in IP4 by mid-June 2022. Criteria for these regional representatives is that they speak fluent English and will actively contribute to the discussions during IP4.

8. Closure of the meeting

71. The Co-chairs thanked all meeting participants for their contributions and look forward to further engaging with them in the lead up to IP4.

72. In her closing remarks, the ICCM5 President thanked the participants for their constructive discussion. She appreciated the informative formal and informal discussions that took place over the past two days, which were very useful to sharpen the views on how to best approach the next steps. In this context, she stressed focusing on the big picture on key issues such as vision, scope, and objectives requires further work. She emphasized the important role and the ongoing work of the IOMC, which seems promising in attracting political attention and resources. In this regard, she supported the request for more information from the IOMC on their proposal for an integrated approach to chemicals management and reiterated the importance of engaging with the health sector in chemicals management. She recognized that the meeting was successful in raising a better understanding of the work of the Virtual Working Groups and thanked the Co-facilitators for their excellent work. She expressed her sincere gratitude as well to the Co-Chairs of the meeting, the IP Co-chair and the government of Uruguay for hosting the meeting.

73. The meeting closed at 16.30 on Saturday, 7 May 2022.
