

**Fourteenth meeting and sixth teleconference of the Bureau of the International Conference on Chemicals Management for its fifth session**  
Wednesday, 27 January 2021, from 14:00 – 16:30 CET

## **REPORT OF THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE ICCM5 BUREAU**

### **1) Opening and welcome**

The President of the International Conference on Chemicals Management for its fifth session (ICCM5), Ms. Gertrud Sahler, welcomed participants to the fourteenth meeting and sixth teleconference of the ICCM5 Bureau. The President sincerely thanked all Bureau members for their continued commitment and flexibility as the Covid-19 pandemic continues to be a challenge. She gave a special thanks and welcomed the Co-facilitators of the 4 Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) for having made themselves available to participate in this meeting for a second time. She also thanked the two Co-facilitators of the High-level Declaration (HLD) Informal Drafting Group who will inform the Bureau of the developments of the group under agenda point 7. Ms. Sahler introduced Ms. Sarah Brosche as new Bureau member representing the public interest organizations and finally, she informed that the SAICM budget for 2021 was adopted through a silent procedure.

The ICCM5 President indicated that, as agreed previously by the Bureau, the co-facilitators of the VWGs and the HLD Informal Drafting Group are invited to participate in ‘listen only’ mode as observers to the meeting and invited to intervene under the relevant agenda items.

The President thanked everyone and closed this agenda item.

### **2) Adoption of the agenda**

Ms. Sahler highlighted that the primary focus of the teleconference would be on agenda item 4: Status of the planning for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process (IP4) and the fifth session of the International Conference for Chemicals Management (ICCM5); agenda item 5: Update on the progress made by the four virtual working groups to develop recommendations for consideration by IP4 and ICCM5 and agenda item 6: Report back from the Co-facilitators of the High-level Declaration Informal Drafting Group.

She invited Bureau members to propose additional items to be added to the agenda under agenda item 9 Any Other Matters. No additions were suggested, and the President introduced the provisional agenda as set out in document SAICM/ICCM.5/Bureau.TC.6/1.

The meeting agenda was adopted.

### **3) Adoption of thirteenth meeting report of the ICCM5 Bureau, held on 9 December 2020**

The President proposed the approval of the report of the thirteenth meeting and fifth teleconference of the Bureau held on 9 December 2020. She mentioned that the draft meeting report was circulated on 13 January 2021 for review and comment. With no additional comments, the report was adopted by the Bureau.

### **4) Status of the planning for fourth meeting of the Intersessional Process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4) and fifth session of the International Conference for Chemicals Management (ICCM5).**

Ms. Sahler recalled that alternative options for IP4 were discussed at the previous Bureau meeting. Several members had asked for more time to consult with their constituencies. Comments received subsequently clearly show that a face to face IP4 is the preferred option for SAICM stakeholders based on the understanding that substantive consultations can only take place in person. Ms. Sahler shared her observations on the Covid-19 pandemic situation in Germany. She recounted that cases decrease very slowly, and that it would be highly likely that the lock-down will be prolonged even after February 2021, that the new variants of the virus has caused increased nervousness and that there is a shortage of doses of vaccines. Based on this, the President noted that most likely there will not be face to face meetings bringing in participants from around the world in 2021. Travel from all UN regions will not be possible with different travel restrictions. Germany must take a decision soon in order to prevent further reservation costs at the World Conference Center. Against this background Ms. Sahler opened the floor to invite Bureau members to share information regarding the situation in their respective country/region.

The CEE representative Mr, Domagalski mentioned that the situation in Poland is similar to what the President reported in Germany. The country is still under lock-down, the number of cases is decreasing at a slow pace. He noted that an increasing number of vaccinations are administered each day, however, taking into account the size of the population and shortages in the supply of the vaccine, it is hard to determine when 70 percent of the population will be vaccinated, in order to secure public health. If the same pace of the vaccination roll-out is maintained, a ratio of 70 percent will be reached in 2024. He expressed his understanding that a decision to further postpone ICCM5 is necessary. On the other hand, he noted that very important decisions have to be taken at ICCM5, which will further affect the global chemicals management worldwide and this will not be feasible through online consultations and virtual meetings. Participation from the CEE, African and Asia-Pacific regions in the VWG has been limited.

Most of the members of the Bureau reported similar situations regarding Covid-19 in their own countries and were supportive of the postponement of both IP4 and ICCM5 until the time when face to face meetings can take place.

Ms. Sierra, the focal point for GRULAC, asked if there is any possibility to hold the meeting during the second semester of 2021 like BRS seems to be considering.

The NGO labour representative, Mr. O'Neill noted that the VWG process in its current form was considered a short-term solution and proposed to take a break. In his view, the process had its value, however, if it should become the default process, the mechanism and modalities would have to be reviewed. He considered the process exhausting and not equitable due to language and time zone differences, which impacts the equal participation of Governments and NGOs in certain regions.

The representative of public interest organizations, Ms. Brosché also supported the postponement of the face to face meetings and supported Mr. O'Neill's comments. She noted that partners in Africa, Asia and GRULAC will still to wait for a long time until vaccines are available for a large part of the population.

The regional focal point for WEOG, Ms. Leppinen commented that she would not stop the VWG process but would propose to revise it. She highlighted the importance to find a way to ensure that stakeholders are well prepared once face to face meetings are possible again. The industry representative Ms. Goren supported the postponement of the face to face meetings and agreed with previous comments on revising the VWG process.

The CEE regional focal point, Mr. Vladimir Lenev explained that in Russia vaccinations are very advanced. He asked the President about the deadline for deciding on the ICCM5 postponement and whether the meeting could take place in 2022. He added that experience shows that proper/meaningful negotiations are not feasible online.

The President responded to the comments made so far. She noted that it would be difficult to determine when the face to face meetings will be able to take place and therefore there is no proposal for new dates. She stated that the pandemic could last not only months but even years. She further noted that the additional time provides an opportunity to prepare for IP4 and ICCM5 at a slower pace. Based on this decision, she asked the Bureau members if the VWG process should be given more time to conclude their work.

Ms. Fernandez supported the decision of the postponement of the IP4 and ICCM5. In her view, it has become clear that it is difficult to negotiate virtually. She agreed with other Bureau members on the importance of meetings being face to face. Concerning the question on identifying new dates, she noted that perhaps it might be possible to convene later this year in Europe but it is impossible to say at this time.

Mr. Morin also supported the postponement of both face to face meetings and saw this as inevitable. He proposed to find a new date for the two meetings, which is realistic and not too ambitious, considering the global situation. He said that engagement by all stakeholders is essential to ensure ownership. The one area he would appreciate a discussion on is which options exist to maintain the attention on SAICM beyond 2020 process through virtual working arrangements – although at a slower pace.

Ms. Sahler thanked all for the interventions and was grateful to all Bureau members for agreeing to the postponement of IP4 and ICCM5. She noted that the contract with the World Conference Center in Bonn will be cancelled and a new contract will be discussed only when there is certainty that face to face meetings can take place. She also said that she will work together with the IP Co-Chairs and the Secretariat to use the time until next Bureau meeting to develop proposals on a way forward.

She asked the delegates whether the VWGs should continue or not. She mentioned that VWG1 on targets, indicators and milestones is interested to continue with their work.

Mr. O'Neill suggested to delay or suspend the process until it is reviewed. Time should be taken to think about a long-term solution.

Ms Brosche explained that within her constituency all appreciate the hard work and recognized what has been achieved so far. However, she also supports taking a break and reflect on how to make the process more inclusive.

Ms. Sierra reported back from the GRULAC region where stakeholders have concerns due to the lack of participation and the high workload of the VWGs. She said that if the virtual work continued, the process including the schedules should be carefully reviewed. In GRULAC they face limitations in engaging as the teams are small and cover diverse topics, therefore they cannot be dedicate too much time to this process. Therefore, the virtual working process would need to be realistic considering these circumstances.

Mr. Naziri stated that at this juncture the only viable option is to postpone IP4 and ICCM5. It is a fact that virtual meetings have their own challenges and cannot replace face to face negotiations.

Mr. Domagalski noted that he is very satisfied with the results achieved in the VWGs and appreciates the hard work of the Co-facilitators. He would support that they continue but understands that the work modalities could be revised to make it more inclusive for the other regions. He shared an experience from the week before in a Chemical Watch Conference where SAICM was mentioned often which led him to the conclusion that this was because of the VWG process, which is keeping the momentum and gives stakeholders something to work on during their preparations for ICCM5. With regards to timing of ICCM5, he agreed that the global situation should be considered.

The President concluded this agenda item highlighting that there has been great appreciation for the virtual work thus far. She welcomed the proposal to have a short break of the VWGs and to think about how to progress with the virtual work based on the lessons learned over the past six months and to ensure that the concerns raised by the Bureau are addressed. She then invited all Bureau members and Co-facilitators of the VWGs to provide ideas on these rather technical issues and let her and the Secretariat know how the process could be improved in the future.

Ms. Sierra requested the SAICM Secretariat to give briefings in Spanish to the GRULAC region to inform of the outcomes of the VWGs in order to increase the understanding and support.

- 5) **Update on the progress made by the four virtual working groups to develop recommendations for consideration of ICCM5 regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.**

The ICCM5 President welcomed and thanked the Co-facilitators of the VWGs for their availability to participate in the Bureau meeting. She further thanked the Co-facilitators for their continued commitment and hard work throughout this process. She also thanked the Secretariat for its support and expressed satisfaction with the progress made so far and the active participation of the SAICM stakeholders.

The President gave the floor to the Co-facilitators, to provide an update on the work of their respective VWG.

#### **VWG1: Targets, indicators and milestones: Silvija Kalnins, Latvia and Wajira Palipane, Sri-Lanka**

Regarding the Progress since the last Bureau meeting held on 9 December Mr. Palipane said that the VWG1 has made progress to achieve the group mandate. A total of four virtual meetings have been held and electronic feedback has been requested on four occasions between November and January 2021. We have had over 90 participants in each virtual meeting. In addition, one more virtual meeting was held since our last Bureau meeting on 9 December and have made two more calls for electronic submissions in this time. We received a total of 12 submissions for the third request (21 December 2020) and a total of 11 submissions for the fourth request (25 January 2021). The group will have its last virtual meeting on 01 February 2021.

Regarding the vision for the outcome document, Mr. Wajira said that they are trying to prepare an outcome document for the last meeting which is scheduled on 1 February that will consist of two parts as per our group mandate. The outcome document will build on the SAICM IP4/3 document from IP4 developed by the Technical Working Group. One of the parts has already been circulated which is the part related to progress for recommendations on targets, indicators and milestones. In this document we are laying out three options: Option 1) proposes a continuation of work on target, indicators and milestones by a policy experts policy group, similar in nature to the current VWG on targets. Option 2) combines work of a policy expert group with work by a subgroup more technical in nature, which would prepare specific work on indicators. Option 3) is to currently pause work on targets, indicators and milestones, returning to this work only at IP/4 or ICCM-5. It appears from the submissions received that stakeholders are leaning more to the second option which is something similar to the virtual working groups where there are policy experts working on targets and a technical working group working on indicators, with a reiterative process on discussions on targets and indicators between the two groups. This is also a signal in some of the submissions of the desire to have UNEP and others take the lead in the indicator part of the work.

Mr. Wajira continued saying that the second part of the mandate will be circulated by the end of the week. During the last meeting on 12 January, the group called on the co-facilitators to come up with possible targets that can agree upon, which could be laid out in an outcome document and presented as the progress of the group on the formulation of targets. The results of this exercise, and thus the output of this part of the mandate, will depend on the willingness of participants to agree on points of convergence assessed by the co-facilitators. It is difficult to gauge whether these will be specific agreed formulations or considerations tabled by the group for any further work on targets. After the 1 February discussions, we will finalize the outcome document and submit to the Bureau for consideration in moving forward with this work.

Finally, he added that on last meeting held on 12 January, the group made a call to think about possible additional targets to be included in the outcome document. He added that we know that the VWG is not negotiating, just exchanging views. The outcome of this VWG will depend on parties to agree on it. He said that the stakeholders also want to know if they can continue the discussions until face to face meetings can take place. The group would like to continue.

#### **VWG2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation: Karissa Kovner, USA and Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, Thailand**

Ms. Kovner stated that a lot of work has been done and the preparation of the outcome document has started. In terms of timing the group would appreciate the proposal of going at a slower pace, which she believes will also help address the issue of participation as there are too many meetings scheduled per week. She said that an additional couple of weeks to the overall schedule might help to complete the mandate and not lose momentum. Section E: Subsidiary and ad hoc bodies and the Science Policy Interface will be discussed at the virtual meeting next week on Thursday, 4 February 2021. This group will welcome expectations for the output report from the Bureau. There is also a *Parking Lot* document where ideas and suggestions have been placed that don't quite fit

under the current discussions. With more time and a slower pace, more progress could be made. There is significant willingness and interest in the process and usually virtual meetings do not finish on time due to more interventions than expected. On participation it has been good, she stated that a large number of participants and a large number of written submissions. Of course, mostly the same voices (virtually and electronically) as mentioned by other groups.

Ms. Wiriwutikorn added that the group also identified gaps that will be important on the way forward.

Ms. Fernandez suggested that it would be useful to have an informative summary, circulated by the Secretariat, with the update of the work of the virtual groups, as the co-facilitators are presenting today and the President said that this will be included in the Bureau meeting report.

Ms. Brosche pointed out that the process needs to be more inclusive and means of participation should be reevaluated.

Ms. Kovner responded that it is a fact that the voices in the meeting are also the same that provide written submissions. It is hard for the Co-facilitators to determine if it is a question of interest or of access and opportunity to participate. She then added that the evaluation of meetings should happen after the first round of this virtual process, including the virtual meetings is finished.

Mr. Naziri mentioned that he has been informed that certain limitations has been put excluding delegations to propose any new suggestions. Such an approach is not in conformity with the procedure agreed. He noted that he has serious concerns regarding this issue and would continue to make suggestions at any stage of the discussion leading up to ICCM5.

### **VWG3: Issues of concern: Sam Adu-Kumi, Ghana and Thomas Jahre Sverre, Norway**

Mr. Adu-Kumi explained that the group has reviewed Annex B which is one of the mandates. The co-chairs and have proposed a new structure to the document which is now slightly shorter. The group is working well and starting to work on the outcome document. The proposal has been generally well received and not had any opposition. The welcome reception of document so far paves the way for using the document as basis for further negotiations at IP4. The group is working well and starting to work on the outcome document. It has been circulated and the comments received will be incorporated into a the text for the discussion on 2 February 2021 this week.

The second part of the mandate relates to the future of the Regarding existing SAICM emerging policy issues and other issues of concern. The VWG is proposing a path forward to address them. So far, the group has envisaged a process between ICCM5 and ICCM6 to consider future work. With ICCM5 now being pushed to 2022, this will need to be revisited. The co-facilitators will propose that some of the considerations foreseen for after ICCM5 could take place from now and until ICCM5.

EPIs it seems that there is a great consensus among the group, but this could be affected by the postponement of the face to face meetings. The co-facilitators are considering how to incorporate a parking lot for some of the ideas presented at most recent meeting and incorporation into the text of other views.

It is foreseen that the group will conclude its work at the next meeting on 2 February 2021.

### **VWG4: Financial considerations: Jonah Davis Ormond, Antigua and Barbuda and Reggie Hernaus, The Netherlands**

Mr. Ormond explained that this VWG will have a total of four online meetings, the last one will be held on February 10<sup>th</sup> ( this was not in the original schedule but an additional meeting was required to finalize discussions not addressed during the last meeting). In addition, a small group was created to advance discussions and make progress on the sections related with private sector involvement and the proposal of a Capacity Building clearing house. Regarding stakeholders participation, it is felt that some regions were not adequately represented in the discussions due to technical challenges, conflicting schedule or different time zones. However, the discussions have been fruitful and vibrant. The VWG participants raised the concern of

limited participation at numerous occasions. Other stakeholders also expressed concerns on the Virtual Working Group process and questioned the ability of the VWG to conduct text negotiations.

Mr. Hernaus echoed what was said by Mr. Ormond. He also referred that in the last meeting, some participants raised the work that the Secretariat is planning to advance on the development of guidance on industry involvement in the integrated approach to financing and the establishment of an informal advisory group, which is scheduled to meet on Friday, 29 January 2021. The co-facilitators are concerned that since this guidance document is not part of the mandate of the VWG, it could create some confusion that could affect the finalization of the VWG work. Therefore, considering the further delays of ICCM5, the co-facilitators proposed that the Secretariat delays the first meeting of the informal advisory group by at least a few weeks. This will allow the VWG to finish off its work without distraction and to report back to Bureau on the outcome.

The ICCM5 President Ms. Sahler asked the Secretariat about this advisory group under the guidance of UNEP. Mrs. Sharma explained that based on the evaluation of Integrated Approach of Financing under UNEP/UNEA SAICM was requested to draft a report to clarify the industry involvement. SAICM has hired 2 consultants and made a call to the VWG participants and many registered but with a non-balanced result that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Hernaus reiterated his request to postpone this meeting and convene later. This was confirmed by the Secretariat.

The President again thanked the Co-facilitators for their great commitment to the process, she said that she is proud of what has been achieved and showed curiosity to see the final outcome which will be published on the SAICM website. It would t She announced that it would be decided during one of the next Bureau meetings how to move on with the virtual work after a pause and evaluation.

Ms. Fernandez considered essential to continue working intersessionally because that allows maintaining momentum towards IP4 and ICCM5. Ms. Fernández also mentioned that there is room for improvement and asked how the process will advance once the outputs of each VWG are set. In the other hand she proposed to avoid text negotiations and finally she asked if the texts emerging from the working groups would be the basis for the negotiations at IP4, and whether it will be possible for a party not present in the VWG to actually disagree with the advanced text. Ms. Fernandez also requested to the Secretariat not to plan overlapping meetings in order to have the possibility of addressing all topics. Only a limited number of GRULAC countries have been able to send comments, which shows the limited capacity of GRULAC countries to give a timely response to request for comments.

**6) Report back from the Co-facilitators of the High-level Declaration informal drafting group.**

Ms. Sahler welcomed and thanked both Co-facilitators for their commitment and work in supporting the work of the High-level Declaration informal drafting group. She invited the Co-facilitators to report on progress made thus far.

Ms. Williams reported that to date two virtual meetings of the HLD informal drafting group have been held, as well as the development of a draft document that was circulated to members of the informal drafting group for comment. Ms. William noted that the atmosphere of the group is calm and productive. She mentioned that not all regions are active, including Africa. Regarding the format of the elements for the proposed HLD, she proposed a document no longer than 2 – 3 pages. She stated that there is disagreement regarding the scope of the possible HLD and if it should focus on the beyond 2020 instrument or be broader to include issues such as biodiversity and climate. Regarding the ambition of the document the group is working on the language to improve it. There is still an obvious limitation on the group's progress since the work of the VWGs has not yet been completed.

Ms. Rivera thanked the President for invitation to participate in this Bureau meeting. Regarding terminology, she noted that the group discussed the key elements through a simple survey. The first draft of the possible HLD was circulated on 23 December 2020 to the members of the informal drafting group for their comments and consultation with their constituencies. Based on the comments received, it was clear that some members of the

group would have preferred to not have a draft at such an early stage. Consequently, it was decided to take a step back and focus on the elements for a possible HLD.

The President opened the floor for comments and questions from the Bureau.

Ms. Lepinnen mentioned that she received the draft document through the regional representative, and she was indeed surprised to see a draft whereas the mandate was to discuss elements. She recognised the challenge in drafting text or discussing the elements while the beyond 2020 instrument is still being discussed.

Ms. Sahler confirmed that the Co-facilitators will focus their efforts on the elements for a possible HLD rather than drafting text. She thanked the Co-facilitators of the HLD informal drafting group for their availability and work done thus far and she noted that she was extremely pleased with the way the work started and looks forward to the upcoming meeting on 9 February 2021.

#### **7) SAICM secretariat budget**

Ms. Sahler opened this agenda item announcing that the second step for approving the SAICM Secretariat budget for 2021 was launched on 10 December 2020 and finalized on 31 December 2020. All SAICM focal points were informed of the approval of the SAICM Secretariat 2021 budget through the silent procedure. She thanked the Bureau for their support in advancing the 2021 budget through the silent procedure as it is an important step in the functioning and operations of the Secretariat.

#### **8) Next teleconference of the Bureau**

It was agreed that the fifteenth meeting and seventh teleconference of the ICCM5 Bureau will be held in mid-March 2021. As per established practice, the Secretariat will provide options for dates and times.

#### **9) Any Other Matters**

Under this agenda item Ms. Sahler opened the floor for Any Other Matters. Ms. Azzi, representing the IOMC organizations announced a series of webinars on key cross-sectoral issues as a contribution to the ongoing beyond 2020 discussions organized by the IOMC and coordinated by UNITAR, with the generous financial support of the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. The aim of the webinars is to exchange information and share examples of good practices and policy options in a multi-sectoral context. The webinars are scheduled to take place from the last week of February 2021 to end of March 2021. Participation will be open to all interested stakeholders participating in the SAICM beyond 2020 process. Further details will be circulated to all SAICM stakeholders once these are available.

Mr. Naziri noted that due to a technical problem of connectivity he was unable to contribute to all the agenda items and requested to provide his inputs on each agenda item through a written submission once the draft Bureau meeting report is circulated for review and comment. Ms. Sahler agreed to this request.

Mr. Domagalski requested clarification from the ICCM5 President to be sure that when Bureau members can report back to their constituency regarding the postponement of both IP4 and ICCM5 meetings. Ms. Sahler confirmed that the decision on postponement was made and stakeholders can be informed.

#### **10) Closure of the meeting**

The President thanked the Secretariat for organizing the thirteenth meeting and sixth teleconference of the ICCM5 Bureau and all Bureau members, IP Co-Chairs and the Co-facilitators of the VWGs and the HLD informal drafting group for their attendance and continuing contributions.

She asked all to maintain their commitment to this Intersessional Process and noted that the work should continue but at a slower pace than over the past six months as more time is available now. This will ensure

increased participation, inclusiveness and transparency in a virtual process. She thanked all participants for their participation in Bureau meeting and closed the meeting at 4:15pm.

---

FINAL

## Annex

### Participants

**Bureau Members:** Ms. Gertrud Sahler (Germany, ICCM5 Bureau Member Western Europe and Others Group), Mr. Szymon Domagalski (Poland, ICCM5 Bureau Member Central and Eastern Europe) and Ms. Valentina Sierra (Uruguay, ICCM5 Bureau Member Latin America and the Caribbean) and Dr. Dharmendra Kumar Gupta (India, ICCM5 Bureau Member Asia Pacific Region, alternate).

**Regional Focal Points:** Mr. Mohsen Naziri Asl (Iran representing Asia-Pacific), Ms. Suzanne Leppinen (Canada representing Western Europe and Others) and Ms. Ana Fernandez Blanco (Argentina representing Latin America and the Caribbean), Mr. Vladimir Lenev (Russian Federation for Central and Eastern Europe) and Mr. Kouame Georges Kouadio (Cote D'Ivoire for Africa).

**Representatives of non-governmental participants and the IOMC:** Ms. Sarah Brosché (Public Interest Organizations), Mr. Rory O'Neill (Labour NGOs), Ms. Servet Goren (Industry), Ms. Manal Azzi (Chair of the IOMC) and Susan Wilburn (Health).

**SAICM Secretariat:** Ms. Nalini Sharma (SAICM Coordinator), Mrs. Brenda Koekkoek, Mr. Jose de Mesa, Mr. Eduardo Caldera Petit, Ms. Delfina Cuglievan Wiese and Ms. Marijana Todorovic.

**Observers:** Mr. David Morin (Co-chair of the intersessional process), Ms. Judith Torres (Co-chair of the intersessional process), Mr. Vassilios Karavezyris (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety, Germany), Ms. Monika MacDevette, Chief of the Chemicals and Health Branch, UNEP and Mr. Stadler Trengove, Principal Legal Officer, Law Division, UNEP

**Regrets:** Mr. David Kapindula (Zambia, ICCM5 Bureau Member Africa)

### VWG Co-Facilitators:

VWG1: Targets, indicators and milestones: Mr. Wahira Palipane, Sri-Lanka

VWG2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation: Ms. Karissa Kovner, USA and Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, Thailand

VWG3: Issues of concern: Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi, Ghana and Mr. Thomas Jahre Sverre, Norway

VWG4: Financial considerations: Mr. Jonah Davis Ormond, Antigua and Barbuda and Mr. Reggie Hernaus, The Netherlands

### High-level Declaration Informal Drafting Group Co-Chairs:

Ms. Kay Williams, United Kingdom and Ms. Angela Rivera, Colombia