



7th EU-JUSSCANNZUK¹ regional meeting on the
Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
Virtual, 23 June 2022

Report of the 7th EU-JUSSCANNZUK Regional Meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The EU-JUSSCANNZUK regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management was chaired by the Regional Focal Point Victoria Tunstall, who opened the meeting 23 June 2022 at 5:00 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT).

Item 2: Organizational matters

2. Participants met virtually from 5:00 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. (EDT) on June 23 in accordance with the detailed programme as set out in Annex 2 of the annotated provisional agenda (SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/1).

(a) Adoption of the agenda

3. Participants adopted the agenda of the meeting with no amendments, as stipulated in document SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/1.

(b) Objectives and expected outcome of the regional meeting

4. Ms. Tunstall provided an overview of the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the regional meeting noting that we are just over 2 months until the Fourth Meeting of the Intersessional Process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4) that will take place in Romania.

5. Meeting documents, presented in Annex 1 of document SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/1. had been provided to meeting participants in English only prior to the meeting.

Item 3: Opening Remarks from the ICCM5 President

6. Anita Breyer, President of the Fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) provided her perspective on the expected outcomes of the regional meeting in the context of both IP4 and the ICCM5.

7. With regard to the overall outcome for the Beyond 2020 intersessional process, she emphasized the need to send a strong signal to the world to gain support from political leaders from all sectors including health, labour, environment, and finance, as well as heads of state to support more sustainable chemicals management moving forward. Messaging on the new instrument needs to be put in very clear

¹ “EU-JUSSCANNZUK” is being used to better reflect regional composition of this SAICM related meeting.

language understandable by those leaders. For IP4, she expressed a wish that participants come prepared and come willing to work together and compromise. She noted that while the Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) made significant progress and need to be taken into account, participants also need to recognize that for some, the VWGs were not inclusive enough and therefore we may need to start from IP3 agreed text as the basis of discussions and then bring the ideas of the VWGs and others to the table focusing in on the ideas and positions being put forward rather than debating whether the process was legitimate. She expressed her desire for one unified document at the end of IP4 that would be forwarded to ICCM5.

Item 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

8. Dr. Kay Williams, nominated Co-chair of the Intersessional Process introduced document SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/2: Road map leading to IP4 and ICCM5.

(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

9. Dr. Kay Williams introduced document SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/3: SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020”, for consideration by the ICCM5.

10. She further introduced text last considered at the Third meeting of the Open-Ended Working Group for the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (OEWG3) but not considered during the VWG on vision, scope, principles and approaches, and strategic objectives in preparation for the IP4.

11. She presented slides with the current text on paragraph 2 of “main general recommendations”, vision, scope and strategic objectives to remind participants how the text currently stands and asked participants to reflect on whether they agreed with what was there. She indicated her desire to simplify language wherever possible. Participants were not prepared to comment at this time. With regard to strategic objectives, Dr. Williams presented a slide with the objectives as they currently stand and suggested that the language could be greatly simplified to improve communication. To this end, she proposed alternative wording and asked participants to provide feedback on the suggested text.

12. A number of government participants agreed that the current language was awkward and supported the idea to simplify language to ensure clear messaging. However, none were ready to discuss specific text at this time. Dr. Williams thanked the participants and asked them to flag to her any missing element in advance of IP4 discussions. An NGO representative noted that similar to some of the previous speakers, they would also need some time to reflect on this and asked what the procedure for feedback is. Dr. Williams said that participants could email her directly.

(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

13. The VWG Co-facilitator(s) provided an overview of the work of their respective VWG, highlighting the process used, its outcomes and key issues that regional group participants need to consider in preparation for IP4. The purpose was to refresh the minds of participants on key areas where progress had been made and identify gaps or areas for consideration for moving forward at IP4.

14. Under this agenda item, participants could refer to the following documents: SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/4: Outcome of Virtual Working Group 1 on targets, indicators and milestones; SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/5: Outcome of Virtual Working Group 2 on governance and mechanisms to support implementation; SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/6: Outcome of Virtual Working Group 3 on issues of concern; SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/7: Outcome of Virtual Working Group on financial considerations; and SAICM/RM/EUJ.7/INF.1: Table comparing the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, 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.

i. Virtual Working Group 1: Targets, indicators and milestones

15. The Co-facilitator of the VWG1 on targets, indicators and milestones, Ms. Silvija Nora Kalnins provided an overview of VWG outcomes and addressed questions or clarifications posed by the regional group. She noted that one of the challenges with this VWG and the previous Technical Working Group (TWG) was that two groups were involved; those with more technical background and focused on trying to obtain SMART targets, and those who were more policy oriented; while it is good to have diversity in the group, it was a challenge to gain common understanding. Another challenge was the number of targets submitted by participants. Moving forward, we will need to agree on priorities. There is a need to discuss this openly if we want to move forward. She suggested that one option could be to create general targets and allow different stakeholder groups to have their own milestones.

16. With regard to specific issues, she said the VWG avoided the discussion on waste. Moving forward, IP4 will need to consider to what extent waste will be covered under the framework. There is a need to come to a common understanding or definition of terms such as circular economy. There is also an interest to include new concepts, e.g., accident prevention and response. In addition, there are many process oriented targets and there needs to be a better balance with results oriented targets.

17. She noted that the Strategic Objectives have not been revisited since OEWG3 and that in general, the VWG agreed on the need for a more iterative process between discussion on targets and objectives, and that this process will need to be facilitated by co-chairs.

18. In the discussion that followed, one government participant asked whether the Outcome of the TWG on targets and indicators in 2019 would be appended to the compilation document. The Co-Chair responded that it would be appended to the compilation document. The same participant asked IOMC to clarify the status of their work in this area and what would be available for IP4. WHO, on behalf of the IOMC, indicated that work was ongoing but may not be ready by IP4.

19. Many governments supported using the outcome of the VWG as the starting point for discussions at IP4. Ms. Kalnins further clarified that the VWG built on the outcome of the TWG and that the VWG was actually more broadly representative than the TWG. She acknowledged that there were some difficulties with online engagement but that written input was also an option that was used by many. The IOMC work will need to be brought into the discussions in a transparent manner.

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

20. Ms. Karissa Kovner presented the detailed mandate of the group, which was based on reviewing the text of the compilation of recommendations, as well on the Science-Policy Interface.

21. Ms. Kovner noted that six meetings were held for this VWG and there were 214 participants. 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 needed to be done in each section of the outcomes’ documents.
- Part II: Recommendations for the establishment of a Science-Policy Interface. She noted that since the VWG concluded, a process had been launched by the United Nations Environment

Assembly (UNEA) for the establishment of a Science Policy Panel and that we will need to have further discussion on how this impacts the science policy needs of SAICM; 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.

22. 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 (Section G) and Updating the Instrument (Section H) and the overlap with related sections of SAICM/IP.4/2 that were not part of the VWG2 mandate.

23. Ms. Kovner noted that there was a lot of participation from stakeholders and regions, with some calls including more than 200 participants, but that they still experienced similar challenges as other groups.

24. In the discussion that followed, one government participant asked how the parking lot issues would be addressed at IP4. In particular, the issue of how multi-sectoral engagement could be strengthened. She noted that, related to this, INF4 and INF5 prepared for the original IP4 included some good ideas that have also not yet been discussed, and questioned whether there would be an opportunity to discuss this at IP4. The IP Co-Chair responded that she would take this away and will look for how this could be incorporated.

iii. Virtual Working Group 3: Issues of concern

25. The Co-facilitator Mr. Thomas Jahre Sverre presented an overview of the work conducted and key outcomes of the VWG3.

26. He indicated that there had been broad participation in both the virtual meetings and through written input and that the Co-facilitators had based their work on SAICM/IP.4/2.

27. He also indicated that there had been two changes of substances: 1) the list of criteria put into the compilation document at IP3 was removed as there was little support for it. Elements of criteria can be found in section B, however; 2) there was an introduction of the idea of a stakeholder committee, drawn on experience from other fora (e.g. Basel partnership).

28. The group tried to streamline text drawing substantially from SAICM/IP.4/2 or agreed text from ICCM2 as it was simpler and more straightforward. The text now chronologically follows the process from identification, to selection, to reporting and continuation or closure. The title of “Issue of concern” was maintained. Many different views were expressed, but no agreement was reached on a new title. This may need to be adjusted if we want to look at new issues such as sustainable chemistry. The definition included is from the ICCM2 text and this may also need to be revisited.

29. It was originally proposed that the future of existing Emerging Policy Issues (EPIs) could be considered at ICCM6 but given the continued delays due to the pandemic, it is now proposed that this could be discussed at ICCM5 and that each EPI should be looked at separately. For EPIs that continue, the Co-facilitator’s advice would be that they be placed under the same title (i.e., as “issues of concern”), and follow the same process (e.g. reconsideration of continuation based on progress) as new “issues of concern”. He expressed that it would be good if delegations could come prepared to discuss the future of EPIs, including para 33-34.

30. Many governments supported using the outcome of VWG3 as much as possible given the significant progress made. One suggested that the changes made are very helpful though the function of the suggested multi-stakeholder group or committee might need to be discussed further. Another reiterated that great progress was made and welcomed using the outcome as a starting point giving the example of the streamlining of nomination process and the proposal on how to assess EPI, echoing the comment on multi-stakeholder committee.

iv. Virtual Working Group 4: Financial considerations

31. Co-facilitator Mr. Reggie Hernaus presented the outcomes of the VWG. He provided an overview of the mandate and process of group's work. He indicated that it would be important to refer to both SAICM/IP.4/2 and VWG4 outcomes for the discussion at IP4.

32. He then identified the main issues that still need to be addressed at IP4 including:

- Integrated approach to financing (3 pillars)
- Financing the secretariat
- Capacity-building
- Private sector involvement

33. With regard to the Integrated approach to financing, the first pillar, mainstreaming, is not likely to be a controversial issue. The group will need to consider how to improve text related to private sector involvement so it is acceptable to all stakeholders. Ideas were launched during the VWG, including the idea of a capacity building clearinghouse, but no text was officially submitted. Mr. Hernaus noted that without an official proposal, it can't be addressed at IP4. In relation to the dedicated external finance pillar, the outcomes of the GEF-8 replenishment, which increased funding to SAICM considerably, and the extension of the Special Programme were highlighted as well as the role of bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Nevertheless, countries will also need to consider the proposal already put forward for a new dedicated fund.

34. With regard to financing the secretariat, participants need to consider whether to continue with open voluntary contributions or move to voluntary assessed contributions using the UN scale as per the proposal from Norway and Switzerland. The current donor base is small and needs to be increased, not only for governments but also for other stakeholders.

35. Capacity-building has been reflected in IP3 and the VWG outcome documents and a decision needs to be made as to whether it should be a separate theme or included in the integrated approach to financing.

36. Mr. Hernaus then identified the issues and proposals not discussed in the VWG, including the idea of a global tax from IPEN; the African group proposed tax, and; ICCA proposal on a clearing house mechanism, noting that he was uncertain if text on these proposals will be submitted officially at IP4. Industry representatives indicated that work has continued in collaboration with the secretariat and that this will be part of a capacity-building proposal.

37. In the discussion that followed, one government representative expressed strong appreciation of the work done by ICCA, stating that the role of private sector is important. He suggested that to date there had been a bit of an adversarial approach at times between stakeholders but he hoped this could be avoided going forward. We all need to work as collaboratively as possible, recognizing more needs to be done. The same government representative indicated that his government would not agree to have legally binding contributions, including a tax, in a voluntary agreement. He noted that the extension of the Special Programme and the GEF8 replenishment should signal that we are listening. However, new funds don't necessarily result in additional funding overall and it may be more productive to consider how existing mechanisms can be more effective. It was noted by other government representatives that this is an important topic and that further discussions will be required.

38. The Secretariat pointed out that the Programme of Work and Budget, that were approved by silent procedures, included the development of a capacity-building strategy and that this work is underway. With regard to a proposal from Japan on reporting mechanisms, the Secretariat has been doing an in depth look at existing mechanisms but won't be able to present anything concrete at IP4. In addition, the Secretariat informed the group that GRULAC did a follow-up questionnaire on what sort of capacity-building is needed, are hoping that other regions will do something similar, and that this information could be brought to IP4.

Item 5: Update from IOMC organisations

39. Ms. Lesley Onyon from the WHO provided an update on behalf of the IOMC on activities and outcomes, including: further development of the IOMC toolbox, including new technical guidance and information tools. She provided an update on the status of the IOMC work on indicators, linked to the outcomes of the WG1 on targets, indicators and milestones.

40. Mr. Achim Halpaap on behalf of UNEP then introduced IOMC work envisaging the development and implementation of an integrated approach to chemicals and waste management that moves away from a chemical by chemical approach into something more integrated. This concept is a three tiered approach which focuses on (1) basic national chemicals management capacities (2) key industry sectors and product value chains (3) linkages to sustainable development issues.

41. In the discussion that followed, one government representative asked how this proposal fits within the current framework and compilation document. All agreed this was an important question to be determined. The presenter indicated that there was a one-day stakeholders workshop planned for a day prior to IP4 and possibly a technical briefing where they would hope to define some very precise suggestions that can be fed into IP4. Another government representative indicated the importance of digging deeper into different industrial sectors and that this is linked to the Swiss proposal on a target on the use of private sector standards.

42. The President noted that she had attended Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm Conference of the Parties (BRS COPs) and that there was a lot of interest in the integrated approach presented by the IOMC. She stated that she felt the IOMC are on the right track in getting us to be more concrete and that she was happy for the active engagement of the IOMC as they are central to the engagement of other sectors.

Item 6: Logistical preparations for the Fourth meeting of the Intersessional Process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

43. The representative of Romania presented an update on preparations for IP4. She presented the proposed meeting dates for IP4 scheduled to take place in face-to-face mode from 29 August to 2 September 2022 at Romexpo in Bucharest, Romania. Romania is expecting a total of 250 participants.

44. She also noted that since they are not a Schengen country, some participants may need to have a visa to enter, but that at the moment, there are no COVID related restrictions.

45. The Secretariat representative noted that the invitation and agenda should be circulated shortly. She also noted that the next Bureau meeting will take place on July 12 to finalise the documents for IP4. Meeting documents should be posted by July 15.

46. The President noted that IP4 will be a meeting with limited participation. This means that funding for participation for the other regions is severely limited (instead of one delegate per country it will be eight delegates from Africa and Asia-Pacific respectively; 5 GRULAC and 3 CCE). There may be some additional delegates from those regions travelling by other funding. Nevertheless, it will be important for countries in our region to keep in mind the limited participation expected from other regions, and that it would be advisable for WEOG countries to not expand the number of delegates compared to previous IP meetings. In response to a question, the President also clarified that the meeting will be face to face only.

Item 7: Other matters

47. No other matters were raised by participants.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

48. The President expressed her excitement to meet everyone in Bucharest and Regional Focal Point thanked participants for their active participation and contribution to discussions at the meeting. The meeting was closed at 8:02 a.m. on Thursday, 23 June 2022.
