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This submission is response to a request following a discussion during the 10th SAICM Bureau meeting about three topics: 1) Beyond 2020 Co-Chairs’ scenario note; 2) Secretariat’s proposal to convene virtual meetings and online consultations; and 3) Budget 2020 – 2021. Specific proposals from Pesticide Action Network are noted in the submission.

Beyond 2020 Co-Chairs’ Scenario Note
Please see tracking changes comments on the Co-Chairs’ Scenario Note that are included in this submission in a separate document. In addition to proposed text edits, the tracking changes document also includes inserted web links so that delegates can easily access information about meetings or documents mentioned in the Scenario Note.

Comments to explain proposed Scenario Note tracking changes include:

Introduction
Suggested comments include some editorial editing of IP4 and ICCM5 dates and locations and an assurance that decisions on substantive issues will be saved for face-to-face meetings.

Goals and expectations for ICCM5
The text, “approach to finance” is not clear and could suggest that the new agreement will not actually have a finalized financial mechanism, but a vague “approach” instead. For this reason, a suggested edit is simply, “Finance and capacity building.”

We propose rearranging the items to be completed in the intersessional process to be consistent with their organization at IP3. This includes placing issues of concern in the implementation mechanisms contact group.

Since government road maps are also important for implementation, they were added as well.

Online Technical Briefings
The suggested edits include adding a bullet for the possibility of additional briefings that are relevant to the Beyond 2020 process.

Virtual working groups (VWG)
This section had some substantial proposed edits, based on the suggestion that the Beyond 2020 virtual process mimic the open nature of the previous IP meetings and the Stockholm Convention POPs Review Committee (POPRC) processes.

Participation in the virtual working groups could simply mimic participation at IP meetings: Stakeholders that have participated in previous meetings would be invited to participate in any of the four groups. This open participation feature of IP meetings should translate well to the online
format and provide an opportunity for greater participation and political buy-in that is not available for in-person meetings due to funding limitations.

A key part of our proposal for the virtual working groups is to conduct them primarily by email using written submissions based on the most recent versions of the compilation of recommendations and other relevant materials. Sufficient time should be provided to send written inputs to ensure that stakeholders with connection problems can contribute. Typically in other processes sufficient time means 3 – 4 weeks.

There is ample experience with intersessional working groups conducted via email. For example, IPEN has participated as an observer in the Stockholm Convention POPs Review Committee since its formation in 2005. All working groups of the Committee have a chair and drafter and work intersessionally by email. Participation is open to those who have participated in Committee meetings.

In contrast, a procedure based on conducting online meetings via video teleconference has some built-in difficulties. These include unequal internet access that prevents active participation in an online meeting that requires consistent, high-quality connectivity. These concerns are not theoretical. Online virtual meetings were pushed for the Basel Open Ended Working Group as well as the UNEA Ad Hoc Open-Ended Expert Group on Marine Litter and Microplastic webinar series. In both cases, these events failed to advance. In the case of the Basel meeting, the African region communicated several times to the Bureau about this problem, and it took three rounds of communication before the Bureau embarrassingly had to change course. IPEN hopes the SAICM Bureau will not repeat the mistakes that other Bureaus have made and instead opt for a more open, inclusive and transparent way to proceed.

To fully advance the intersessional process, it would be most useful to simply replicate the working groups established at IP3: Targets and indicators, Finance, Governance and Mechanisms to support implementation. All of these groups have significant work to do. It is especially important to convene a group on finance which was missing in the Co-Chairs’ scenario note. As noted in the SAICM evaluation, this is a core issue that prevented SAICM1.0 from achieving its goals. Finance simply cannot be left until the last moment, risking a failure to obtain any final agreement.

In keeping with the POPRC process, the Secretariat could issue an invitation to SAICM stakeholders to participate in any of the four VWGs and then develop a participants list for each VWG for use of the VWG co-chairs.

Finally, the Scenario Note should clearly state the expected outcomes of the VWGs: 1) alternate text proposals; 2) compromise text proposals; and 3) notes identifying gaps.

**Open online briefing and webinars of VWG proposals**
We suggest some changes in order of bullet points and to delete redundancies.
Outcomes from the VWGs
This section should clearly state that VWG outcomes will be presented in meeting documents. It would also be useful to clearly note that in the event that IP4 cannot be held due to the pandemic, substantive discussions will be delayed until a face-to-face meeting is possible.

PAN comments on Beyond 2020 Co-Chairs’ Scenario Note

Page 2: Goals and expectations for ICCM5
Add as follows:
• Criteria for selection of new issues of concern and an approach to current emerging policy issues and Issues of Concern
• Implementation mechanisms, including: approach to science-policy; financial considerations and capacity-building; review and taking stock of progress; and consideration of a process for detailed sector/stakeholder/states implementation roadmaps

Page 3: Online Technical Briefings:
Material that serves to inform stakeholders will be presented online through webinars and accessible to all stakeholders on the SAICM website. A timeline for these technical briefing webinars will be posted on the SAICM website. These will include

Add to the list of technical briefings:
• Information regarding a concrete mechanism for identifying issues of concern (IoCs) in need of increased levels of obligation (Technical briefing organised by NGOs) (see http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/IP4/stakeholders/IoC_2020_New_Mechanism_of_Action.pdf)
• Technical briefing on Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs), Human Rights and Double Standards in Trade of HHPs (organized by PAN International).

Page 4 Participants of the VWGs:
• We suggest that for each VWG, each region and stakeholder group be invited to submit an expression of interest for two three representatives to participate. To ensure that there is balanced representation, additional participation could be requested based on sector and stakeholder gaps at the discretion of the Bureau

For more explanations see “PAN International feedback on the proposal to continue the work from the 3rd Intersessional Process meeting” (sent by Sarojeni V. Rengam on behalf of PAN International on 3rd June): “That the virtual working groups including the Friends of the President, are open to more stakeholders and sectors. In addition to having one representative from labour, health and public interest groups, we propose participation of NGO/trade union/health representatives from three different regions”

Page 4 The task and methods of the VWGs:
PAN supports the method to allow “written input” and that documents are put on the SAICM website (open access to all, not just to VWG participants)
In addition to the official VWGs, it is recognized that there may also be stakeholder driven groups on some topics. The outcomes of these initiatives could be submitted as information documents for IP4.

**Secretariat’s proposal to convene virtual meetings and online consultations**

Please see tracking changes comments on the Secretariat’s proposal to convene virtual meetings and online consultations that are included in this submission in a separate document. In addition to proposed text edits, the tracking changes document also includes inserted web links so that delegates can easily access information about meetings or documents mentioned in the Secretariat’s document.

Comments to explain proposed tracking changes in the Secretariat’s document include:

**Purpose**

It would be useful to explicitly note that the purpose of the VWGs is to develop tangible outcomes including alternate text proposals, compromise text proposals, and notes identifying gaps. It is also suggested to indicate that the output of the VWGs will be in the form of a meeting document for IP4.

**Key considerations**

There are some editorial suggestions to update the virtual meetings of the Bureau.

Additional considerations include:

- The long-standing experience of virtual work in the Stockholm Convention POPs Review Committee.
- Reinforcement that all decisions on substantive issues will be saved for face-to-face meetings.
- Assurance that significant response time for submissions of 3 – 4 weeks will be allowed.
- Noting that the VWGs will be open to all SAICM stakeholders, since the process is proposed to take place primarily by email.

**Virtual Working Groups**

This section had some substantial proposed edits, guided by suggesting that the Beyond 2020 virtual process mimic the previous IP and Stockholm Convention POPs Review Committee (POPRC) processes. IPEN has worked as an observer to this Committee since it began in 2005 and it has worked virtually via email between face-to-face meetings since then.

It may be useful to actually name the topics of the VWGs, once this has been established. This would provide greater coherency between the Scenario Note and this Secretariat document if both are to be issued publicly.

Participation in the virtual working groups could simply mimic participation at IP meetings: Stakeholders that have participated in previous meetings would be invited to participate in any of
the four groups. This open participation feature of IP meetings should translate well to the online format and provide an opportunity for greater participation and political buy-in that is not available for in-person meetings due to funding limitations.

The virtual working groups could work by email using written submissions based on the most recent versions of the compilation of recommendations and other relevant materials. Sufficient time should be provided to send written inputs to ensure that stakeholders with connection problems can contribute.

As noted above, there is ample experience with this type of work. For example, IPEN has participated as an observer in the Stockholm Convention POPs Review Committee since its formation in 2005. All working groups of the Committee have a chair and drafter and work intersessionally by email. Participation is open to Members and Observers who have participated in Committee meetings.

To fully advance the intersessional process, it would be most useful to simply replicate the working groups established at IP3: Targets and indicators, Finance, Governance and Mechanisms to support implementation. In keeping with the POPRC process, the Secretariat could issue an invitation to participate in any of the four VWGs and then develop a participants list for each VWG for use of the VWG co-chairs.

The Secretariat proposal should clearly state the expected outcomes of the VWGs: 1) alternate text proposals; 2) compromise text proposals; and 3) notes identifying gaps. It would also be useful for participants to understand that the outcome of the groups will be in the form of a meeting document for discussion at IP4.

Technical briefings
It may be useful to signal that other technical briefings relevant to the Beyond 2020 process could be held.

PAN comments on Secretariat’s proposal to convene virtual meetings and online consultations
Virtual meetings: PAN proposes that each virtual working group has sessions at two different times to accommodate all the times zones, and that each session is also open to written comments for stakeholders with connectivity and time zone problems. All discussions and comments should be made available as soon as possible on a part of the SAICM website dedicated to the Virtual working groups, so that all stakeholders can see the discussions.

PAN supports provision of information in UN languages. Please take into consideration that stakeholders might be on summer break in late July. (see also next comment)

- Information should be available in the UN languages in order to facilitate participation from all regions, as relevant;
- Kick-off VWGs in late July.
Page 3 (b) Technical briefings

[...] The technical briefings will be scheduled in July and August 2020. Note that this is exactly during summer break time in Europe which might endanger people’s participation.

**Budget 2020 – 2021**

As noted in the revised proposed 2020 – 2021 budget, the financial contributions from ICCA to the secretariat are restricted for “activities on industry engagement.” Considering the importance of the current Beyond 2020 process and the very high costs in 2021, it would be appropriate for ICCA to make these funds unrestricted so that they could be used where needed.