**INPUTS - LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN, JULY 8TH**

**BRAZIL (written comments)**

In light of the discussions held yesterday during two different GRULAC briefings, organized by our regional representatives, whose efforts to provide information and a channel for coordination I would like to thank, I take this opportunity to share with you Brazil’s main remarks about the issues under discussion in the 10th meeting of the Bureau of ICCM5, especially our concerns about the role those virtual working groups should play:

1. **Dates for ICCM5 and the intersessional process:**

   We have already expressed our views on the issue in our previous submission, which is attached to this message. We do think it would be advisable to delay some of the international meetings scheduled for July 2021 due to limited financial and human resources in developing countries. Undoubtedly, additional financial support is essential. However, in many cases, even with additional financial resources, technical teams would not be able to spend a whole month abroad. Regarding IP4, we think it is fundamental to hold a face-to-face meeting.

2. **Discussion on next steps and timelines:**

   1. We reiterate our understanding that those virtual working groups (VWGs) should not play the role delegations have defined to a face-to-face IP4, which is the only legitimate arena for delegations to discuss and negotiate language and proposals about the future of SAICM – for further consideration by ICCM5 – on equal terms, ensuring transparency and inclusiveness.

   2. Regarding the proposal by the co-chairs of the intersessional process, we believe that any type of virtual working process to be held until IP4 should guarantee the participation and collaboration of all delegations and stakeholders, as well as appropriate channels for coordination within regions and sectors. All participants should have timely access to documents and relevant information. As for the mandate of those VWGs, we think they should facilitate deeper technical debates, the exchange of views and experiences among delegations and stakeholders, as well as the compilation of opinions and suggestions as a possible result of their work without modifying versions that have already been negotiated during the intersessional process. From our point of view, virtual discussions cannot substitute in-person negotiations, especially on sensitive issues.

   3. When it comes to the idea of establishing a group of “Friends of the President” to negotiate a High-Level Declaration to be considered by ICCM5, we reiterate our understanding that the format is not advisable for this purpose, inasmuch as this type of institutional arrangement is not capable of ensuring proper transparency and inclusiveness in such an important political process.

   4. We support the creation of synergies to promote the chemicals and waste agenda, but this process should not result in the (re)opening of negotiations on agreements within other environmental areas.

**COLOMBIA (written comments)**

Annex 4 “proposal for virtual meetings and online consultations”

- First of all, we want to acknowledge the efforts of the Bureau in taking into consideration a large part of the concerns raised by Parties and other interested parties, such as GRULAC’s
consideration regarding the difference in time zones, translation into the UN languages as well as connectivity issues that can differ from one country to another.

- Regarding connectivity, we appreciate considerations made by the Bureau to explore ways to assure participation by all stakeholders due to eventual technological problems. In this sense, although we find that written inputs could be a solution, also, we want to draw the attention to align the timeline and schedule for the countries with no possibility to participate online, to have them the opportunity to send comments that can be considered during the online discussions. Also, we consider important to think of the way on how those countries would react to the online outcomes.

- Although we agree with establishing mandates under the guidance of the virtual groups, we also find important that members of the Bureau can provide feedback to their regions before making decisions in order to include all interests and perspectives from countries.

- It is stated that parallel sessions will be avoided. However, when talking about the format it is set out that there will be the possibility to break out the virtual groups in parallel and multiple groups. According to the latter mentioned, we want to emphasise our remarks, as we have transmitted in previous submissions, regarding the importance to avoid parallel groups, since this scenario would make difficult the participation of small country delegations as it is the case of Colombia. Also, avoiding parallel sessions would facilitate the participation of all interested actors.

- Regarding the number of participants in the virtual groups we kindly suggest considering limiting that to a maximum of 50 delegates. This can facilitate the process of discussions and consultation in the groups.

- We welcome the possibility to hold virtual regional meetings which we consider, as it is stated in the annex, these should be in addition to the face-to-face regional meetings in 2021.

- We consider important the criteria for nominating members of virtual working groups that consider region, sub-region and sector/group interested.

Annex 5 “proposed draft: scenario note for path forward to develop recommendations for submissions to ICCM5”

- With regard to topics of the VWGs we want to put under consideration to include the topic of financing in the deliberations which can be complemented with written submissions. This can help countries to progress in the understanding of proposals and the setting of positions towards IP4 face-to-face meeting and ICCM5.

- Regardless of whether they are not spaces for negotiation, it is important to seek broad participation from all the "Stakeholders" or interested actors, which would make it possible to contribute to the consultation process.

- We want to point out that these virtual consultations should not replace the deliberations of the topics at IP4, which should take place in person in 2021. In this sense, we reiterate that Colombia does not consider doable a contingency scenario where IP4 does not take place, as it is stated in annex 5 in part of outcomes from virtual meetings.

Rubén Muñoz - ASOCIACIÓN NACIONAL DE LA INDUSTRIA QUÍMICA (ANIQ), ICCA (written comments)

Fechas de reunión para la ICCM5 y la IP4

- Como sector industrial privado en México, estamos de acuerdo en que se debe mantener un esquema que permita cierta flexibilidad en las reuniones pero con la debida secuencia para efecto de poder realizar la mejor toma de decisiones en las reuniones de decisión. Considerando que
ciertos eventos se traducen en suministros o “materia prima” para la realización de otras reuniones como la IP4 y la ICCM5.

- Manifestamos que estamos más que de acuerdo en que solo en estas reuniones IP4 e ICCM5 sean en las reuniones en las que se logren los acuerdos pertinentes para cada tema incorporado en el SAICM mediante los debidos procesos de negociación; es decir, que en los trabajos de los grupos virtuales no se realice negociación alguna.

Grupos de trabajo Virtual

- Apoyamos la continuidad de los trabajos de los grupos virtuales y los temas técnicos que se ha definido.
- En cuanto a la formación y función del grupo de trabajo denominado amigos del Presidente; si éste tiene el objetivo (que suponemos que sí) de eficientar el trabajo estamos más que de acuerdo en que dicho grupo de trabajo se active; solo sugerimos poder trabajar en la creación de criterios o lineamientos que garanticen en la medida de lo posible una suficiente representatividad de los involucrados, así como un proceso mayormente transparente.

Financiamiento

- No nos oponemos a la discusión de los procesos de financiamiento, sabemos que es fundamental para la realización de las actividades del bureau. Pero el financiamiento considero que no solo debe estar encaminado a facilitar la participación, también debe estar orientado al desarrollo de iniciativas o programas de salud pública y educación que permitan dar evidencia del avance en las metas y objetivos establecidos. Consideramos que no se debe considerar contribuciones obligatorias a la industria ya que consideramos que de manera paralela también el sector invierte en mejorar sus procesos de producción y distribución de sus productos, no solo por el beneficio de su productividad; sino orientado en la realización de tareas y compromisos específicos en materia de protección ambiental y de salud, así como de capacitación. Hoy en día, ya se realizan contribuciones de manera local en el mismo sentido.

**Briefing 1 in Spanish, July 6th** (comments/oral statements based on informal notes taken at the meeting)

**Fernando Bejarano - RAPAM/IPEN**: 3 issues to highlight: include financial considerations in virtual working groups; reinforce the idea of working by email; open and inclusive participation.

**Argentina**: It was stressed the importance of the intersessional work already carried out and progress made to serve as a basis for the proposal of virtual working groups (VWGs) under discussion. Regarding topics proposed for the GTVs, it was mentioned that the financial considerations are not clearly included. It was also recalled the proposal submitted at OEWG3 on integrated approach to financing which includes several components, so GTVs may be useful to achieve progress in this regard, without waiting until IP4.

When it comes to the proposed group D entitled “mechanisms to support implementation”, it was suggested that the workload can be very high and that it would be convenient to split topics, adding financing explicitly. On the other hand, the convenience of having a group dedicated to evaluating and continuing to discuss the science-policy interface was pointed out.
Another issue that was taken into consideration was the number of participants proposed for the GTVs, since it is understood that having only 2 nominations per region and per sector/stakeholder group is a very limited number.

**Argentina is consolidating comments and it is expected to formally send the national position as soon as possible**

**Mexico**: indicated that comments from different government agencies are being consolidated, since it is a joint work. It was also added that how “issues of concern” will be financed is a challenge, so it should be considered in a relevant way in the discussions.

**Lilian Corra - ISDE**: mentioned concern to ensure that SAICM beyond 2020 is open, transparent and even, so it is important to reach consensus on who will participate and in what way. Regarding Working Group D, the comments on the work overload were echoed, suggesting that the group can be divided into 2 related areas: science-policy interface and capacity development as one and, on the other hand, financing and monitoring.

**Costa Rica** mentioned agreeing with that proposal.

**Fernando Bejarano - RAPAM/IPEN**: positively rated the proposal to divide VWG D in two, explicitly including the issue of financing. He also recalled that one of the 3 components of the integrated financing approach includes private sector involvement. In this sense, IPEN is preparing a proposal and the document will be shared soon.

**Briefing 2 in English, July 6th** (comments/oral statements based on informal notes taken at the meeting)

A summary of the main comments made during the briefing in Spanish was shared.

**Brazil**: recognizes the importance of maintaining momentum but guaranteeing the participation and collaboration of all stakeholders as well as appropriate channels for coordination. Regarding the GTVs, they can facilitate deeper technical debates, the exchange of opinions and the compilation of opinions and suggestions, without modifying previously negotiated documents during the intersessional process. Virtual discussions cannot substitute IP4, which is the only legitimate arena to negotiate for ICCM5. In relation to the establishment of a group of "Friends of the President" to negotiate a high-level declaration, given its political importance, they understand that the format would not be advisable for this purpose and to ensure transparency and inclusiveness.

**Colombia**: appreciates considerations made by the Bureau on eventual connectivity problems (to assure broad and inclusive participation), avoiding parallel sessions to facilitate the participation of all interested actors. In this sense, they consider that written feedbacks could be useful as well as align timelines and schedule for those who cannot participate online to have enough time to comment in written.

Regarding the number of participants in virtual working groups (VWGs), it is suggested to consider limiting to a maximum of 50 delegates, with a nomination criterion based on regions, sub-regions and sector/group interested. It was also mentioned that the topic of financing should be included in the deliberations of the VWGs.

They also welcomed the possibility to hold virtual regional meetings, but these should be in addition to the face-to-face regional meetings in 2021. In this regard, they consider it convenient to know when
those face-to-face regional meetings are planned to be held and if they will be back-to-back with those of BRS or Minamata. Colombia will host the regional meeting of the Minamata Convention. To conclude, they pointed out that virtual consultations should not replace deliberations at IP4 and reiterated that Colombia does not consider doable a contingency scenario where IP4 does not take place.