

**Twenty-third meeting of the Bureau of the
International Conference on Chemicals Management for its fifth session**
Tuesday, 4 October 2022, from 14:00 – 17:00 CET

REPORT OF THE TWENTY THIRD MEETING OF THE ICCM5 BUREAU

1) Opening and welcome

The President of the Fifth Session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5), Ms. Anita Breyer welcomed all participants to the twenty-third meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau. She referred again to the successful Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4) that was held in Bucharest, Romania from 29 August-2 September 2022. The President recalled that the meeting has been adjourned and will be resumed in a place and date to be determined hopefully during this meeting. She mentioned that the main purpose of this meeting is to take a decision on the proposed budget and venue for the resumed IP4 meeting in order to initiate a silent procedure for budget adjustments required to cover the resumed IP4 meeting as soon as possible.

2) Adoption of the agenda

Ms. Breyer presented the provisional agenda for the meeting. She invited Bureau members to raise additional points they might have under AOB.

The agenda was adopted without any further requests from the Bureau members.

3) Adoption of the 22nd meeting report of the ICCM5 Bureau, held on 12 July 2022

The President asked the Bureau members if they had comments on the report of the Bureau meeting held on 2 September 2022, which has been uploaded on the SAICM webpage. She mentioned that some editorial comments provided have already been incorporated and that the final version was circulated on 23 September 2022.

Mr. Szymon Domagalski (Central and Eastern Europe Representative) noted that at the last Bureau meeting it was agreed to send the thank you letter to the Government of Romania, and this had not been reflected in the meeting report. The President informed the meeting that she had signed the letter last Thursday, which has been circulated to the Bureau members and the IP-Cochairs for their signature. Once signed, the letter will be sent to the Government of Romania.

Ms. Judith Torres (IP Co-chair) took the floor and proposed a small change to the report of the 22nd Bureau meeting. On her intervention on targets and indicators she proposed to delete Issues of Concern. She said that a contest on the name of the new instrument may be launched during the intersessional process.

Ms. Susan Wilburn (Health sector representative) mentioned that she has been attributed in the report to something that was said by Ms. Sara Brosche. Regarding the increased number of financed delegates up to 60% for the resumed IP4, she suggested to include the reference to the paragraph on the number of eligible participants for funding from the ICCM4 resolution on the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and beyond 2020.

Ms. Nalini Sharma said that the Secretariat will include these suggested changes in the report and will also include the reference to the ICCM4 resolution into the draft decision for the silent procedure.

Ms. Victoria Tunstall (WEOG regional focal point) asked how the proposed contest for the name of the new instrument would be done. She said it is unusual to have a contest for this kind of task. She suggested to replace the word “may” to soften the request. Ms. Torres mentioned that this issue was raised at IP4 meeting and the idea arose when trying to involve more people into the decision of naming the new instrument, for example the youth group.

In this regard Mr. Szymon Domagalski (Bureau member for the CEE Region) pointed out that “contest” might be the wrong word, and don't necessarily mean contest as such, in any case the decision will be at ICCM5. He added that a survey or a consultation may be a better term for this exercise.

Ms. Breyer suggested to use both terms. She then asked the secretariat to implement the proposed changes and the report would then be considered approved.

4) Review and endorsement of the draft decision on the convening of the resumed session of the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.

Ms. Breyer took the floor noted that a decision needs to be made on the launch of the silent procedure to be launched with respect to the budget adjustment, which also includes a decision on when and where to hold the resumed IP4 meeting.

Ms. Sharma mentioned that the UNEP legal officer has suggested to use the terminology of adjourned and resumed meeting for the official documents, and the term IP4.2 would be used informally and internal to the Bureau.

Ms. Breyer then recalled the offer from Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (IOMC representative) on behalf of ILO and WHO to host the resumed IP4 meeting, and it was decided to do a comparison table between the Nairobi and Geneva options. She then gave the floor to the Secretariat.

Ms. Sharma mentioned that the Secretariat received feedback from ILO on the meeting requirements and based on the available space this venue would not be large enough to run a successful resumed IP4 meeting, which now includes increased participation. Both main conference centers for ILO and WHO are under renovation. She noted that in addition, our Swiss colleagues have been actively looking for a venue for the resumed IP4 meeting in Geneva and they concluded that there was no suitable venue available for the proposed dates. Having taken into consideration all the factors mentioned above, Nairobi is the only valid option. At this point Ms. Sharma proposed screening the draft decision to go through it paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. Rory O'Neill (Labour sector representative) was disappointed about this decision and was surprised that no venue could be found in Geneva.

Ms. Tunstall also provided some mixed comments from her region. Some supported holding the meeting in Nairobi to provide the opportunity of holding a SAICM meeting in a different region, but others thought that Geneva allows better options for back-to-back meetings which should lead to cost savings.

Ms. Brosche mentioned that the NGO community prefers Geneva. She believed that it would be some participation overlap between the Basel Convention meeting to be held in Geneva and the meeting in Nairobi that could complicate the travel for some of the delegates. She also mentioned that the visa issue could be a problem for Kenya since the process could be long and costly.

Mr. Naresh Gangwar (Bureau representative for the Asia Pacific Region) mentioned that taking into account the increased participation, the space needed should be the criteria to follow, and, in this case, it seems that Nairobi is the only option. He added that sometimes back-to-back meetings have more inconvenience than advantages including long periods of being absent from the office.

Having heard the views from the Bureau members, Ms. Breyer confirmed that the option of having the resumed meeting in Nairobi will be pursued and she requested that the text of the draft decision be put in the screen.

Ms. Sharma went through the comments received in writing and confirmed that comments received to date have been incorporated into the text shown on the screen.

Ms. Brosche requested the new version of the draft decision both in clean and track changes version be circulated by email. Ms. Sharma confirmed that this version will be shared with the Bureau following this meeting, and Bureau members will have the opportunity to undertake a final review with a short deadline for any comments and inputs.

Some Bureau members proposed to specifically add a sentence on the decision to increase the financed delegates up to 60% of developing countries and countries with economies in transition, as well increasing the number of financed stakeholders to participate in the resumed IP4 meeting with the aim of having a broader participation, including regional and gender balance to promote ownership of the process.

Ms. Sharma provided clarifications on the increased participation. She noted that the calculation for Nairobi provides for a total of 135 participants eligible for funding, and subsequently presented a breakdown per region and the NGOs, Health, and Labour stakeholders. For example, the Africa region originally had an assignment of eight countries. Under the approved increased participation, this number has now increased to 32, which would be the equivalent of 60% of countries in the region. Overall, this entails an increase in funded participation at the meeting by a factor of 3.

Several Bureau members provided minor editorial inputs and comments to the draft decision, which were incorporated in the text shown on the screen.

Mr. Santos Virgilio asked about the possibility of having Regional Meetings prior to ICCM5. Ms. Sharma responded that there are plans to have a series of regional in-person meetings to support the preparation for ICCM5 between April and June 2023 and this has been factored into the budget. Additionally, a day or possibly two days are planned for preparatory regional meetings just prior to the resumed IP4 meeting.

Following the discussion, Ms. Sharma informed the Bureau members that the revised draft decision will be shared with the Bureau with a deadline of three days for inputs and the silent procedure will be launched on Monday, 10 October 2022. The silent procedure will run for 20 days, and if there are no objections the decision will be considered adopted on 31 October 2022. At that moment an active resource mobilization effort will be undertaken for the resumed IP4 meeting.

Mr. Szymon Domagalski requested the secretariat to circulate both clean and track-changes versions, which will facilitate the communications with the respective constituencies.

Mr. Jorge Ocana (representing the IOMC organizations) mentioned that WHO mobilized the support for additional countries to participate in the adjourned IP4 meeting responding to strengthening the multi-sectoral dimension of SAICM. He added that without the support from WHO only 4 delegates would have been representing the health sector (Canada, Belgium, Belarus, Brazil). WHO contributed approximately USD 55,000 towards support of the additional health sector participants. Regarding the resumed IP4 meeting, as this meeting was not foreseen, it is unlikely that WHO can provide a similar contribution. Mr. Ocana urged the Bureau to address the need for multisectoral participation at the resumed IP4 meeting and especially without this level of additional contribution. He finally added that ILO and OECD provided support staff to assist with the running of the adjourned IP4 meeting.

Ms. Tunstall further noted that most of the SAICM focal points come from the environment sector, and that there is a need to incorporate and build capacity of delegates from other sectors.

Ms. Sharma added that following the silent procedure, the Secretariat will request the Regional focal points to identify which countries and sectoral organizations will be eligible for funding.

Mr. Domagalski, speaking on behalf of the Bureau members, recognized the engagement of all the IOMC organizations, especially WHO and ILO, in the promotion of the sectoral engagement in the intersessional process.

Mr. Torabi requested support or guidance on how to select the participants eligible for funding for the resumed IP4 meeting and mode of selection. Ms. Sharma confirmed that the Secretariat will guide and support the Bureau members in this regard, including by providing a list of SAICM focal points.

Ms. Breyer then closed the agenda item and thanked all participants for their willingness to cooperate and find consensus.

5) Next teleconference of the Bureau

Following a brief discussion on the date for the next teleconference of the Bureau, it was decided to informally check with the presidency and, send a doodle pool to find out the most suitable date in late November or early December 2022.

6) Any Other Business

The President opened the floor for AOB but there were none.

Ms. Kay Williams (IP-Cochair) informed the Bureau that they had a session with the co-facilitators to discuss what additional work they think may be helpful in advance to the resumed meeting. She added that at some point, a discussion on waste is needed, but hopefully this will take place at the resumed IP4 meeting. For this reason, she did not necessarily envisage a lot of work in the intersessional period. On the other hand, she said there is a need to have more substantive discussion on what is meant by waste. With regards to indicators, Ms. Williams thought that it would be better to wait for the IOMC to complete their work and circulate it for awareness raising ahead of the resumed IP4 meeting, which will facilitate the discussions on targets. She recalled that the Bureau decided not to work on streamlining the targets because that could create a parallel process Ms. William added that the African region would like to talk to industry face to face but it was not fully clear what that discussion could be and how the IP Co-Chairs may be able to facilitate the discussion.

Ms. Servet Goren (Industry representative) mentioned that based on the finance discussions held in Bucharest, the text on capacity building mechanisms is still to be worked out, and she asked if this work should be done now or at the resumed IP4 meeting? On the other hand, she noted that if the African region wanted to advance on this subject this would mean parallel work. Ms. Goren supported having the conversation but would need some clarity on the content. It was finally agreed that the conversation between the private sector and the African region will continue bilaterally. Both Ms. Goren and Mr. O'Neill mentioned that they could help on the identification of downstream users.

7) Closure of the meeting

The ICCM5 President thanked the SAICM Secretariat for organizing and the Bureau members for participating in the Twenty-third meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau.

Annex

Participants

Bureau Members: Ms. Anita Breyer (Germany, ICCM5 Bureau Member Western Europe and Others Group), Mr. Szymon Domagalski (Poland, ICCM5 Bureau Member Central and Eastern Europe), Mr. David Kapindula (Zambia, ICCM5 Bureau Member Africa), and Mr. Naresh Gangwar (India, ICCM5 Bureau member Asia Pacific) (India, on behalf of the ICCM5 Bureau member Asia and the Pacific).

Regional Focal Points: Mr. Santos Virgilio (Angola representing Africa), Ms. Suzana Andonova (North Macedonia, representing Central and Eastern Europe), Mr. Francisco Barbieri (Argentina representing Latin America and the Caribbean), Ms. Victoria Tunstall (Canada representing Western Europe and Others) and Mr. Abbas Torabi (Iran representing the Asia Pacific Region).

Representatives of non-governmental participants and the IOMC: Ms. Sara Brosché (Public Interest Organizations), Mr. Rory O’Neill (Labour), Ms. Servet Goren (Industry), Ms. Susan Wilburn (Health), and Mr. Jorge Ocana (IOMC).

SAICM Secretariat: Ms. Nalini Sharma, Mr. Pierre Quiblier, Mr. Rafal Brykowski, Mr. Jose de Mesa and Mr. Eduardo Caldera Petit.

Observers: Ms. Judith Torres (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process), Ms. Kay Williams (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process), Ms. Jutta Emig, Ms. Myriam Elschami and Mr. Mathias Wolf (German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection), Ms. Jacqueline Alvarez (UNEP-SAICM Secretariat), Ms. Sheila Aggarwal-Khan (UNEP), Ms. Catalina Pizarro (Legal Unit – UNEP) and Mr. Dinesh Runiwal (India).