

**Twenty-fourth meeting of the Bureau of the
International Conference on Chemicals Management for its fifth session**
Thursday, 15 December 2022 from 14:00 – 16:30 CET

**IP Co-Chairs consultation process to further develop the IP Co-Chairs single consolidated
document and discuss other key issues to be considered in advance of the resumed IP4 meeting**

Analysis of the feedback received

The following regional groups provided feedback in response to the IP Co-Chairs consultation process Africa, Bosnia and Herzegovina (CEE), Canada (WEOG), EU (WEOG), Health Sector NGOs, Japan (WEOG/Asia-Pacific), Public Interest NGOs, the UK (WEOG) and the USA (WEOG). All the submissions are posted online at the SAICM website: [IP Co-Chairs consultation process \(saicm.org\)](https://www.saicm.org/ip-co-chairs-consultation-process).

The key messages and issues based on the questions posed are listed below

1. Does the consolidated text help us achieve our vision?

While the primary intention of the question was to gather feedback on the single consolidated document as a whole, in their responses stakeholders focused on the text of the vision statement. They highlighted the need for an ambitious, long-term vision. In their responses, they underlined that there has been good progress on the vision text, but some indicated that work still needs to be done.

Further work at IP4.2 could ensure that the vision is met:

- is clear and simple,
- addresses a structural change in the long-term, with a focus on basic chemicals and waste management capacities in all countries in the mid-term (2030),
- builds from a theory of change approach,
- is supported by clear, measurable and timebound targets and indicators, as well as mechanisms to take stock of progress,
- fully reflects the range of sectoral priorities (e.g., from the health or labour sectors),
- includes appropriate ways and methods to achieve the vision, including financial means.

In Annex 1, the current vision statements have been translated into all 6 UN languages.

2. What are the gaps, enhancements, or improvements to be made in the text?

Stakeholders, in **general, indicated that there are some gaps in the text** and that **enhancements or improvements could be made**. In particular:

- Introductory text (including the rationale for the new framework),
- Scope (including the need to ensure coherence across the document, and to address prevention aspects),
- Strategic objectives and targets (including their prioritization, ensuring appropriate sectoral engagement and representation, and indicators),
- Taking stock of progress (including action plan(s), a step-by-step reporting process, and ensuring appropriate sectoral engagement)
- Financing (external financing, financing of the Secretariat, green finance, and green taxonomy approaches) and capacity building.

Some stakeholders raised the need to consider existing measures under SAICM in the discussion of future arrangements. However, it is not clear whether this consideration would garner general support.

3. Does the text adequately strengthen and enhance sectoral and multistakeholder engagement and ownership, including for the private sector?

Stakeholders indicated that **further work is needed to appropriately reflect**:

- the role of IGOs,
- the role of private sector, including the financial sector,
- the role of health and labor sectors,
- the role of National Focal Points, Regional Focal Points, and balanced sectoral representation,
- the role of civil society (could be strengthened in section D),
- gender issues, and
- vulnerable groups (e.g., women, youth).

4. Could the placement of some text in the document be modified, or moved out of the consolidated text and into a resolution?

Some stakeholders **found the text placement accurate** and/or preferred to **keep the structure as it is**.

Some suggested that the following text/sections could **be moved to a resolution/high-level declaration**:

- statement of needs,
- engagement, endorsement, and recognition, including formal recognition by UNGA, other relevant international bodies and relevant MEAs,
- text from section D referring to SDGs,
- some placeholders, e.g., on SPP,
- some text on targets,
- operating principles.

There was also a suggestion to move text currently in the financing section to the capacity building section (Canada). There is no specification of which paragraph(s).

5. What parts of the document could be considered static versus dynamic i.e., be more easily amended?

Several stakeholders indicated that the sections below could be considered dynamic and placed in annexes:

- Targets and indicators,
- Issues of Concern.

One group of stakeholders (NGOs) also proposed to include in the dynamic part of the document:

- institutional arrangements,
- mechanisms to support implementation,
- financial considerations.

6. Feedback on resolution from ICCM5 on the name and adoption of the new framework.

Stakeholders underlined that **IP4.2 should prioritize the single consolidated text.**

However, stakeholders generally **agreed with the need to prepare** a resolution that includes the name and adoption of the new framework, among other aspects.

There are diverging opinions on **the timing for preparing** the first draft (pre/post IP4.2, before ICCM5).

There has also been a request **to clarify who will prepare the draft, who should table and how input should be provided for consideration.** Another stakeholder (US) believes that the term “policy resolution” might be misleading and imply a more substantive negotiation.

One stakeholder (Canada) **suggests that the IP Co-Chairs clarify what they envision as a final IP outcome i.e., what will be forwarded to ICCM5 for consideration.**

7. Feedback on a resolution from ICCM5 on transitional arrangement and early implementation.

Stakeholders underlined that **the IP4.2 priority should be the single consolidated text.**

In general, stakeholders **agreed with the need to prepare** a resolution for ICCM5 that reflects the intersessional process mandate, but suggested **doing it after IP4.2**, and possibly **provide a limited time slot at IP4.2.** There has also been a request **to clarify who will prepare the draft, who should table and how input should be provided for consideration.**

Stakeholders also proposed to undertake the process of developing the **ICCM 5 high-level declaration** after IP4.2.

8. Feedback on legal and technical (editing) revision comments:

- text should be simple and clear,
- it should be edited to ensure consistency of terms, include an explanation of acronyms and be grammatically correct with proper punctuation,

- it should undergo a legal revision,
- text could be streamlined, and avoid repetition,
- definitions/glossary of key terms could be added,
- any new textual amendments should be clearly marked and agreed upon before integrating within the text.

Analysis of the submissions and possible way forward

The submissions received from stakeholders suggest that there seem to exist **areas of converging or common views**. Stakeholders agree that there are some gaps in the text and that enhancements or improvements could be made (Question 2 *What are the gaps, enhancements, or improvements to be made in the text?*) and that further work is needed to strengthen and enhance sectoral and multistakeholder engagement and ownership (Question 3, *Does the text adequately strengthen and enhance sectoral and multistakeholder engagement and ownership, including for the private sector?*). Stakeholders share the view that IP4.2 should prioritize work on the single consolidated text but also agree with the need to prepare resolutions for ICCM5 (Points 6 and 7 *Feedback on resolution from ICCM5 on the name and adoption of the new framework* and *Feedback on a resolution from ICCM5 on transitional arrangement and early implementation*).

There also seem to be some aspects with a **more diverging views from stakeholders**, for instance on whether the placement of some text in the document could be modified or moved out of the consolidated text and into a resolution (Question 4, *Could the placement of some text in the document be modified, or moved out of the consolidated text and into a resolution?*) and in relation to the timing of the discussions on ICCM 5 resolutions (Points 6 and 7, *Feedback on resolution from ICCM5 on the name and adoption of the new framework* and *Feedback on a resolution from ICCM5 on transitional arrangement and early implementation*).

There is **no clear convergence or divergence** in relation to Question 5 (*What parts of the document could be considered static versus dynamic i.e., be more easily amended?*), where stakeholders seem to need time to further consider their positions. The concept of static and dynamic parts of the text was in principle welcomed by stakeholders, however it seems that some stakeholders may not have yet fixed views on this subject. While targets and indicators, as well as issues of concern, have been proposed to be included in the dynamic part of the text, one submission shows that what should be placed in the dynamic part of the text may be an area of further discussion.

When it comes to the **need of legal and technical editing of the single consolidated text** (Point 8, *Feedback on legal and technical (editing) revision*), stakeholders have supported efforts in this area. Given that the work on the single consolidated document is still work in progress, such revision could take place post resumed IP4 meeting.

The IP Co-Chairs will reflect the submission received during the consultation process in the preparation of their Scenario Note for the resumed IP4 meeting. The reference to the theory of change could also be considered in the context of explaining the IP Co-Chairs expectations of the outcomes of the resumed IP4 meeting.

Finally, some of the comments received on the text of the vision statements **could be addressed in a statement of needs** (Question 1 *Does the consolidated text help us achieve our vision?*).

Annex 1. Proposed vision statements (from the IP Co-Chairs single consolidated document)

English

- Chemical Safety for All
- A toxics free planet. Advancing chemicals and waste safety for a healthy future
- Healthy Planet and People: Making Our Future Chemical and Waste Safe

French

- Sécurité des produits chimiques pour tous
- Une planète sans produits toxiques. Faire progresser la sécurité des produits chimiques et des déchets pour un avenir sain
- Une planète et des personnes en bonne santé : Rendre notre avenir sûr en matière de produits chimiques et de déchets

Spanish

- Seguridad química para todos
- Un planeta libre de tóxicos. Avanzando en la seguridad de los productos químicos y los desechos para un futuro saludable
- Un planeta y personas saludables: hacer que nuestro futuro sea seguro de productos químicos y desechos

Chinese

- 惠及所有人的化学品安全
- 无毒地球。为有一个健康的未来推进化学品和废弃物安全
- 健康的地球和人类：确保我们有一个化学品和废弃物安全的未来

Russian

- Химическая безопасность для всех
- Планета, свободная от токсических веществ. Повышение безопасности химических веществ и отходов для здорового будущего
- Здоровые планета и люди: сделаем наше будущее безопасным в отношении химических веществ и отходов

Arabic

- السلامة الكيميائية للجميع
- كوكب خالي من المواد السامة. تعزيز سلامة المواد الكيميائية والنفايات من أجل مستقبل صحي
- كوكب وشعوب بصحة جيدة: لجعل مستقبلنا آمناً من المواد الكيميائية والنفايات