

**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

REPORT OF THE TWENTY FOURTH 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-fourth meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau. She thanked the Bureau members, the IP co-chairs and the secretariat for their participation in the twenty-third meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau that was held on 4 October 2022. She highlighted that it was a crucial meeting because it aimed at taking a decision on the proposed budget and venue for the resumed IP4 meeting. She recalled that a silent procedure for budget adjustments required to cover the resumed IP4 meeting together with a cover letter signed by the ICCM5 President was launched on 10 October 2022 and, in the absence of formal objections from the SAICM national focal points, the decision was considered as adopted effective on 30 October 2022. Ms. Breyer mentioned that a donor letter was sent to all SAICM focal points on 2 December 2022 with the aim to seek for additional financing for the meetings and activities in 2023, especially for the resumed IP4 meeting, the regional meetings and the ICCM5 meeting.

The President added that the twenty-fourth meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau was an opportunity to receive and provide feedback on the consultation process launched by the IP co-chairs in November 2022 to inform and guide planning of work at the resumed IP4 meeting as well as to discuss other key issues to be considered before the resumed IP4 session in Nairobi. Finally, she added that the meeting would also provide information on the preparations of the resumed IP4 meeting, scheduled to take place from 27 February to 3 March 2023 in Nairobi, Kenya.

2) Adoption of the agenda

Ms. Breyer presented the provisional agenda for the meeting that was circulated on 23 November 2022.

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 twenty-third meeting report of the ICCM5 Bureau, held on 4 October 2022

The President asked the Bureau members if they had comments on the report of the Bureau meeting held on 4 October 2022 which was made available on the SAICM website and circulated on 1 December 2022

Ms. Victoria Tunstall (WEOG regional focal point) indicated that two her comments (regarding the contest for the name of the new instrument and participation at the resumed IP4 meeting) were not appropriately reflected in the posted document. Mr. Jose De Mesa (SAICM Secretariat) confirmed that Ms. Tunstall's comments would be reflected in the revised report.

Ms. Breyer confirmed the adoption of the report with the changes proposed by Ms. Tunstall.

4) Feedback from the 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

Ms. Breyer welcomed the IP Co-Chairs, Ms. Judith Torres and Ms. Kay Williams and invited them to present the outcomes of the consultation process.

Ms. Torres introduced the consultation process and noted that the Bureau members were requested to consult their regions and groups and provide feedback to the questions and issues raised by the IP Co-Chairs by 2 December 2022. Ms. Torres explained that objective of this consultation process was to inform and guide planning of work at the resumed IP4 meeting through consideration of stakeholder comments received on the IP Co-Chairs single consolidated document, in particular on questions and issues related to the vision, gaps/improvements, enhanced sectoral and multistakeholder engagement, and ownership, as well as on modification of the placement of some text in the document, its static vs dynamic parts as well as the legal and technical revisions of the text. The feedback was also requested in relation to the possible ICCM5 resolutions on the name and adoption of the new framework, transitional arrangements and early implementation. Ms. Torres noted that by the deadline of 2 December 2022 feedback was received from the Africa, CEE and WEOG regions, and the health sector and public interest NGOs.

Ms. Williams thanked all for the submissions during this incredibly busy period and acknowledged that some stakeholders may not have been able to submit their views, which should not preclude them from being put forward. She presented an analysis of the submission focusing on areas of converging or common views, areas of diverging views, areas of no clear convergence or divergence of views and on the need of legal and technical editing of the single consolidated document. She noted, *inter alia*, doubts expressed on how to achieve the vision, a proposal from Africa to develop a theory of change to explain what we are doing, why and how, as well as specific areas where improvements can be made (such as the text on multisectoral and multistakeholder engagement and ownership). She underlined that there was a strong view on prioritizing work at the resumed IP4 meeting on the single consolidated text, but also supporting the need to prepare other resolutions for ICCM5. She noted diverging views on the placement of the text in the single consolidated document, as well as on the timing of the discussions on other ICCM5 resolutions. She pointed out a range of views on the structure of the document, including parts that should be dynamic vs. static, and where to place targets and issues of concern. Finally, she noted support for the legal and technical editing of the single consolidated outcome document, which should take place after the resumed IP4 meeting.

The presentation delivered by the IP Co-Chairs is available on the SAICM website [here](#). All the submissions received under the IP Co-Chairs consultation process are available [here](#).

Ms. Williams opened the floor for any views on the feedback they had just presented.

Mr. Abbas Torabi (Asia Pacific regional focal point) asked for more time to compile and send comments from the Asia Pacific region. Ms. Williams confirmed openness for receiving further feedback, noting the deadline to publish all meeting documents for the resumed IP4 meeting is 15 January 2023.

Ms. Sara Brosché (Public Interest Organizations) pointed out the time challenge to prepare feedback and asked for a practical explanation on how the dynamic and static parts would look. She also asked for clarification on the terminology regarding ICCM5 resolutions. Ms. Williams explained, using examples of other international treaties, that the idea is to keep the static part in the main text and to place parts that can be updated more easily in the Annex(es). She also proposed to consider ICCM5 resolutions as any other resolution adopted within the UN context. Ms. Torres further explained that the aim of having consultations was to have a whole picture of the process, including reactions to different proposals made, seeing where difficulties are and how we could advance at the resumed IP4 meeting to have a good set of recommendations to submit to ICCM5 for consideration.

Ms. Tunstall thanked the Co-Chairs for the hard work done to present all inputs received. She asked about the ICCM5 high-level declaration and encouraged the engagement of the thematic group co-facilitators in the

preparatory discussions. She also asked if the scenario note for the resumed IP4 meeting will be shared in advance with the Bureau.

Ms. Susan Wilburn (Health) highlighted that there was difficulty in following the discussions on the consolidated text and supported the UK suggestion on a table of contents. She proposed that the WHO Chemicals Roadmap could be used as an inspiration for the document structure and in understanding roles of stakeholders, and also supported the proposal from the Africa region on the Code of Practice. Further, she underlined the importance of transparency in presenting any structural or content changes to the single consolidated document.

Ms. Williams responded that some work on the high-level declaration has already taken place and it will be continued either in the inter-sessional period following the resumed IP4 meeting or at ICCM5. She clarified that the discussions on the resumed IP4 thematic groups are on-going and said that any views on this would be welcome, as well as any proposals of further co-facilitators, as some of the previous co-facilitators cannot continue at the resumed IP4 meeting. She confirmed that the WHO Chemicals Roadmap is a valuable document.

Mr. Szymon Domagalski (CEE Bureau member) noted that there is a general openness for discussing topics especially those not touched upon at the adjourned IP4 meeting. He asked for clarification on the relationship between the ICCM5 resolutions and a high-level declaration and who is expected to draft them and when. He expressed concern that some issues expected to be included in the ICCM5 resolutions may not be in the mandate of the intersessional process. He highlighted that there is a preference to prioritize the finalization of the single consolidated document at the resumed IP4 meeting. He further suggested further discussion to identify the intersessional work that can take place between ICCM5 and ICCM6. He was in favor of using the WHO Chemicals Roadmap and of introducing a section in the single consolidated document on definitions to better understand the text.

Ms. Torres informed the bureau that the text on the vision of the future instrument proposed at IP4.1 has been translated in all 6 UN languages. She noted that the Spanish version of the text should be reviewed with a critical eye and encouraged others to do the same for other language versions, to ensure that there is a common understanding.

Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (IOMC) informed the meeting that she is still collecting feedback for the IP Co-Chair consultation process. She mentioned that IOMC submitted text on EPIs and IoC at the adjourned IP4 meeting that can be used for other ICCM5 resolutions and that it is being re-drafted and will re-submitted as a CRP at the resumed IP4 meeting. She supported the proposal to dedicate time during the resumed IP4 meeting to discuss other resolutions for ICCM5.

Ms. Williams reassured that Ms. Torres and herself are aware of the mandate and role of the IP Co-Chairs, which includes the preparation of recommendations aside from the single consolidated text. They will consult with the SAICM secretariat regarding the scope of their mandate. She confirmed that the IP Co-Chairs wish to identify the essential work for the resumed IP4 meeting with the aim to have an excellent product at ICCM5. She agreed with the necessity of having clarity on the language in the final text, and suggested that a glossary could help achieve this.

Ms. Breyer thanked the IP Co-Chairs and Bureau members for the update on the consultations and for their hard work in preparation of the resumed IP4 meeting.

Ms. Williams reiterated that they are looking for new co-facilitators and asked for suggestions from the regions. She mentioned that they are also open to receive suggestions on the flow and organization of the meeting.

Mr. Brykowski announced that the translated versions of the vision statements in six UN languages was prepared and it will be posted on the Bureau webpage following this meeting [here](#).

Mr. Domagalski asked for clarification on the new co-facilitators, e.g., how many are needed and for which group. In addition, he asked if co-facilitators from developed countries will receive financial support. Mr. De Mesa clarified that co-facilitators from developed countries will not receive financing. Ms. Williams added that two co-facilitators will not be available for IP4.2. She added that they are still working on the structure of thematic groups for the resumed IP4 meeting and there may be need to work in further smaller groups.

Mr. Torabi reminded that the single consolidated text still has parts with text to be discussed, i.e., text still in brackets and expressed concern about the difficulty that small delegations would encounter in participating in small break-out groups if these were to be created in parallel to the thematic groups at the resumed IP4 meeting.

Ms. Torres asked the secretariat to share the number of funded participants and how they have increased per region (see agenda item 5), as this would help planning for the thematic groups and formal consultations.

Ms. Breyer expressed satisfaction regarding the decision taken to increase the number of funded participants for the resumed IP4 meeting, and recommended that the regions coordinate ahead of the meeting and try to be flexible in ensuring that regions are appropriately represented in all the discussions at the resumed IP4 meeting.

5) Preparations for the resumed Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, 27 February – 3 March 2023, Nairobi, Kenya

Mr. de Mesa presented an update on the preparation for the resumed IP4 meeting (presentation available on the SAICM website [here](#)), including deadlines for registration for funded and non-funded participants, number of financed participants per region and constituency and a nomination process for funding participants, planned online regional briefings ahead of the resumed IP4 meeting, meeting documents, visa requirements and accommodation.

Ms. Eigenmann asked if there is an interest in having an IOMC briefing during the online regional briefings. She also indicated that WHO will be able to mobilize funds and finance up to ten representatives from health ministries to participate in the resumed IP4 meeting. She further informed that IOMC is organizing a workshop on Advancing global chemicals and waste management in chemical intensive economic sectors and value chains from 18-19 January 2023 at OECD in Paris, France.

Ms. Tunstall welcomed the WHO efforts. She highlighted that most of the SAICM national focal points are from the environmental sector and there should be efforts to further balance stakeholder and sectoral representation with regards to health and labor sectors. Mr. de Mesa informed the meeting that increased participation from all sectors is encouraged, but it is the Bureau members and regional focal points who select funded participants. He added that the secretariat has been in contact with WHO encouraging them to communicate with Bureau members and regional focal points to promote participation of the health sector. The same approach is being encouraged for the labor sector and through ILO. Ms. Breyer clarified that WHO informed the Bureau members via email on WHO's intention to fund up to 10 participants.

Ms. Valentina Sierra (GRULAC regional focal point) noted that some Latin America countries are having challenges with their internal authorization process. There are new countries that have applied for financial assistance. Some countries have submitted the request to finance two delegates one from environmental sector and one from foreign affairs which is crucial for the negotiations. Ms. Sierra and Mr. Francisco Barbieri (GRULAC regional focal point) will encourage countries in their region to nominate representatives from health and labor sectors.

Mr. David Kapindula (Africa Bureau member) thanked the ICCM5 President, the IP Co-Chairs, and the secretariat for their work. He asked for clarification on the number of participants from the Africa Region, if there are new documents added for the resumed IP4 meeting, and on the regional briefings. Mr. de Mesa explained that the number of financed participants presented excludes the Bureau members who are funded additionally. He added that the secretariat is still accepting registrations and it is up to Bureau members and regional focal points to decide on financed participants. He informed that the IP Co-Chairs and the ICCM5

President will be available to participate in the regional online briefings, upon request. The secretariat will share the draft agenda of the briefings with the regional Bureau members and focal points for review and suggestions.

Mr. Brykowski clarified that IP4.2 is a resumed meeting, therefore documents posted for the adjourned IP4 meeting will remain unchanged, with the exception of the information note for participants, the annotated agenda and the scenario note, which will be updated. The single consolidated document will be published as a separate document. He added that there may be additional information documents, and these will be made available on the website. He informed the meeting that in order to support preparation for the resumed IP4 meeting, the same six weeks deadline, i.e., 15 January 2023, is applied for posting all updated or additional documents for the resumed IP4 meeting. All stakeholders wishing to provide additional information documents for the upcoming meeting, should submit it to the SAICM Secretariat no later than 9 January 2023, to allow the Secretariat to prepare the documents for uploading on the SAICM website in a timely manner.

Ms. Breyer informed the meeting that she would be happy to participate in the regional briefings. Ms. Torres encouraged Bureau members and regional focal points to explain the process of negotiations at the resumed IP4 meeting to participants who may be new to the process. She also informed the bureau of her availability to participate in the regional briefings.

Mr. Torabi highlighted that many countries have not yet been able to register and requested that the registration is left open for a few more days while the regional focal point reaches out to countries. He also asked if, in the event that the maximum number of funded participants/countries per region is not reached, whether a country can have more than one funded participant. Mr. de Mesa confirmed that registration will remain open until the end of the year, and it is up to the regions to decide what is the best way to increase participation. He added that the regional briefings are open to all stakeholders including civil society, private sector, labor sector, IOMC, etc. However, he clarified that in the past some regions asked for part of the meeting to have limited participation, and this request may happen again.

Mr. Domagalski mentioned that he did not receive the e-mail from WHO and asked when the list of participants sponsored by WHO will be available, as this will help the Bureau deciding whom to finance with the SAICM budget. He added that CEE region has shown great interest in the participation in the resumed IP4 meeting. He proposed to consider funding participants from other regions in case the maximum number of funded participants is not reached. He also pointed out that priority should be given to delegates who participated in the adjourned IP4 meeting and asked for a response from the secretariat on the issues he raised. Furthermore, he invited IOMC as well as the ICCM5 President and the IP Co-Chairs to the CEE online regional briefing. Mr. de Mesa confirmed that the goal is that the maximum number of countries would be financed for each region. He added that Mr. Domagalski's proposal on utilizing the funding not used in other regions is theoretically feasible. With regards to the second point raised by Mr. Domagalski, Mr. de Mesa advised that the regions could decide whether to give priority to delegates who already participated in the adjourned IP4 meeting or favor new countries to encourage capacity building in the region.

Ms. Wilburn thanked the secretariat for extending the deadline for registration. She communicated that they are working on the nominations for the health sector NGO representatives, and they hope to have a representative from the occupational health community. She requested more information on the IOMC workshop in January 2023 and Ms. Breyer suggested that she discusses her queries directly with IOMC. Ms. Eigenmann provided an initial response and shared the contact of Mr. Oliver Wootton from UNITAR for further details.

Ms. Tunstall proposed to prioritize funding delegates from different sectors within the same country. She further commented that there was no deadline for the submission of information documents until now and, if this is a new procedure, it needs to be communicated broadly. She also extended the invitation to IOMC to attend the WEOG regional briefing. Mr. Brykowski confirmed that the secretariat has proposed to apply the same six weeks deadline to all meeting documents for the resumed IP4 meeting, including information documents. He reassured that appropriate communication on the deadline will be sent to all SAICM

stakeholders. Ms. Breyer emphasized that this document deadline would allow sufficient time for delegates to get familiar with the documents and prepare themselves. She encouraged the secretariat to go ahead and send a note informing everyone about the deadline for submission of information documents.

Ms. Eigenmann thanked the regional Bureau members for the invitation to the regional briefings and confirmed that they will be happy to attend them. She reaffirmed that IOMC is interested in the SAICM implementation, and that IOMC is discussing options on how best to formalize and recognize the role of IOMC in SAICM.

Ms. Breyer concluded with a reminder on deadlines for registration of funded and non-funded participants in accordance with the information provided by the secretariat.

6) Next meeting of the Bureau

Ms. Breyer asked the secretariat and the IP Co-Chairs regarding a suitable time slot for the next Bureau virtual meeting.

Ms. Williams pointed out that the January and February 2023 period is going to be extremely busy. Mr. Domagalski expressed his preference for having another Bureau meeting prior to the resumed IP4 meeting to discuss the text of the resolutions and the scenario note for the resumed IP4 meeting. Mr. Torabi suggested that it would be good to have another Bureau meeting in February 2023, following the regional online briefings.

Ms. Tunstall agreed that another Bureau meeting in February 2023 following the regional online briefings would be useful to review the updated and additional documents as well. She reminded the meeting that the question on who is responsible for preparing the resolutions and a high-level declaration was not answered yet. Ms. Williams responded by offering her and Ms. Torres availability to draft the text of resolutions. She reiterated that substantial amount of work has been done already on the high-level declaration and the work will continue intersessionally between the resumed IP4 meeting and ICCM5 or at ICCM5. Ms. Breyer confirmed that the high-level declaration is very important to the ICCM5 Presidency.

Mr. de Mesa reminded participants of the date of the resumed first session of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Science Policy Panel meeting and suggested to circulate a doodle poll with the two following dates: 31 January 2023 and 7 February 2023. No objections were raised. Ms. Breyer confirmed that a doodle pool will be sent to identify the day and time for the Bureau meeting.

7) Any Other Business

Ms. Breyer informed that Ms. Steffi Lemke, Environment Minister of Germany, will be addressing the importance of the ICCM5 meeting during her bilateral meetings over the coming months and she encouraged Bureau members to liaise with their ministers in this regard. Ms. Tunstall suggested that, in view of the multi-sectoral engagement, it would be helpful if the ministers responsible for environment could reach out to other ministers, such as ministers responsible for health, on the importance of the ICCM5.

Mr. Domagalski asked for further clarification on drafting the resolutions. Ms. Williams explained that they will work with the SAICM secretariat and have some components that could go in the resolutions. She confirmed that the IP Co-Chairs are ready to work on a first draft of the resolution text if requested. Mr. Torabi suggested that in view of the limited time left until the resumed IP4 meeting, the ICCM5 resolutions and the high-level declaration could be discussed during the resumed IP4 meeting.

8) Closure of the meeting

The ICCM5 President thanked all participants for the very constructive and interesting discussion.

She thanked the SAICM secretariat for all the effort in organizing the meeting and for providing clear responses to all the questions raised. She wished everyone a relaxing end-of-the-year holiday and looked forward to seeing everyone in the new year, which will be very exciting.

DRAFT

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), Ms. Valentina Sierra (Uruguay, ICCM5 Bureau Member Latin America and the Caribbean), and Mr. Dinesh Runiwal (India, on behalf of the ICCM5 Bureau member Asia and the Pacific).

Regional Focal Points: Mr. Santos Virgilio (Angola representing Africa), 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), Ms. Servet Goren (Industry), Ms. Susan Wilburn (Health), and Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (IOMC).

SAICM Secretariat: Ms. Nalini Sharma, Mr. Pierre Quiblier, Mr. Rafal Brykowski, Mr. Jose de Mesa, Mr. Eduardo Caldera Petit, Ms. Eleonora Simeone, Mr. Oleksandr Nazarenko.

Observers: Ms. Judith Torres (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process), Ms. Kay Williams (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process), Mathias Wolf (German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection).