
**6th Asia-Pacific regional meeting on the
Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management**
Dead Sea, Jordan, 5-7 July 2022

Report of the 6th Asia-Pacific regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

Item 1: Opening of the meeting

1. The sixth Asia-Pacific regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management was opened at 9.25 a.m. on Tuesday, 5 July 2022 at the Kempinski Hotel Ishtar Dead Sea in Dead Sea, Jordan by H.E. Muawieh Khalid Radaideh, the Minister of Environment (Jordan); Ms. Anita Breyer (Germany), the President of the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5); Mr. Mohsen Naziri Asl (Iran), the SAICM Regional Focal Point for Asia-Pacific; Mr. Ved Prakash Mishra (India), on behalf of the Vice-President of the ICCM5 Bureau representing the Asia-Pacific region and Ms. Nalini Sharma, SAICM Secretariat.

2. H.E. Muawieh Khalid Radaideh welcomed participants to the regional meeting in Jordan. In providing a brief overview of the trends and challenges affecting the environment, he noted that with the expansion of the economic activities, there is an increasing use of chemicals. In this context, he referred to the national regulations in Jordan that have been developed to better address the related challenges affecting the environment and the health of the population. Within the global context, he perceived SAICM as an effective tool and policy framework to avoid chemicals negative impacts. He further stressed the need for a well-coordinated international framework and noted that climate change impacts exacerbate chemicals related risks and negative effects on health and the environment. He described the actions undertaken in Jordan to enhance green chemistry development. He highlighted some related to both energy and water use efficiency and others related to enhancing circular economy through the coordinated work on wastes with several authorities, bodies and organisations. He expressed the Jordanian's commitment to take the necessary steps through precautionary measures to address the challenges related to nanotechnologies, endocrine disruptors and electronics. He concluded his welcoming remarks in stressing the need to bridge the gap between countries on their capabilities to achieve the expected objectives of sound management of chemicals and wastes which requires the further development of international partnerships, technical assistance and financial aids.

3. Ms. Anita Breyer, President of ICCM5, thanked the region for the invitation to the Asia-Pacific meeting. She thanked the government of Jordan for hosting the regional meeting and the Co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) for their availability to present and discuss the work of their respective groups and share the outcomes with the regional meeting participants. She also thanked the SAICM Secretariat for their valuable work in preparing the meeting.

4. Mr. Mohsen Naziri Asl (Iran), the SAICM Regional Focal Point for Asia-Pacific and Mr. Ved Prakash Mishra (India), on behalf of the Vice-President of the ICCM5 Bureau representing the Asia-Pacific provided their opening remarks. Mr. Mishra thanked the Government of Jordan for hosting the meeting and the Secretariat for its good work in preparing the meeting and its documents. He noted that in this wonderful setting on the shore of the Dead Sea he is expecting to

meet the objectives of the regional meeting. He stated that he is looking forward to working closely with the region in demonstrating the leadership role that the region can play in the sound management of chemicals and waste and the readiness and commitment to contribute in a constructive manner to the ambitious and successful outcomes of the upcoming IP4 and ICCM5.

5. Ms. Nalini Sharma, the SAICM Coordinator, thanked the government of Jordan for facilitating the organization of the meeting. She highlighted the ICCM5 Bureau decision and rationale, as well the objectives, for holding the regional meeting and the main elements of the road map towards IP4 and ICCM5 as presented in document SAICM/RM/AP.6/2.

Item 2: Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

6. Participants adopted the agenda of the meeting, as stipulated in document SAICM/RM/AP.6/1. To reflect the availability of some co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Groups, it was proposed to advance Agenda Items 4c iii) and 4c iv) on day 2. This proposal was accepted by the meeting.

7. The meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Naziri (Iran) and Mr. Mishra (India). The meeting was conducted in English, with interpretation services provided in Arabic. The list of participants is presented in the Annex to this report.

(b) Objectives and expected outcome of the SAICM Asia-Pacific regional meeting

8. Mr. Naziri (regional focal point for Asia Pacific) stated that the objectives of the regional meeting is to undertake strategic discussions to prepare for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, including on: (i) the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups held between October 2020 – February 2021; (ii) IP3 outcome text not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, strategic objectives and institutional arrangements; (iii) to facilitate the exchange of regional information and knowledge, reviewing progress towards the current SAICM objectives.

9. The ICCM5 President provided her perspective on the expected outcomes of the regional meeting in the context of both the Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4) and the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5). She stated that the “beyond 2020” SAICM instrument is an important instrument that can potentially deliver what the world needs to “build back better” and the just transition that is inherent to the overall vision of the SDGs. She encouraged a full engagement of participants at the meeting to support that at ICCM5 the following issues are underlined: the role sound chemical management plays to protect health, workers, consumers, and the environment worldwide; the need to improve chemicals management worldwide to achieve a sound level of protection; and the need for political support and adequate resources everywhere to be able to take the necessary steps. She highlighted the importance of awareness raising at the highest levels and in all relevant sectors. She stressed the mandate of the four Virtual Working Groups, an opportunity to discuss their outcomes with the co-facilitators and the documents prepared to facilitate the discussion as agreed by the Bureau, including the comparison table. She noted the concerns raised on the inclusiveness of the virtual process which has been taken on board by the ICCM5 Bureau by underlining that the basis for IP4 discussion are the outcomes of IP3 with VVG outcomes constituting a valuable input to these discussions. She noted the 2022 developments relevant for the SAICM process: the UNEA5 resolutions on Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste, Science-Policy Panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution and on End plastic pollution: Towards an international legally binding instrument; as well as the 8th

replenishment of the Global Environment Facility, with an increased budget for the chemicals and waste area.

10. The President brought attention of the meeting participants to the discussion at a side event co-organised by the SAICM Secretariat and IOMC on the margins of Meetings of the Conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions (BC COP-15, RC COP-10, SC COP-10), which introduced a concept of an integrated chemicals and waste management. She encouraged the meeting to consider and discuss how this concept can stimulate the commitment and engagement of various stakeholders and sectors that play a key role in promoting and implementing chemicals and wastes management and as such contribute to the ambitious and comprehensive global framework that we all expect to be achieved under the ongoing Intersessional Process and the forthcoming IP4 meeting in Bucharest. She also informed that a workshop will be organized by UNITAR on 26 August 2022 in Bucharest, back-to-back with IP4, which will offer further opportunities to discuss this concept among regions and stakeholders.

11. Finally, expressing her regrets for not being able to confirm the schedule of ICCM5 yet, she advised participants to get prepared for the third quarter of 2023.

Item 3: Update from the BRS Conventions and Minamata Convention Secretariats and IOMC members

12. Under this agenda item, representatives from the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Minamata Convention, the IOMC and UNEP regional office in Asia updated the meeting participants on their current and recent work, within the context of the face-to-face segment of the 2021/2022 BRS COPs, the second segment of the Fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury (COP-4), the work of the IOMC and UNEA, respectively.

13. Mr. David Ogden, the representative of the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions, provided an overview of the outcomes of the face-to-face segment of the 2021-2022 meetings of the conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm conventions. He reported on the high-level segment of the meetings of the conferences of the parties to the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm conventions, held on 1 June 2022 in Stockholm, Sweden, in connection with the Stockholm+50 meeting. He presented the main outcomes of the Basel Convention COP-15, Rotterdam Convention COP-10 and Stockholm Convention COP-10, held in Geneva from 6 to 17 June 2022, as well as decisions on joint issues considered and planned follow-up activities. In the ensuing discussion participants asked how we can better address fragmented management of chemicals at national level in the context of BRS work and how it is expected that the outcomes of ICCM5 (scheduled in the autumn of 2023) will be reflected in the next BRS COPs scheduled earlier in 2023. In relation to fragmented chemicals management, Mr. Ogden underlined that there are different layers of coordination in place, and he referred to the June 2022 decision on international cooperation and coordination of the BRS COPs. In relation to ICCM5 and BRS COPs in 2023, he noted that the SAICM Secretariat is welcome to provide updates at the BRS COPs and BRS would be happy to provide updates at ICCM5.

14. Ms. Claudia Ten Have presented an update on behalf of the Minamata Convention Secretariat. Her presentation provided information on the outcomes of the COP-4 of the Minamata Convention, including advances made on Annex A and B, explaining all phasing out happening with mercury-added products, as well as the dates agreed for this process. She addressed the progress made by the effectiveness evaluation group and its milestones, and other selected decisions of COP-4. Finally, she presented the status of national reporting on Minamata in the Asia-Pacific region. In the discussion, one participant asked when the Bali amendments to Annex A of the Convention, considering dental amalgam, will enter into force. Ms Ten Have clarified that the revised Annex will be communicated to the depository and then to all parties and signatories.

Following the notification period, the Annex will enter into force for the parties of the Convention, unless they have notified otherwise.

15. Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann from UNIDO (IOMC Chair) provided a presentation on behalf of the IOMC, with a video, displaying IOMC advances, composition, and membership, as well as activities and outcomes provided by the IOMC toolbox including technical guidance and information tools. She provided an update on the status of the IOMC work on indicators, linked to the outcomes of the Virtual Working Group 1 on targets, indicators and milestones. As a contribution to the Intersessional Process, she introduced IOMC reflections on integrated chemicals and waste management. She presented possible three key dimensions of integrated chemicals and waste management, i.e., establishing a basic national chemical management system; integrating chemicals and waste management in chemical intensive industry sectors and value chains; and integrating chemicals and waste management within sustainable development initiatives. She noted that the concept of integrated chemicals and waste management was presented at a side event co-organised by the SAICM Secretariat and IOMC on the margins of Meetings of the Conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions (BC COP-15, RC COP-10, SC COP-10) on 14 June 2022. She also noted that IOMC reflections were presented at 2022 SAICM regional meetings and she informed that another opportunity for discussion will be the UNITAR workshop on 26 August 2022 in Bucharest, held back-to-back with IP4. In the ensuing discussion, one meeting participant asked if IOMC can provide a report on the amount of financial and technical assistance provided by IOMC in recent years. Ms. Eigenmann responded that this information needs to be verified with all 9 IOMC participating organisations. Another participant asked how the recent ILO resolutions are being reflected in the IOMC work. Ms. Eigenmann informed that the recent developments have been discussed by IOMC and are being reflected in the IOMC toolbox. Representative of one of the governments asked if IOMC has experience with supporting development of a comprehensive legislation on chemicals at national level that would ensure multistakeholder engagement and would help to address fragmented institutional and regulatory frameworks. Ms. Eigenmann provide an example of Switzerland in this regard and encourage the use of IOMC toolbox as the source of information. SAICM Secretariat informed about the publicly available UN Environment Programme *Guidance on the Development of Legal and Institutional Infrastructures and Measures for Recovering Costs of National Administration for Sound Management of Chemicals* and *Guidance on chemicals control contributing to national progress and safety*. India informed that they are currently working on an omnibus resolution on chemicals. IP Co-Chair asked if IOMC reflects regional dimensions in their work and the response received noted that IOMC is aware of regional differences. A representative of the civil society noted the importance of including labour aspects in MEAs and other international work on chemicals.

16. Mr. Mushtaq Memon from UNEP presented the outcomes of the UNEA5 of relevance to chemicals management issues. He highlighted the omnibus resolution on the sound management of chemicals and waste, the establishment of an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee with the mandate to forge an international legally binding agreement by the end of 2024 to end plastic pollution, and the establishment of a comprehensive and ambitious science-policy panel on the sound management of chemicals and waste and pollution prevention.

Item 4: Substantive preparation for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

(a) SAICM roadmap towards IP4 and ICCM5, including the overview of the intersessional process

17. Ms. Judith Torres, Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process introduced document SAICM/RM/AP.6/2: Road map leading to IP4 and ICCM5. She informed participants IP4 is scheduled from 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania. Regional and stakeholder

consultations are scheduled to take place the weekend prior to IP4 from 27 to 28 August 2022. She presented the following three steps, as outlined in the roadmap document:

- Step 1: Compile the outcomes and recommendations of the VWGs into one document as presented in SAICM/ICCM.5/Bureau.TC.11/2
- Step 2: Prepare a comparison document – an evolution of text from SAICM OPS, IP.4/2 and VWG outcomes, as presented in SAICM/RM/AP.6/INF.1
- Step 3: Face to face regional meetings in preparation for IP4:
 - GRULAC, 6-7 May, Montevideo, Uruguay
 - CEE Regional Meeting, 12-13 May 2022, Prague, Czech Republic
 - EU-JUSSCANNZUK, 23 June 2022, online
 - Africa Regional Meeting, 27 – 29 June 2022, Accra, Ghana
 - Asia-Pacific Regional Meeting, 5 – 7 July 2022, Dead Sea, Jordan

18. She stated the primary meeting document for consideration at IP4 will be SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020”. Furthermore, as agreed at the 11th ICCM5 Bureau meeting held in February 2022, the VWG outcomes will be included as addenda to this meeting document. In addition, the outcomes of the regional meetings and any stakeholder submissions prior to IP4 in 2022 as well as the comparison document (SAICM/RM/AP.6/INF.1) mentioned above can be included as information documents. Outlining the expected outcomes of IP4, she emphasized that IP4 is expected to produce one single document for negotiations at ICCM5.

(b) SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” text not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, and strategic objectives

19. Ms. Kay Williams, ad-interim Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process, introduced the document SAICM/RM/AP.6/3: SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, for consideration by the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management. She further introduced text which was not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, strategic objectives and institutional arrangements in preparation for the fourth meeting of the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4).

20. The ensuing discussion had an interactive character with participants split into several small groups. The participants addressed, among others, the following issues.

21. On the “main general recommendations” section, one participant raised that terminology used does not utilise the term “major groups” and the reference to local communities is missing (that was supported by other participant who directly referred to recent ILO resolution in the field). Other participants noted that there may be a need to reconsider the timeline for achieving the goals of the future framework. Another participant mentioned the need to have further discussions on “waste” at IP4. He also noted that the wording of paragraph 2 may be too strong for a voluntary instrument, and he proposed to add “common but differentiated responsibilities” into the paragraph to balance it. One participant highlighted a recent chemical accident in the region and noted that chemical management framework should be mandatory. One participant urged the need to reflect all SDGs under the SAICM process and not only SDG 12.4. Finally, one participant suggested that referring to “urgent and resolute action at all levels” may water down the message.

22. On the “vision” section, intervening participants presented diverging opinions as to the preferred option, with some leaning towards the first option, considering second option too emotional. One participant suggested that the vision should be manageable. Another participant reacted saying that the vision and goals should be separate.

23. On the “scope” section, Ms. Williams noted that the second paragraph of the text needed to be removed due to an editorial mistake. One participant noted that the second paragraph should encompass financial mechanisms, BAT/BEP and environmental impact assessments for sectors, as well as mechanisms to implement them. Another participant suggested not to enumerate elements in paragraph 1 but use “all” to be more inclusive. For paragraph 2, he suggested to explicitly define sectors and stakeholders covered to reflect that not all sectors and stakeholders are covered by SAICM. Reacting participants proposed to focus on certain key sectors in the wording, but leave it open for others. Intervening participants presented diverging views on referring to the protection of human rights in the text, with some pointing out that the protection of human rights is the starting point for all the activities and different types of rights (e.g., economic or social) are interconnected, while others argued that there are different reading of the term and it needs to be further clarified to address specific chemicals and waste management context.

24. When it comes to the “principles and approaches” section, one meeting participant asked if the 2030 SDGs will be adapted to reflect the impact of Covid-19 pandemic. Another participant noted that he does not recognize any approaches in the current text. On request of one of the participants, the SAICM Secretariat informed what was discussed under this point in the Africa and CEE regional meetings. Co-chair asked how the principles and approaches contribute to the sound chemicals management, noting that simply listing them may not be the most appropriate approach. One representative suggested including ILO conventions and recommendations.

25. On the “Strategic Objectives” section, the Co-Chair proposed for consideration of the meeting participants a list of outcomes of the Strategic Objectives with simplified wording and asked if there are any Strategic Objectives that may be missing. Several participants welcomed the simplified and clearer wording. One participant suggested an additional objective to follow up on the SDGs. Other participant suggested not to refer to circular economy, to avoid restricting to chemicals only. This was supported by another participant. One participant underlined that implementation through incorporating best practice in partnership and co-operation is important for developing countries who need capacity, funding, technology transfer and technical assistance.

26. Regarding “institutional arrangements”, one participant noted important linkages between the SPP and Beyond 2020 process, indicating that ICCM may respond to recommendations from SPP and raise relevant issues to SPP. One participant proposed for consideration having the future framework secretariat present in the regions also and noted the shape of the future secretariat should follow its functions.

(c) SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” and the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups held between October 2020 – February 2021

27. The IP Co-Chairs informed participants that under this agenda item:

- One and a half hours will be dedicated to each Virtual Working Group.
- The Virtual Working Group Co-facilitator(s) will provide a 30-minute presentation, introducing the work of the Virtual Working Group, highlighting the methodology used, its outcomes and key issues that the regional group need to be made aware of.
- The presentation will be followed by a one-hour discussion to provide further explanation and clarification with an overall aim to seek stakeholders’ views, build consensus and reach a common understanding of the outcomes of Virtual Working Groups.

i. Virtual Working Group 1: Targets, indicators and milestones

28. Ms. Silvija Kalnins, co-facilitator of the Virtual Working Group 1 presented the outcomes of the Group. Ms. Kalnins started by referring to relevant documents in front of the meeting and introduced SAICM/RM/AP.6/INF.1: Table comparing the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy,

document SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” and the outcomes of the VWG1 (SAICM/RM/AP.6/4) and its relevant sections.

29. She introduced the mandate, methodology and process related to the technical working group established and mandated by IP3 that met between January and February 2020 (outcomes of its work are available in documents SAICM/IP.4/3 and SAICM/IP.4/INF/15) and the Virtual Working Group on targets, indicators and milestones established and mandated by SAICM Bureau.

30. She presented the main outcomes of the work of the Virtual Working Group 1 and highlighted the formulations of targets based on points of convergence of views expressed by stakeholders, which include 5 strategic objectives, 25 targets (30 brackets) and over 80 indicators. She noted that the VWG1 proposed the two following options for moving forward:

- Option 1) continuation of work on targets, indicators, and milestones by a policy expert group; and
- Option 2) combine the work of a policy expert group with the work by a sub-group more technical in nature which would prepare specific work on indicators (a specific example in relation to the Strategic Objective D was provided by the co-facilitator).

31. Following the overview of the structure of the outcome document she highlighted the issues raised but not addressed by the group, as well as the following main considerations for moving forwards:

- The need to consider targets together with the strategic objective formulations to establish a comprehensive indicator framework for the new instrument; and
- The need to consider targets in a reiterative process and together with the indicators, to capture and develop a comprehensive indicator framework for the instrument, including considerations of resources and capacities for monitoring implementation.

32. In the ensuing discussion, the Asia-Pacific Regional Focal Point noted this as an important issue for the region. Another participant noted that for the region it is important to start first with building capacities at the national level and only later move to international level. Ms. Kalniņš confirmed that considering national and international capacities is important.

33. Other participant provided several points on observation of various targets discussed by the VWG1, including targets A1 (as SAICM is a voluntary instrument balance the wording on legal framework), A5 (reflect targets under MEAs and remove the deadline), B1 (clarify to whom will information be generated), B4 and D2 (include capacity building and technical assistance for developing countries), new target on GHS (noting that as GHS is not binding, it can be difficult to be enforced), D5 (clarify what is understood by building SMEs capacity), E1 (include all stakeholders) and E3 (clarify who will be financing partnerships). In response, Ms. Kalniņš supported suggestions to make the future framework clearer. She noted that some targets will have indicators that should provide further context and could address some comments made. She also highlighted the iterative nature of the process of agreeing on targets, indicators and milestones. She informed that stakeholders explicitly requested a specific indicator on legal framework and noted that complementary indicators could address varying timeline of targets under MEAs. She also noted that financial aspects have been discussed by other VWG.

34. One participant welcomed the outcomes of the work of the VWG1 including the videos prepared. She suggested to prepare a Q&A document to support common understanding of the issues discussed. She noted that her country supports SMART targets and underlined the need to address their timelines, to avoid coming back to the discussion after 2030. She suggested agreeing on a limited number of indicators at ICCM5. She also asked how the outcome of the technical working group on targets, indicators and milestones will be presented at IP4, whether it will be attached to the main document or a separate INF document? Ms. Kalniņš supported the idea of Q&A document, appropriate timeline for targets and minimum set of indicators at ICCM5. SAICM

Secretariat specified that the meeting documents for IP4 are specified in SAICM/RM/AP.6/2 and the outcome of the technical working group on targets, indicators and milestones was considered under the work of VWG1.

35. One participant noted that in total there are over 80 targets proposed and asked how they will be incorporated in the IP process. Ms. Kalniņš noted that many targets have not been discussed by VWG1 and she feels there are too many in total.

36. The Co-chair thanked Ms. Kalniņš for the presentation, being available for the questions and answer session and for her dedication to the IP process.

ii. Virtual Working Group 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation

37. Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn and Ms. Karissa Kovner presented the outcomes of the Group. They presented the detailed mandate of the group, which was based on reviewing the text of the compilation of recommendations, as well on the Science Policy Interface. In addition, they provided an overview of the number of participants, the virtual meetings held and the requests for written submissions during the process.

38. They provided an overview of the outputs that were categorized into three parts:

- Part I: Textual recommendations based on the convergence of views among stakeholders for Sections B, C, D, E, G, and H; She highlighted the issues on which progress was made and on which more work needs to be done in each section of the outcomes' documents.
- Part II: Recommendations for the establishment of a Science-Policy Interface. Among the main recommendations in this regard, she highlighted that further dialogue needs to take place on the functions and characteristics of a Science Policy Interface, on the development of the potential options for its scope and placement; and
- Part III: Recommendations for further consideration of issues in the "Parking Lot," a document created by VWG2 to reflect areas of work or views that could not be addressed in the context of the mandate or that needed more time for further discussion and consideration.

39. They concluded the presentation by presenting the next steps and recommendations from the Co-facilitators which include the Japanese proposal for Taking Stock of Progress (Section G) and Updating the Instrument (Section H) and the overlap with related sections of SAICM/IP.4/2 for which the VWG2 was not mandated.

40. In the discussion that followed, one participant raised the issue of using new terminology – "a parking lot". Other participant underlined the need for addressing financial and technical capacities of countries in many sections of the VWG2 outcome document. He proposed reflecting in Section D, paragraph 5 a voluntary nature of SAICM. For Section G, paragraph 7, he asked if the review process should be multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral or both. For Section G, paragraph 8 he asked on clarification who will be the independent evaluator. Ms Kovner noted that it is likely that it will be stakeholders within the sectors reporting and that SAICM independent evaluation could serve as an example for the future framework.

41. A meeting co-chair noted that the ICCM mandate covered additional text on reporting and noted that his country might wish to open at IP4 issues discussed by VVG2 (e.g., on removing brackets in the text) that they are not satisfied with and where their earlier textual proposals are not reflected. Ms Kovner noted that nothing is agreed in relation to brackets in the text and that VWG did not go beyond its mandate. Diverging views are reflected in the text.

42. One participant noted that VWGs were expected to promote common understanding. SAICM Secretariat provided clarification on the VVGs mandate. ICCM5 President encouraged stakeholders to present their views but not to reopen discussion on the mandates of the VWGs.

43. Another participant noted that lack of resources is the main reason for the lack of reporting under SAICM. He encouraged to have simple reporting under the future SAICM, with automated dissemination of information, to ensure broader participation.

44. The Co-chair thanked Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn and Ms. Karissa Kovner for the presentation and being available for the questions and answer session.

iii. Virtual Working Group 3: Issues of concern

45. The co-facilitators Mr. Thomas Jahre Sverre and Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi presented the outcomes of their Group. They introduced the mandate and process of their group highlighting that the Group had 262 registered participants from all SAICM stakeholder groups, including a number of sectors and all UN regions who met through four virtual meetings and three rounds of electronic feedback.

46. They presented the outcomes of the group referring to the comparison table as displayed in document SAICM/RM/AP.6/INF.1 and highlighted the broad agreement in the group that the emerging policy issues process has been useful in raising the profile of specific issues globally, but that a clear plan of action is needed. The co-facilitators concluded their presentation with a set of recommendations from the virtual working group aiming including elements of an omnibus resolution on the existing SAICM EPIs and other issues of concern.

47. In the ensuing discussion, one participant highlighted the importance of an effective system to deal with emerging issues comprehensively (and their political, social, economic or environment dimensions), as we do not know what to expect in the future. Other participant called to reflect financial and technical requirements in the nomination and selection process. He highlighted the importance of inclusiveness and openness in establishing proposed ad hoc multi-stakeholder committees. Co-facilitators and some other participants supported the need for inclusiveness. Another participant requested to explain the process of nominating emerging policy issues under SAICM and feedback was provided by SAICM Secretariat. Asia-Pacific Regional Focal Point asked who proposed the ad-hoc committees and SAICM Secretariat responded that it was proposed by a representative of South Africa.

48. IP Co-Chair noted the importance of considering how the SPP will impact the work on emerging issues. Co-facilitators welcomed the UNEA5 resolution and noted that impact will depend on the outcome of SPP negotiations. One participant noted that while some work could be taken over by the future SPP, ICCM will still need to consider scientific issues under the future framework, as SPP will be an independent body. He urged to provide SAICM inputs to SPP negotiations. One participant suggested to wait with discussion under SAICM until SPP process finalised, but another responded it will lead to the fact that SAICM needs will not be reflected in the future SPP.

49. The Co-chair thanked Mr. Thomas Jahre Sverre and Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi for the presentation and being available for the questions and answer session.

iv. Virtual Working Group 4: Financial considerations

50. Mr. Reggie Hernaus presented the outcomes of the group. He provided an overview of the mandate and process of the work of the group and highlighted that 166 people registered for this VWG from all SAICM stakeholder groups, including different sectors and all UN regions and convened 4 virtual meetings and 3 rounds of electronic feedback. He presented the outcomes of the Group and highlighted the consolidated views, recommendations and proposed cleaned redline

texts. The group agreed to include a chapeau paragraph to section VII on Financial Considerations with a proposed text to highlight the need for adequate, predictable, and sustainable financing, technical assistance, and technology transfer for the implementation of the Strategic Approach. He also pointed out the three following outcomes:

1. Stakeholders unanimously supported strengthening the financing of the Secretariat with contributions from all stakeholders, although details on how these contributions should be reflected in the beyond 2020 instrument have not been agreed on.
2. Stakeholders provided inputs to the draft resource mobilization strategy and the review document on cost-recovery mechanisms and other economic instruments for financing the sound management of chemicals and waste. The Secretariat will use these inputs to prepare revised versions of both documents; and
3. The co-facilitators and stakeholders also launched an Open Discussion on capacity building and defined concrete mechanisms and actions regarding capacity building across sectors to support the beyond 2020 programme of work.

51. In the discussion, one participant urged for transfer of technology and funding for developing countries and implementation of polluter pays principle (PPP) in the developed countries. Another participant called for a global mobilisation strategy for financing the future framework. The meeting co-chair noted the importance of GEF for funding. Other participants suggested that SAICM Secretariat activities in the countries to be financed and supported the implementation of PPP.

52. Another participant provided several textual comments on the VWG4 outcome document. On Clearinghouse mechanism to track development aid, he suggested to create a data bank for identifying and addressing needs of developing countries. He called for the SAICM Secretariat to be tasked with comprehensive reporting on financing by developed countries and transfer of technology to developing countries. He noted the importance to increase the private sector involvement in the text of paragraph 8, to cover also technical and in-kind assistance, based on extended producer responsibility and PPP. In relation to dedicated external financing, he informed about his country position on GEF and requested the need for equal and non-discriminatory access to funds provided by GEF to be addressed in the future framework. Mr. Hernaus thanked for the comments and the concrete text proposals. He asked the participants to provide them in writing preferably before the discussions in the IP4 thematic group will start .

53. The Co-chair thanked Mr. Reggie Hernaus for the presentation and being available for the questions and answer session.

Item 5: Logistical preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

54. ICCM5 President presented an update on the preparations for the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management in 2023. She expressed her regrets for not being able to confirm the exact dates for ICCM5 yet but advised participants to get prepared for the third quarter of 2023.

55. The representative of the SAICM Secretariat presented an update on preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020. She presented the meeting dates for IP4 scheduled to take place in face-to-face mode from 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania and expected to have a total of 250 participants. Regional and stakeholder consultations as well as technical briefings are also scheduled to take place the weekend before IP4 from 27 to 28 August 2022. She provided information on the meeting venue ROMEXPO, 65-67 Marasti Blvd., District 1, Bucharest – Romania (www.romexpo.ro). The participants were informed that the letter of invitation to the meeting as well as the provisional agenda were distributed to SAICM

Stakeholders on 6 July 2022. The SAICM Secretariat representative noted that the Secretariat looks forward to the list of funded participants from the Asia-Pacific region.

Item 6: Exchange of regional information and knowledge, reviewing progress towards the current SAICM objectives.

56. Co-chair invited representatives from the Asia-Pacific region to share information on activities related to SAICM objectives.

57. Iran reported back from the closed session: During the closed session, meeting participants discussed the key questions prepared by each VWG Co-Facilitators, to support finding a common ground of the region or a compilation of views from Asia-Pacific members on each topic discussed. Another issue discussed was the use of a questionnaire on capacity building, technical assistance, and financial needs of the Asia-Pacific SAICM stakeholders to gather information from the region in terms of capacity building needs and financing. It was noted that the questionnaire will be circulated to the region. Countries in the region were requested to fill out the questionnaire and return it to the Bureau member and focal point of the region by 22 July 2022.

58. The Asia-Pacific Regional Focal Point encouraged stakeholders from the region to provide their views on outstanding issues which have not been addressed during Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) discussions by 27 July 2022. Asia-Pacific Regional Focal Point and the Bureau member would compile the information received and share with the SAICM Secretariat prior to IP4 meeting. The Asia-Pacific Regional Focal Point asked for a possibility to organize an online information briefing for the region ahead of IP4. IP Co-Chairs and the SAICM Secretariat responded positively to this request.

59. The representatives of Land and Human to Advocate Progress and the World Alliance for Mercury-Free Dentistry (participating online) informed about the launch of the Arab Center for Environmental Health in Amman, Jordan. The Center will promote the concept of dental amalgam free dentistry. The representative of Jordan welcomed the initiative.

60. The representative of ITUC underlined the importance of the Intersessional Process for the labour sector and highlighted the relevance of incorporating human rights aspects into the future framework. He noted with concern that NGOs have not been allowed to participate in the closed session at the meeting. He noted a multistakeholder character of SAICM and called to address the issue in the future, for instance but providing information ahead of such session to allow arranging a separate meeting with the NGOs.

61. The representative of Japan informed about the activities under the Asia-Pacific Regional Forum on Environment and Health and its Chemical and waste (Solid and hazardous waste, Toxic chemicals and hazardous substances) Thematic Working Group. Several webinars are scheduled under the auspices of this Thematic Working Group this year and in person meetings are expected to follow in 2023.

Item 7: Other matters

62. Mr. Naziri (Regional Focal Point for Asia Pacific) informed that he will not be able to continue personally performing the role of a SAICM Region Focal Point for the Asia Pacific due to taking another assignment. Iran will inform the Asia-Pacific region and other stakeholders as who will replace Mr. Naziri as Regional Focal Point as soon as possible.

Item 8: Closure of the meeting

63. The meeting co-chairs, ICCM5 President, the IP Co-Chairs, the representative of the SAICM Secretariat and of the host country provided closing remarks thanking participants for their active

participation and contribution to discussion at the meeting. The meeting was closed at 12.20 p.m. on Thursday, 7 July 2022.

Annex: List of Participants

Government: Mr. Mohammed Amran Hossain (Environment Directorate, Bangladesh), Mr. Sujit Kumar Bajpayee (Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change, India), Mr. Ved Prakash Mishra (Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, India), Mr. Vinod Kumar Singh (Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change, India), Mr. Mohsen Naziri Asl (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Iran (Islamic Republic of)), Mr. Abbas Torabi (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Iran (Islamic Republic of)), Ms. Itsuki Kuroda (Ministry of the Environment, Japan), Mr. Fumito Ishimura (online) (Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, Japan), Mr. Hiroyuki Machida (online) (Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, Japan), Mr. Hitoshi Yoshizaki (online) (Ministry of the Environment, Japan), Ms. Tomoe Kotani (online) (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan), Ms. Kumiko Takeuchi (online) (Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry, Japan), Mr. Hiroyuki Tsukamoto (online) (Ministry of the Environment, Japan), H.E. Dr. Muawieh Khalid Radaideh (Minister of Environment, Ministry of Environment, Jordan), Mr. Mohammed Khashashneh (Ministry of Environment, Jordan), Ms. Rima Mustafa (Ministry of Environment, Jordan), Ms. Hajar Majar (Ministry of Environment, Jordan), Mr. Jihad Alsawair (Ministry of Environment, Jordan), Ms. Hyo Hun Lee (online) (Ministry of Environment, Korea, Republic of), Mr. Jungkyu Kwak (online) (Ministry of Environment, Korea, Republic of), Mr. Meshaal Alebrahim (Kuwait Environment Public Authority, Kuwait), Ms. Dini Fajrina Mohd Hussain (online) (Ministry of Environment and Water, Malaysia), Mr. Mohd. Shahrin Mudzarap (online) (Department of Environment, Malaysia), Ms. Nur Ain Husna Amiruddin (online) (Department of Environment, Malaysia), Mr. Hassan Azhar (Ministry of Environment Climate Change and Technology, Maldives), Ms. Bernadett Besebes (Environmental Quality Protection Agency, Palau), Mr. Hussain Mohd (SAICM Focal Point, Qatar), Mr. Aram Bhandhuwanna (Pollution Control Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Thailand), Mr. Xuan Sinh Nguyen (SAICM Focal Point, Viet Nam), Mr. Mohsen Alshateri (online), (Environment Protection Authority, Yemen).

IGO (Intergovernmental Organizations): Ms. Claudia Ten Have (online) (Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury), Mr. Mazen Malkawi (WHO/EMRO/HPD/CHE), Ms. Heba Safi (online) (WHO), Mr. David Ogden (online) (Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam, and Stockholm Conventions), Mr. Mushtaq Ahmed Memon (online) (UNEP), Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (online) (UNIDO).

NGO (Non-Governmental Organizations): Ms. Weiyu Lin (online) (BCRC China), Ms. Siddika Sultana (online) (Environment and Social Development Organization-ESDO), Ms. Oruba Al-Refa'i (Hands for Environment and Sustainable Development), Mr. Ashutosh Bhattacharya (IndustriALL Global Union), Mr. Uphi Kim (International Trade Union Confederation - Asia Pacific), Mr. Aminur Rashid-Repon Chowdhury (ITUC-Bangladesh Council), Mr. Ziyad Al-Alawneh (Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP)).

Private Sector: Mr. Taketoshi Fujimori (online) (Japan Chemical Industry Association), Ms. Emiko Hase (online) (Kao corporation).

Others: Ms. Yuki Hashimoto (online) (EX Research Institute Ltd), Mr. Takashi Nishida (EX Research Institute), Mr. Min Maw (online) (Nay Pyi Taw), Mr. Achim Halpaap (online) (independent expert), Ms. Minu Hemmati (adelphi).

SAICM Secretariat: Ms. Nalini Sharma, Mr. Rafal Brykowski, Mr. Pierre Quiblier.

ICCM5 President: Ms. Anita Breyer (online) (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conversation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection, Germany), Ms. Jutta Dr. Emig (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection, Germany).

IP Co-Chairs: Ms. Kay Williams (Defra, United Kingdom), Ms. Judith Torres (Ministry of Environment, Uruguay).

VWG Co-facilitators: Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi (online) (National Focal Point, Ghana), Ms. Silvija Nora Kalnins (online) (Head of Strategy and Development, Latvia), Mr. Reginald Hernaus (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, Netherlands), Mr. Sverre Thomas Jahre (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, Norway), Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn (online) (Pollution Control Department, Thailand), Ms. Karissa Kovner (online) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, United States of America).