Eighth virtual meeting of the Virtual Working Group on Governance and Mechanisms to Support Implementation
Thursday, 4 February 2021, from 13:00 – 16:00 CET

VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE AND MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

Summary of the 8th Virtual Meeting

1) Welcoming remarks

Ms. Karissa Kovner and Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, the two co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Group on Governance and Mechanisms to Support Implementation (VWG2), welcomed all participants of the Virtual Working Group and introduced the annotated agenda of the eighth virtual meeting. Ms. Wiriwutikorn noted that this was the final virtual meeting and looking back at the last 3 months, the VWG had made a lot of progress. She also noted that apart from the final review of Section G, which had been circulated just prior to the meeting, this meeting was primarily an administrative meeting to finalize progress and ensure the accuracy of the annexes in the annotated agenda.

The co-facilitators reviewed the annotated agenda, which had been circulated in advance, and announced the order would be to first consider the following issues: general consideration of VWG recommendation for Section E (Subsidiary and Ad hoc Expert Bodies) – Annex A; general consideration of VWG recommendation on a Science-Policy Interface – Annex B; consideration of Switzerland’s proposal on a voluntary peer review process for insertion into Section G, 3bis – Annex C; final input from VWG on enhancing the need for enhanced sectoral and stakeholder engagement in Sections B, C, D, (E), G, and H; the Parking Lot as of 14 January 2021, to be updated by 4 February 2021 – Annex D; recommendation for the Japanese proposal for Section G – Annex E; and finally the compilation of work of the VWG for the co-facilitators’ final report – Annex F. In addition, they highlighted the two separate documents that were also circulated in advance of the meeting for the final review of Section G, a redline version and a clean version.

2) General consideration of VWG recommendation for Section E: Subsidiary and Ad hoc Expert Bodies (Annex A)

Ms. Kovner, as one of the co-facilitators, stated in her opening of this agenda item that she and Ms. Wiriwutikorn thought the discussion within the VWG on Section E on 17 December 2020 (summary available here) was very thorough and that the various views and interests represented across the VWG were all very well aligned. Specifically, there was general agreement that Section E was not needed for procedural purposes. There are other tools (Section A, Rules 23 and 3, Resolutions) that are available and may be more appropriate to use.
There was also general agreement that the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) should continue, and that there are other functions that the Intersessional Process may wish to consider formalizing in the text from a substantive point of view. Therefore, further discussion will be needed on those possible functions and their structure. Ms. Kovner then called attention to both Annex A of the annotated agenda and the PowerPoint presentation on the shared screen so that the VWG could review how the recommendation for Section E would move forward to IP4 or whatever the next stage of the process will be. The floor was opened for additional ideas for what might need to be included or for any stakeholder to indicate any concerns regarding misrepresentations, etc. Ms. Kovner also noted that in the interest of time, the VWG would use its usual silent procedure. Therefore, if the VWG felt that the recommendation from the co-facilitators covered what needed to be covered, then no intervention was necessary.

**Section E: Subsidiary and Ad hoc Expert Bodies**

“The co-facilitators will summarize the VWG discussions on Section E in the compilation, including the need for the Intersessional Process to ensure the sufficiency of the final text of Section A and Rules 3 and 23, as well as the need to further consider the options for the continuation of the OEWG and other potential functions, and the form of those functions.”

The EU indicated its support for the recommendation of the co-facilitators, as well as the content of the discussion in Annex A of the annotated agenda, but noted that in the discussion part of Annex A, the fourth bullet on the possible further functions (“facilitation of technical and scientific issues”) seems to be a possible reference to the Science-Policy Interface (SPI), but it is not explicit. So perhaps it would be better to include that bullet in Annex B on the SPI as opposed to in Annex A, if relevant in the recommendation. Ms. Kovner agreed and noted that it was her recollection that the bullet being referred to was from the submission of the African Region, and should that bullet go forward as part of the recommendation, the co-facilitators would be sure to note the linkage or better placement in the SPI discussion. Canada noted that Section A. 1 (ix) of the IP3 compilation text (SAICM IP.4/2) will need to be revised to include ‘ad hoc bodies’ and Iran noted the importance of factual summaries and the ability of stakeholders to present their views. SDPI expressed its satisfaction with the factuality of the summaries so far.

3) **General consideration of VWG recommendation on a Science-Policy Interface (Annex B)**

Co-facilitator Ms. Teeraporn Wiriyutikorn introduced the summary of VWG recommendation on a Science-Policy Interface in Annex B of the annotated agenda and then opened the floor for comments by the Virtual Working Group. The co-facilitator of the VWG on Issues of Concern took the floor to note that VWG3 has briefly discussed the relevance of a SPI for its Virtual Working Group and identified several potential functions for a SPI, for example in relation to the identification of issues, in the evaluation of nomination of issues, and in the evaluation of progress of work on an issue. He noted that VWG3 will be giving further consideration to the SPI given that the stakeholders have not been able to converge on any particular role or responsibility of a SPI. There was general appreciation for the work of the co-facilitators and support for the proposed recommendation provided in Annex B, specifically the need for further dialogue on the functions and characteristics of a SPI. A number of VWG members emphasized the need for a SPI as well as their views on its form, while noting the importance of continuing the discussion. Recognizing the earlier intervention by the co-facilitator of the VWG on Issues of Concern, others noted that there are different places and forms for which a SPI dialogue is relevant and requested the Co-facilitators to ensure that the recommendation going forward is not limited to a binary presentation.

Several stakeholders highlighted the relevance of a SPI that is inclusive of all sectors and stakeholders, especially related to issues of gender and indigenous and traditional knowledge. The UK and others also
encouraged stronger participation from the wider scientific community and stressed the need to consider new channels to engage such stakeholders with a specific recommendation from this VWG. The Royal Society of Chemistry noted its willingness to explore and discuss such new channels. There was also a call to ensure that it was clear that there is no intention for the SPI to duplicate other efforts, in particular the scientific bodies of the chemicals and waste MEAs. A number of stakeholders noted the ability of a SPI to facilitate decision-making and provide support to capacity building efforts through a clear and direct interface with stakeholders.

4) Consideration of Switzerland’s proposal on a voluntary peer review process for insertion into Section G, 3bis (Annex C)

Ms. Kovner first thanked Switzerland for their work in consultation with the other stakeholders to develop the proposal on a voluntary peer review process. She then provided a brief summary of the proposal and supporting information provided in Annex C, reminding the VWG that Switzerland had proposed bringing the idea of voluntary peer reviews into the discussion during the 3 December 2020 VWG meeting on Section G as a way to address the possible gap in capacity in many countries while, at the same time, respecting the lack of appetite expressed by the VWG for in-country reviews. Ms. Kovner noted that the proposal seemed to offer a nice balance and emphasized that these peer reviews would be voluntary in nature and it would be the responsibility of national governments to indicate if they would be interested in having such a review.

Ms. Kovner then provided her understanding for the proposal, which was for the VWG to consider the short text for insertion into the recommendation for Section G in brackets as an alternative to 3bis, and the further suggestions presented in Annex C for the potential process would go into the Parking Lot for further discussion. In other words, the VWG would not provide full consideration of all the details at this meeting, but rather would decide whether to include the proposed text in its outcome and the details in the Parking Lot. She then turned the floor over to Switzerland for its confirmation and if it would like to add any further points.

Switzerland confirmed the explanation provided by the co-facilitator and noted that Switzerland sees it as an additional tool for national governments to use on a voluntary basis. The tool would help analyze aspects of national processes on the management of chemicals and waste and receive options on improvements based on the issues identified in the peer review and better implement such policies and measures. The co-facilitator then confirmed that this text (reproduced below) would be a replacement for the idea of in-country reviews and, if welcomed by the VWG, would be placed in brackets as an alternative text in Section G, 3bis.

Alternative Text for Paragraph 3bis

3bis(alt) [To improve implementation efforts and strengthen the monitoring, evaluation, and reporting, the Secretariat may facilitate, upon request by a government, voluntary peer reviews.]

The overall reaction of the VWG to Switzerland’s proposal was positive. Brazil, GAHP, the EU, SDPI, the United States, the UK, Colombia, Canada, A Group of NGOs, Uruguay, Iran, the Africa Institute, and others noted that more discussion would be needed, but welcomed the idea of placing the text in brackets as an alternative to 3bis. The suggestions for further consideration included, but are not limited to:

- how the voluntary review process would relate to the strategic objectives, targets, indicators and milestones,
- consideration of implementation mechanisms and a viable platform for all regions,
- the commitment, methodology, and financing of the peer review,
• the duration of each peer review,
• the role of the Secretariat,
• the need for minimum requirements or information level for the report, and
• the connection between the peer review and the monitoring of the targets.

5) Final input from VWG on enhancing the need for enhanced sectoral and stakeholder engagement in Sections B, C, D, (E), G, and H

The co-facilitator Ms. Karissa Kovner thanked everyone for all the suggestions throughout the VWG process that were intended to improve the multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder engagement. She noted that part of our mandate was to review the entire text of Sections B, C, and D to address the multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral issues. She noted the co-facilitators’ assessment that such a review had been done during the section by section review and by the additions that the VWG had made to the text in Sections B, C, and D. But she also underscored that Sections G and H had also benefited from further discussions and provided examples such as the inclusiveness found in paragraphs 1-3, the ideas in 3, and language throughout the text that encouraged broad participation and provided the opportunity to report, as well as text that emphasized the roles of all sectors and stakeholders to revise and update the 2020 instrument. She also highlighted the participation of the IOMC organizations together, as well as separately through UNEP, the WHO, and others in helping to provide new proposals and to fill gaps where additional stakeholder or sectoral participation was needed.

But before finalizing the remaining recommendations, Ms. Karissa Kovner asked the VWG whether there was any additional input from the VWG on this portion of the work it had done to be added to the Parking Lot.

When the floor was opened, the ILO noted that it could be important to do a full mapping of the text to see how, in the fabric, foundation, and processes of the overall instrument, multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral aspects have been incorporated and how, or if, they fit together well. The ILO recognized that this exercise would be difficult to do before the overall text was further advanced but noted its interest to do so at a later stage of the process. The co-facilitator supported the sentiment of the ILO and indicated that it would be shared with the Bureau and captured in outcome of the VWG. Later in the meeting, the IOMC called attention to its submission under Section D, paragraph 13, and, consistent with its views regarding the need for consideration of the full text, suggested that it be given increased visibility for discussion at a later stage.

6) The Parking Lot as of 14 January 2021 (Annex D)

Co-facilitator Ms. Teeraporn Wiriutikorn introduced the “Parking Lot,” noting that as the VWG had discussed several times, the Parking Lot is a formal place for the VWG to consolidate and highlight issues that need further discussion, almost a codification of “mental notes” that the VWG does not want to overlook or forget. She indicated that the Parking Lot would go forward as one of the VWG’s recommendations for further consideration.

However, before sending all of the issues in the Parking Lot forward to the next stage of the process, Ms. Wiriutikorn indicated that the co-facilitators wanted to ask the “owners” of the issues in the Parking Lot to determine whether their views had changed about the issues or whether over the course of the life of the VWG, the issue that owners had placed in the Parking Lot had been resolved. She then walked through the issues in the order they appeared in Annex D of the annotated agenda and asked the owner to indicate whether that stakeholder wanted to keep its issue in the Parking Lot or whether it could delete it.
She also clarified that the VWG was not going to change the Parking Lot or add on to it – the process was simply to confirm that the issues that are there for certain stakeholders still need to be there.

She started with the United States and its footnote related to the reference to the scope of waste. The United States confirmed that footnote needed to remain. The next entry she noted as being from A Group of NGOs and was related to having national action plans aimed at achieving the targets and indicators for the strategic objectives and Issues of Concern. The Group of NGOs confirmed that it needed to stay. She then called on Switzerland, whose issue speaks to the need to recognize existing mechanisms within national governments and the need to not duplicate those mechanisms. Switzerland agreed that it could be deleted as it been resolved during the discussion by the VWG. Likewise, GAHP agreed to delete its reminder on the need to consider how the name of the future instrument impacts the text being dealt with in different VWGs, noting that it should be resolved in a separate process. The Africa Group and A Group of NGOs were supportive of its note on the importance of non-governmental focal points being deleted from the Parking Lot given the brackets that have remained on this issue in the text itself of Section B.

For Section C, paragraph 5, the EU had suggested text related to regional focal points in the context of a paragraph that did not have any existing brackets but were comfortable deleting the issue from the Parking Lot. Finally, in Section D, there were two issues in the Parking Lot where it was clear that further discussion was desired – a gap in the representation of the Bureau and the idea of ensuring that the reporting by all stakeholders is provided to the Secretariat in such a way that the information can be compiled and evaluated properly – and therefore the co-facilitators maintained those issues in the Parking Lot without discussion.

7) Recommendation for Japanese proposal for Section G (Annex E)

Ms. Wirawutikorn then opened agenda item 7 on the proposal from Japan for Section G, which had been presented and discussed in earlier meetings. Ms. Wirawutikorn noted that there are several organizations that liked the concept proposed by Japan for Section G (replicated in Annex E of the annotated agenda) and, therefore, the recommendation of the co-facilitators would be for its further consideration at the next stage of the process.

Noting that some of the Japanese colleagues were unavailable due to a conflicting meeting, the Secretariat provided a brief report of its conversation with Japan prior to the meeting and presented to the VWG some small work items that Japan had requested to further the VWG’s dialogue related to its proposal. The Secretariat noted that they would explore the targets dashboard hosted by the CBD Secretariat that tracks progress on the Aichi targets and determine if the SAICM knowledge platform (saicmknowledge.org) established under the SAICM GEF project could serve this purpose. The co-facilitators suggested that those items seemed reasonable to enable a more informed discussion at IP4 or at the next stage of the process. There were no objections from the VWG.

8) Compilation of work of the VWG for co-facilitators’ report (Annex F)

Ms. Kovner then opened the final substantive agenda item (as presented in Annex F of the annotated agenda), which was the review of the textual recommendations that had been made by the group to date in previous meeting (with the exception of Section G). She indicated that these would be the recommendations of the VWG for these sections and that they would be forwarded as they had been presented on the website in the summaries from each meeting, without any changes by the co-facilitators.

Ms. Kovner then walked through each section, beginning with Section G, and the Secretariat shared its screen with the VWG such that the text for each section was visible and displayed in PowerPoint. That
text appears below. For Section G, the VWG began its review by finalizing the small number of corrections or elaborations that were made at the last meeting on this section to ensure that Section G was indeed as the VWG would like it. At the end of the review of Section G, Ms. Kovner noted that it would be moved into the outcome of the VWG.

The co-facilitator also reminded the group that it was concluding its work on these sections, and therefore the VWG would not be introducing new materials or reinventing or reengaging on issues already discussed. For Section G, she began with the redline version of the text and then moved to the clean version to finalize the discussion and the ordering of the paragraphs. Any further corrections or additions to the text made during the 4 February 2021 meeting (as presented in the recording of the meeting) appear in redline solely for the purposes of ease of understanding in the context of this summary; a clean version will be placed in the recommendation of the VWG for consideration at the next stage of the intersessional process.

It should be noted that the paragraph numbers below are consistent with their presentation in previous meetings but will be adjusted appropriately going forward. Ms. Kovner also noted that the footnotes are an integral part of the text and will be included as the text advances for consideration at the next stage of the process.

**Progress of Virtual Working Group-2 on Governance and Mechanisms to Support Implementation: Recommendations for Consideration by IP-4 and/or ICCM-5**

**Section G: Taking Stock of Progress**

1. All stakeholders are [encouraged][invited] to contribute to the assessment of the progress of the beyond 2020 instrument* in meeting the vision statement by providing information on their implementation efforts to meet the strategic objectives and their associated targets, taking into account the indicators, milestones, and contributions of all relevant sectors. By doing so, stakeholders can identify successful outcomes, as well as any gaps or shortcomings, drive opportunities for scaling up and improvement, share information, and assess the need for enhanced implementation efforts, and, if necessary, further prioritize their engagement and activities.

   * Brazil notes that for all the recommendations of the VWG, there is not yet agreement nor a final decision on the name or form of the Strategic Approach. Therefore, it will be important to ensure that once such a decision is made, the terminology currently noted as “the beyond 2020 instrument” will need to be revised.

12.** Reporting processes should occur regularly and sufficiently often to provide for the effective assessment of the progress of the beyond 2020 instrument in meeting the vision statement.

   ** As this Section is considered, it is important to note that the timeframes for the reporting and the assessment of information and data provided in Section G and updating process in Section H will need to be harmonized and, therefore, should be discussed together.

2. All stakeholders should provide information related to their implementation efforts to*** the Secretariat for its compilation, [analysis], and presentation of the report to the international conference for its review. Stakeholders should provide such information in an organized and transparent manner, consistent with any guidance or template provided by the international conference. Such information may also include reporting on voluntary commitments as well as pledges or similar activities.
The VWG requests that both the task of receiving reporting from stakeholders and the task of reporting to the international conference on the progress of the instrument in attaining the strategic objectives and targets be referred to the next stage of the process for consideration under Part V on Institutional Arrangement and, in particular, Section C on the role of the Secretariat. Text similar to “Receive reports from all relevant stakeholders on progress of implementation efforts and to disseminate such information as appropriate” and “Reporting to the international conference on the progress of the instrument in attaining the strategic objectives and targets” (this task would include the compilation, [analysis,] and presentation of a report for the international conference) could be placed in brackets in Part V, Section C, and identified as an issue flagged for consideration by VWG2.

3. The information provided by stakeholders should focus on efforts to implement the agreed strategic objectives and targets, taking into account the indicators, milestones, and contributions from all relevant sectors to allow the international conference to assess the progress in implementing the beyond 2020 framework [instrument] and in fulfilling the vision in a comprehensive manner.

**** The VWG notes the need to ensure in Section A (Part V) that the international conference is tasked with evaluating and reporting on the implementation of programmes that are fulfilling the vision with a view to reviewing progress on the strategic objectives and targets, and updating the programme of work as necessary. The VWG refers this task to the next stage of the process for consideration.

****** The VWG notes the importance of the comment in the Parking Lot from a number of stakeholders on Section G, paragraphs 1 and 2, related to the need for future consideration of a template or guidance to ensure that all aspects of the instrument are included in the reporting.

3ter Stakeholder data and information should be made available and be able to be shared publicly to allow for a comprehensive and cooperative review by the international conference of the overall progress in achieving the vision, strategic objectives, and targets, as well as to propose recommendations to address any identified gaps.

****** Should the VWG recommend that there be an ad hoc or periodic review group, then the text of this section should be further considered to take into account the functions of that periodic review group and the potential linkages to Sections A and H should be further considered.

5bis The beyond 2020 instrument invites the sharing of data and information from complementary reporting processes of relevant agreements, initiatives, and the IOMC and other organizations in order to take into consideration, as appropriate, any linkages with such agreements, initiatives, or organizations and to minimize the reporting burden for all stakeholders.

******* [3bis. Institutional arrangements for taking stock of progress on the sound management of chemicals and waste should include a multi-stakeholder periodic review process, facilitated by the secretariat, to review progress and, in cooperation with the Secretariat, prepare the report for the international conference that summarizes implementation progress and outlines recommendations.]

******** Only one stakeholder group (A Group of NGOs) asked for this paragraph to be retained (please see the summary from the 7th virtual meeting of the VWG held on 14 January 2021).

[ALT 3bis. To improve implementation efforts and strengthen the monitoring, evaluation, and reporting, the Secretariat may facilitate, upon request by a government, voluntary peer reviews.]

******* [6. These reports should facilitate discussion among stakeholders and allow for adaptation and response to any issues of concern.]
14. The overall effectiveness of the beyond 2020 instrument should also be independently evaluated, taking into account the stakeholder reported data and information presented by the Secretariat and evaluated by the international conference. This overall effectiveness evaluation should take place [after sufficient time has elapsed] [as decided by the international conference] [[possibly [in conjunction with] [at the same time as] the review of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.]

Section B: National Implementation

1. To sustain an integrated approach for the sound management of chemicals and waste, each Government should establish arrangements such as national plans of action for implementation on an inter-ministerial or inter-institutional basis, in consultation with stakeholders, so that concerned national department and stakeholder interests are represented and all relevant substantive areas are addressed.

2. Each government should designate a technical [and] [or] a political national focal point to facilitate communication and coordination at the national, regional, and international levels with respect to the [sound management of chemicals and wastes] [beyond 2020 instrument]. National focal point[s] should, among other duties, attend meetings, disseminate information, develop a network or a mechanism to coordinate national views [that includes consultations with all relevant sectors and stakeholders], and be representative of the country’s inter-ministerial or inter-institutional arrangements, where such arrangements exist.

3. To support effective implementation, stronger efforts are required to ensure that national implementation involves the engagement of the appropriate range of stakeholders and sectors (e.g., the health, environmental, agriculture and labour sectors) to address national priorities.

4. Should a [government] [stakeholder] choose to develop a national plan of action or program to further implementation efforts at the national level, such plan or program [may] [should] be used to support its reporting under this Section on the progress made during the reporting period [with respect to the agreed strategic objectives and targets], keeping in mind that such plans or programs are tailored to national actions and measures and should not be duplicative of existing arrangements or other reporting efforts.

5. All stakeholders should undertake actions to [ensure] [promote] progress on the implementation of the strategic objectives and targets at the national level.

Section C: [International,] Regional, and Sectoral Cooperation and Coordination

1. Priorities and capacities for implementation vary among regions according to their different economic and other circumstances.

2. International, regional, and sectoral collaboration play integral roles in supporting the sound management of chemicals and waste at all levels, including among trading partners and other regional organizations.

3. International and regional meetings and coordination mechanisms play an important role in enabling stakeholders in each region to exchange experience and identify priority needs in relation to implementation, as well as to develop regional positions on key issues.
4. Regions are encouraged, where appropriate:
   a) To identify common priorities,
   b) To develop regional implementation plans for the sound management of chemicals and waste, and to consider regional or sub-regional approaches and projects, and
   c) To appoint a regional focal point.

5. Regional focal points are to play a facilitative role within their regions, including undertaking activities determined at the regional level, such as chairing regional meetings, disseminating information of interest to focal points within their region, collecting views from national focal points on matters of interest to the region, identifying opportunities for regional cooperation, assisting in the flow of information and views from the region to its Bureau member, as appropriate, and reporting periodically on the outcomes of their regional meetings and other regional activities.

Section D: Enhanced Sectoral and Stakeholder Engagement

1. The involvement and commitment of all relevant sectors and stakeholders at the local, national, regional and international levels is important for the sound management of chemicals throughout their lifecycle and waste.

2. At the national level, governments, as appropriate, should undertake, in accordance with their laws, regulations and policies, actions to build or improve regulatory and non-regulatory frameworks and institutional structures and capacities for multi-sectoral coherence [for the sound management of chemicals and wastes][in the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument], as well as [urge] complementary action by relevant stakeholders.

3. Relevant regional [conventions] programmes, bodies and processes, such as health and environmental ministerial forums, should support and augment such national efforts, fostering coordination and cooperation.

4. It is also essential that at the international level, relevant international organizations and bodies, in particular the IOMC organizations [and the chemicals and waste-related conventions,] also support national and regional efforts to enable and enhance the participation of stakeholders and sectors and to promote awareness regarding the crosscutting nature of the sound management of chemicals and waste [as an essential element*] to achieve the sustainable development goals.

   * There was only one stakeholder group (A Group of NGOs) that asked for this bracketed text to remain.

5. In addition, mindful of the need to avoid duplication and taking into account their respective mandates [and constituencies], [such][relevant] international organizations and bodies [should be][are] invited to [endorse and adopt][formally recognize] [the beyond 2020 instrument] and strengthen their own engagement on [and ownership of] policies and actions for the sound management of chemicals and waste [through establishing a mechanism to coordinate activities and further include them in their programmes of work and budgets], [including coordinating relevant activities and programmes of work] relating to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and its sustainable development goals and targets.

6. The enhanced efforts of all relevant sectors and stakeholders involved in [the sound management of chemicals throughout their life-cycle and waste][the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument] should include increased or improved: (1) actions by members of individual sectors and stakeholders, (2) collaboration between and among key sectoral and stakeholder groups, and (3) multi-stakeholder and multi-sector dialogue throughout the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument.
7. All relevant sectors and stakeholders [throughout the value chain of chemicals and waste**] are invited and encouraged to enhance their contributions, as appropriate, to achieve the shared vision, the objectives and targets of the beyond 2020 instrument.

** IP-4 may want revisit the phrase “throughout the value chain of chemicals and waste” in this section to determine whether further definition or clarity is needed and to consider whether there is duplication of content with, for example, paragraph 1 or other paragraphs.

** There was only one stakeholder group (A Group of NGOs) that asked for this bracketed text to remain.

8. The involvement of industry and the private sector throughout the value chain needs to be significantly enhanced in the beyond 2020 instrument at all levels. The roles and responsibilities of industry and the private sector throughout the value chain in implementing the sound management of chemicals and waste offer a strong basis for enhanced involvement and action and should be clearly identified and developed.

9. Contributions to the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument are expected to be in the form of workplans, road maps, action items, milestones, pledges, or other appropriate commitments and should contain a clear definition of the roles and responsibilities of the sector and/or stakeholder, and the intended mechanism for implementation that contributes to the achievement of the objectives and targets, as well as opportunities for joint collaboration or actions.

10. The secretariat is requested to compile the contributions from the relevant stakeholders and sectors and, taking into account the objectives and targets of the beyond 2020 instrument, identify any potential engagement gaps, in consultation with other stakeholders. The secretariat is also requested to prepare an analysis using input from stakeholders and others to identify any additional coordination and collaboration necessary to enhance the multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder engagement within the framework of the beyond 2020 instrument.

11. The international conference may decide to request periodic updates on the implementation of the contributions from the relevant sectors and stakeholders to consider and assess whether enhanced levels of sectoral and stakeholder engagement have resulted in progress toward the achievement of the common objectives and targets or whether particular actions within the beyond 2020 instrument require additional enhancement or engagement.***

*** IP-4 may want to consider whether this paragraph is duplicative of content in Sections A and/or G.

12. All efforts to enhance sectoral and stakeholder engagement should be expected to lead to strengthened cooperation and coordination with respect to the [sound management of chemicals and waste][implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument], following a common and shared [and timeless] vision to be adopted by ICCM-5 [, [taking into account any engagement] [and endorsed] [and formally recognized] by the UN General Assembly (UNGA), other relevant international bodies such as the governing bodies of the IOMC members, and relevant MEAs [to secure the necessary ownership****].

**** There was only one stakeholder group (A Group of NGOs) that asked for this bracketed text to remain.

[13. To improve the multi-sectoral cooperation and coordinating structure focused on chemicals and waste, the IOMC should promote broad membership and participation of relevant intergovernmental bodies, including international organizations and secretariats of chemicals and waste related conventions,
and seek guidance from governmental representation from their respective governing bodies to strengthen their sound management of chemicals and waste prioritization, coordination, engagement and support for national implementation, within their respective mandates.]

Section H: Mechanism for Updating and Revising the Framework*

1. The international conference [may update] [may consider initiating a process to update] or revise the beyond 2020 instrument after taking into account: the assessment of the information and data called for from all stakeholders under Section G (Mechanisms for Taking Stock of Progress) and the results of the periodic evaluations called for by the international conference to review the overall effectiveness of the beyond 2020 instrument.

2. Such updates or revisions may be proposed by any [government] [stakeholder] and will require formal adoption by the international conference. The text of any proposed update or revision shall be communicated to all stakeholders and focal points by the Secretariat at least six months in advance of the international conference. The budget for the process to update or revise the instrument will be provided for via the operational budget adopted by the international conference.

* If this section impacts the work and mandates of the international conference under Section V. Institutional arrangements and its rule of procedures, those should be updated accordingly. One member of the VWG also called attention in general under this section to the need to ensure consideration of, and potentially consistency with, the rules of procedure.

9) Closing remarks

Ms. Kovner and Ms. Wiriwutikorn thanked all the VWG participants for their time and energy over the past few months. They noted that this VWG was given a large mandate and they appreciated how many hours this VWG had put in to make sure it could meet the expectations of the ICCM5 President, the Bureau, and the IP Co-chairs. They hoped that the VWG participants were happy with the outcome and noted that the spirit of this group has been very good and are looking forward to seeing how the work of this VWG will be taken forward.