B. NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION (Page 8, Section VI.B)

Paragraph 2. Based on the first sentence of the compilation text, please explain in no more than two sentences your organization’s view on the government focal point(s) and the primary role of the focal point(s). The first sentence reads as follows:

To facilitate communication, nationally and internationally, each Government should [designate or develop a network of] [a political and a technical national focal point] [to communicate on the SAICM matters and develop a network at the national level of coordinators] that represent the multi-stakeholder and multisectoral nature of [SAICM] [the instrument to communicate on the sound management of chemicals and waste matters].

View of the United States:

The brackets in this paragraph could be read as: (1) instructing each country to put forward several focal points covering different sectors, as well as (2) suggesting the possibility of each country having more than one focal point to bring differing views to SAICM 2.0. We do not support these ideas; in our view, each country should have one national focal point that is responsible for national engagement and coordinates internally amongst multiple agencies on that engagement. To emphasize the importance of multisectoral engagement at the country level, the competing brackets could be synthesized to read: “designate a national focal point and develop an internal network to…”.

Paragraphs 3 and 4.

View of the United States:

The United States can support the proposal in paragraph 3 to include “environmental” without brackets in the parenthetical and the text proposed by the co-facilitators in paragraph 4 related to reporting back on national plans, provided the latter includes an “as appropriate.”

---

1 As a general point of clarification, the United States has been clear in its view that the scope of UNEA Resolution 1/5 is limited to the waste that is associated with the production and use of chemicals. Therefore, either all references to waste in the Beyond 2020 Instrument/SAICM 2.0 text should either be: (1) defined within the text as being the waste associated with the production and use of chemicals, or (2) each reference to waste should be preceded by “associated.” The United States has not added in additional brackets to the texts presented in Section B, C, and D to reflect this view as we believe our position is well known and understood, but please consider this footnote a reminder that these texts will need to be revisited to address this issue once the scope of the instrument is agreed to prior to the conclusion of ICCM-5.

2 Given that this is the first reference to “waste” in this document, the United States is highlighting it to ensure that footnote 1 is recognized and duly noted.
Paragraph 5.

**View of the United States:**

The United States supports the removal of the brackets on this paragraph. However, please replace “ensure” with “promote” since actions of stakeholders external to the government or at subnational levels cannot be “ensured” by national governments.

C. **[INTERNATIONAL,] REGIONAL AND [SUBREGIONAL] SECTORAL COOPERATION AND COORDINATION (Page 9, Section VI.C)**

*Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 contain a very limited set of brackets with respect the levels of geographic engagement. Based on the understanding that the engagement of all stakeholders, regardless of their geographic level, has been highlighted as important throughout the IP process, the co-facilitators propose that the text reflect all of the geographic levels proposed by removing the limited brackets in paragraphs 1-4 and correcting the punctuation in further iterations of this section.*

**View of the United States:**

The United States supports the proposal to ensure that the text in paragraphs 1-4 reflects all of the relevant geographic levels.

D. **ENHANCED SECTORAL AND STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT (Pages 10-11, Section VI.D)**

*Paragraph 1. The United States supports the removal of the brackets around [and commitment].*

*Paragraph 2. At the national level, governments, as appropriate, should [undertake][pursue], in accordance with their laws, regulations and policies, [taking into account their national circumstances,] 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 [promote][encourage] complementary action by relevant stakeholders.*

With respect to the brackets in this paragraph, the United States:

- [undertake][pursue] can accept either term, as preferred by others.

- does not support removing the brackets around [taking into account their national circumstances,]. This paragraph is a reference to national-level action in accordance with their laws, regulations, and policies. This clearly indicates that governments are taking action within their national circumstances, so we do not see the need for this addition.

- [for the sound management of chemicals and wastes][in the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument] supports focusing on the implementation of SAICM 2.0 commitments specifically and not purporting to provide direction, instruction, or oversight for the entire field of chemicals and waste, much of which has its own legally distinct, and in some cases legally binding, mandates on the international plane.

- [promote][encourage] can accept either term, as preferred by others.
Paragraph 3. The United States does not agree to removing the brackets around [conventions,] as this body does not have standing to determine what legally-distincted entities, such as conventions, should be doing.

Paragraph 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] [a contribution] to achieve the sustainable development goals.

- The United States does not agree to removing the brackets around ”and the chemicals and waste-related conventions.” It is outside the scope of this body to determine what is essential for the legally-distinct conventions to do, and the broad awareness-raising efforts referenced at the end of the paragraph may be outside the scope of some or all of the conventions.

- The United States does not believe that “an essential element” is accurate, but can accept [a contribution].

Paragraph 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.

The United States finds that the intent of the original paragraph is now difficult to find amongst the brackets. In our view, this paragraph should (being mindful that only the ICCM can “adopt” the new instrument), taking into account the need to avoid duplication and respect relevant mandates, invite relevant international organizations and bodies to strengthen, and, as appropriate, coordinate their own engagement on policies and actions for the sound management of chemicals and waste with the beyond 2020 instrument, particularly in those areas that relate to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda and its sustainable development goals and targets. We therefore support the removal of brackets that would contribute to an outcome that reflects these views.

Paragraph 6. [the sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycle and waste] [the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument]

The United States prefers the second option of these two brackets. The actions called for in the paragraph do not make sense outside of the context of implementing the beyond 2020 instrument.

Paragraph 7. The United States supports the removal of the brackets around [throughout the value chain of chemicals and waste], though we note that when including a phrase such as “throughout the value chain” the waste reference is unnecessary.

Paragraph 11. The United States supports the removal of the brackets around [resulted in progress].

Paragraph 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 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]].

Consistent with the edits above, the clean revised paragraph, as proposed by the United States, would read:
“All efforts to enhance sectoral and stakeholder engagement should be expected to lead to strengthened cooperation and coordination with respect to the implementation of the beyond 2020 instrument, following a common and shared vision to be adopted by ICCM-5, taking into account any engagement by the UN General Assembly (UNGA), other relevant international bodies such as the governing bodies of the IOMC members, and relevant MEAs.”

Paragraph 13. The United States supports the removal of the brackets around this paragraph.