Results of the survey on experiences with the SAICM VWG process held between October 2020-February 2021

The virtual working group process was conducted between October 2020 and February 2021 to support the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020. The objectives of the survey were:

(i) To gather information about the view and experiences of stakeholders of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) to inform the design of future work during the intersessional process;

(ii) To increase ownership and shared responsibility through engagement with SAICM stakeholders and the use of their experiences and suggestions to plan the next phase.

The present document provides the raw data from the survey results.

Timeline for the survey process

![Timeline Diagram]

- **Launch of the survey**: 16 June 2021
- **1st reminder**: 1 July 2021
- **Translation of the survey into the 6 UN languages**: 20 May – 14 June 2021
- **Targeted outreach to developing countries**: 30 June 2021
- **2nd reminder**: 9 July 2021
- **Compile and analyze the survey results**: 16 – 21 July 2021

Present the preliminary survey results to the Bureau at their ninth teleconference, 21 July 2021

Responses received

![Responses Received Chart]

- **Total responses received**: 98
- **Responses received**
  - Arabic: 2
  - Chinese: 1
  - English: 69
  - French: 9
  - Russian: 3
  - Spanish: 0

- **Responses received through**
  - Online: 18
  - Word: 80
A. Respondent information

Q1. Please indicate your country

Q2. Please indicate your region

Q3. Which stakeholder group do you belong to?
Q4. Which organization do you belong to?

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>PAN Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Chemicals Office of the Republic of Slovenia, Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Barbuda Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>WECF, Women Engage for a Common Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>Ministry of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible de la Nación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Directorate of Environment and Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>RAPAL/IPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Arvandtech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ministry for Ecological Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>الخرطوم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>CARPIN, UTech Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>Ministry of Special Planning and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>EX Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Centre de Recherche et d'Education pour le Développement (CREPD) and IPEN Co-Lead for VWG3 on IoC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Center for International Environmental Law (CIEL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Appui aux Initiatives de Développement (AIDE CAMEROUN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Environnement et de Développement Durable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Federal Office for the Environment FOEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>MINISTERE DE L’ENVIRONNEMENT? DE LA PROTECTION DE LA NATURE ET DU DEVELOPPEMENT DURABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>ICCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Government of Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>UNITAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>Ministerio del Medio Ambiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALAYSIA</td>
<td>MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND WATER, MALAYSIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>PAN Asia Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Association Congolaise pour le Développement Agricole ACDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>Centro de Investigación Laboral y Asesoría Sindical (CILAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Fédération des Coopératives des Pays de Mayoko FECOPAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>Comisión Federal para la Protección contra Riesgos Sanitarios (COFEPRIS) / Ministerio de Salud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>AEEFG qui est le Hub d’IPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Ministère de l’Environnement du Développement Durable et du Bassin du Congo (Direction Générale de l’Environnement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>México</td>
<td>SEDATU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Ministry for Ecology, Spatial Planning and Urbanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>Ministry of the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Ministry of Infrastructure and Watermanagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. You are responding to this survey as ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark_Danish Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td>Nicaragua_Comisión nacional de Registro y Control de Sustancias Tóxicas</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania (the)_Comparatively for Tanzania Elites Community Organizers (CTECO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador (el)_Ministerio del Ambiente, Agua y Transición Ecológica</td>
<td>Nigeria_Sustainable Research and Action for Environmental Development (SRADeV Nigeria</td>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania (the)_Irrigation Training and Economic Empowerment Organization - IRTECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia_Environment Forest and Climate Change Commission</td>
<td>Nicaragua_University of Calabar</td>
<td>United States of America (the)_U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union_European Commission</td>
<td>North Macedonia_Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning</td>
<td>United States of America (the)_US Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland_Ministry of the Environment</td>
<td>Norway_Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment</td>
<td>Uruguay (el)_Permanent Mission of Uruguay to the UN in Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France_Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
<td>Panamá_Ministerio de Salud</td>
<td>Venezuela (República Bolivariana de)_Ministerio del Poder Popular para el Ecosocialismo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon (le)_Ministère en charge de l'Environnement</td>
<td>Perú (el)_Ministerio del Ambiente</td>
<td>Vietnam_Vietnam Chemicals Agency (Ministry of Industry and Trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia_Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture</td>
<td>Philippines (the)_EcoWaste Coalition and IPEN Co-Lead for VWG1</td>
<td>Zambia_Children's Environmental Health Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany_BUND e.V.</td>
<td>Poland_Bureau for Chemical Substances</td>
<td>Kazakhstan_Ministerio de Industria y Desarrollo de la Infraestructura del Republica de Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany_German NGO Forum on Environment and Development</td>
<td>Portugal_Portuguese Environment Agency</td>
<td>Russian Federation_Centro “Эко-Согласие”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany_MSP Institute</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia_King Faisal University</td>
<td>Iraq_العراق/المؤسسة العراقية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q6. Did you register for any virtual working group meetings?

![Pie chart showing 22% Yes and 78% No]

Q7. If you did not register for any of the virtual working group meetings, please specify the reason(s)

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system.

- Notifications of virtual working groups were not shared.
- Not got any scope.
- J’ai pas eu l’information à temps.
- Era de nuestro interés participar de las reuniones virtuales del grupo de trabajo, lamentablemente no recibimos la información a tiempo para participar de esta valiosa instancia. Sin embargo, hemos podido acceder a las grabaciones que están disponibles en la página web de YouTube para ponernos al día al respecto, considerando las limitaciones que esto representa.
- Manque de bonne connexion en milieu de travail, délestage en matière d’électricité rurale.
- J’étais à l’intérieur du pays pendant ces réunions, dans les zones très dés enclavées.
- Por falta de tiempo.
- Lack of human resources, too many other online meetings during pandemic, uncertainties how these outcomes of VWGs will be treated at the end, relates to poor participation of key stakeholders in these groups.
- Falta de coordinación en nuestra institución.
- The information had been circulated through focal point. It had limited information about SAICM meeting.
- Maybe I missed some information.
- Italy, as a Member State part of the EU, decided not to take part in the VWG but to support the colleagues of other countries that are participating.
- Unable to attend.
- Not have any invitation on the virtual group meetings.
- Cambios administrativos institucionales.
- No he tenido conocimiento de las reuniones.
- Problema con el servicio de internet.
- No he sido invitada.
- May be i did not received an email notify me to register in those virtual working group if i have received information and like to those group i will join some related one.
- Did not receive the notification / invitation to the meetings yet a SAICM Focal Point.
- Missing the invitation.

- غلبية الاجتماعات والدورات بتكون عبر
- الاعلانات والمدعوم في السودان webic

- Впервые пригласили участвовать в вопросах регулирования химических веществ в рамках СПМРХВ.
Q8. Which virtual working group meeting(s) did you register for?

Q9. Did you provide written comments?

Q10. If you provided written comments, please specify on whose behalf the comments were provided?
Q11. How often did you provide comments?

B. Review of stakeholders’ experience of the virtual working group meetings held between October 2020 and February 2021

Q12. Did you participate in any of the online meetings?

Q13. If you did not participate in the online meeting, please specify the reason(s)

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

- CONFLIT DE CALENDRIER AVEC LES EXIGENCES PROFESSIONNELLES PRÉSENTIELLES; MAUVAISE CONNEXION INTERNET.
Q14. In general, how did the Webex platform work for you?

Q15. Did you encounter any problems?

Q16. Please indicate the kinds of problem that you encountered

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

Additional comments:
• Difficulty with mic in one meeting.
• Some speakers were almost inaudible at times.
• Couldn’t always here others because of their connectivity issues.

Q17. Please indicate the main reason(s) for the problems encountered

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

Additional comments:
• Poor internet connection; Problems of other participants, making it sometimes impossible to understand their inputs.
• Local, time specific internet connection/overload.
• Might have had a problem with internet connection, but also lack of compatibility with our firewall.
• Poor internet connection; Power/electricity instability.
• The Webex itself.
• Not having tested the connection in advance.
• Unclear objectives and process.
• In some cases, the sound of the speakers was not well and therefore difficult to understand.
• Technical problems and poor connectivity.

Q18. Did you use the chat box during the virtual working group meetings?
Q19. Did you find all the necessary information and documentation on the SAICM website?

- Yes: 93%
- No: 7%

Q20. Were you able to access the calendar of meetings?

- Yes: 87%
- No: 13%

Q21. Was the timing acceptable to you in relation to your time zone?

- Yes: 84%
- No: 16%
Q22. Were the virtual working group meetings announced in a timely manner?

Q23. Were the documents for the virtual working group meetings made available in a timely manner?

Q24. How much time did you need to consult the documentation and be sufficiently prepared for the virtual working group meetings?
Q25. How much time between the virtual working group meetings was needed for you to digest the meeting summaries and prepare for subsequent sessions?

Q26. Was the overall schedule of the four virtual working group meetings manageable for you?

C. Potential future process

Q27. Which of the following functionalities are useful for you?

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system.
Additional comments:
- Email.
- Online white board such as OneNote.
- Grupos pequeños de trabajo como el de la Declaración de Alto Nivel.
- Email.
- If during the meeting group chat is useful. Breakout groups can be useful but should not be in parallel to the ongoing meeting.
- No se tuvo la experiencia pero se sugeriría que la comunicación de grupo se mantenga vía correo electrónico.
- No participamos en las reuniones virtuales.

Q28. Have you used other technologies/meeting platforms that you think would be better suited to the virtual working group meetings?

![Bar chart showing responses](chart.png)

*Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system.*

Additional comments:
- I have experience with all above, Webex worked fine.
- Webex nos parece adecuado.
- good experience with zoom, bad experience with Microsoft Teams.
- Webex or Teams ok but probably not Zoom.

Q29. Do you think that the same meetings should be held several times, in smaller groups, in different time zones?

![Pie chart showing responses](chart.png)

*47% Yes, 53% No*
Q30. Which starting time would work best for you for future meetings?

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system.

Additional comments:
- 13:00 Geneva time.
- EAT should also be indicated in the options.
- All suggested starting times are fine.
- à partir de 10 Heures (heure de Nairobi).
- 9.00 horas GMT-5.
- à partir de las 10:00 h Estándar del Este (Nueva York).
- Being situated in the EU, time was good but not for network partners e.g. in Asia/Pacific Region.
- CET 3.00 PM.
- If 4 am EST is an option, then 4 am CET should be too once in a while!!
- Flexible between 7:00 and 22:00 CET.
- 7 heures (heure d'hiver de New York) / 13 heures (heure d'Europe centrale, Bruxelles) / 20 heures (heure du Japon, Tokyo) / 24 heures (heure du Samoa occidental, Apia).

Q31. Would tools such as online simultaneous interpretation be useful for enhancing inclusiveness and participation?
Q32. Would an opportunity for regional dialogue be helpful for your region?

Q33. Would you need support to participate effectively in an online process?

Q34. Please indicate the support that you would need

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

Additional comments:
- Equipment (Laptop, CDM).
- Otra plataforma.
- More time for discussion and emails.
- disponibilidad de documentos a discutir de forma oportuna.
Q35. Which of the following would be helpful for future virtual work?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q35]

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system.

Additional comments:
- Less intervention by facilitators. It is not their business to decide the outcome.
- We see all of these as potentially valuable for future virtual work, however some may need different formats to work virtually e.g. break-out rooms for conflict resolution.

Q36. Do you think that stakeholders who are unable to participate actively in meetings should be allowed to provide written submissions PRIOR to the meeting?

![Pie chart showing responses to Q36]

11% Yes, 89% No.
Q37. Do you think that stakeholders who are unable to participate actively in meetings should be allowed to provide written submissions AFTER the meeting?

87% Yes
13% No

Q38. In addition to a second round of virtual working group meetings, which of the following options could be implemented to advance the intersessional process until face-to-face meetings are again feasible?

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

Additional comments:
- Community of practice discussions on financing and what the new instrument should look like.
- The Open-ended forums would be good to encourage participation.

Q39. Do you have any other suggestions for further increasing engagement in the preparations for IP4?

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

- Participation of at least one representative from each stakeholder country should be made mandatory for increased engagement
- Get more agreement on text and leave contentious / unresolvable issues for FtF meetings
- I haven’t any comment concerning 4th and 5th virtual meeting. But during the meeting to start the meeting adjust the time
- Please let us know what YOU (SAICM sec) are doing.
- The co-facilitators should prepare informal notes in between the sessions to capture all the views expressed and make progress during the discussions.
• I think that the major challenge being faced is that apart from continued discussion utilizing the most appropriate methods, the process is significantly hindered by the fact that the already established texts cannot be negotiated.

• Regional Virtual meetings should be encouraged.

• This may not be directly linked to the further engagement, but I am wondering if secretariat could consider preparing vaccine for those coming to the face-to-face meeting of the IP4 or ICCM5, if needed (just like Tokyo Olympics).

• Participation of at least one representative from each stakeholder country should be made mandatory for increased engagement.

• more encouragement for participation of industry representatives.

• Regional consultations

• In order to attract new actors, particularly outside the "chemicals bubble" any process should be designed in a way that allows for new ideas to be included. As the VWGs (sometimes) turned into negotiations of existing language, this may lead to finding the smallest common denominator rather than effective solutions.

• consider how to link and contribute to the fulfillment of the EU Action Plan: "Towards a Zero Pollution for Air, Water and Soil".

• Face to face meetings to do actual negotiations.

• Advance regional meetings, but also advance briefings for stakeholders on how to participate in these kind of meetings (being well prepared, coordinated with group members, ready to discuss and ready to find a path forward.

• Re-ignite and pull back together via regional meetings, take back from the points of congruence and build up from there.

• I will prefer the zoom or gotowebinar or gotomeeting app to be use for the meeting

• Regional meetings, virtual sessions, but not as many and as frequent as last time

• Kindly consider face to face meetings taking into considerations of Ministry of Health SOPs, so as to have tangible results from assigned focal points

• Co-facilitators could consider more actively inviting comments from the various regions/stakeholder groups during the online meetings. Issues that could require more discussion and information merit to be referred to smaller groups. As the co-facilitators report should be welcomed as the starting point stakeholders could be invited to submit general comments on the progress made or remaining issues. As written submissions are central for understanding other stakeholders views sufficient time between the meetings could be valuable.

• Developing countries' representatives should be enabled (including the provision of airtime, noting most of them are participating on their own private budgets) to fully participate; simultaneous translations into all UN languages should be available.

• Se sugiere la presentación de un documento resumen de los temas abordados en la primera roda de reuniones virtuales del grupo de trabajo, así como los avances y logros alcanzados a la fecha.

• Continuous capacity building for sound chemical waste management for experts and program leaders.

• Regional meetings

• Convening the same meetings in different languages to increase harmony and understanding amongst participant.

• Building virtual bridges between governments and stakeholders.

• Technical assistance prior to the meeting is necessary.

• Nous souhaitons plein succès à la SAICM, appuis multiformes de la SAICM aux organisations de la société civile pour la réalisation des activités de large sensibilisation et vulgarisation de ses initiatives en zones rurales.

• Sufficient time to prepare for the meetings, possibility for written comments before (those who experience technical difficulties), narrow the scope e.g. VWG2 - SPI, proposals of Switzerland and Japan on Section G.

• A helpdesk that would be open 1-3 days (or maybe even longer) ahead of the sessions would be helpful to guide stakeholders to the right documents on the SAICM website and answer specific questions about the text would be helpful to ensure participants have a better understanding of the text proposals and changes and thus be better prepared for the sessions.

• Offer a training on effective participation in virtual meetings; provide clear information on the content of an upcoming meeting and the results of a past meeting; allow for sufficient time between meetings.

• Please number the documents to avoid mixing different versions of the same document.

• Documents should be shared in advance.
• Reduce the influence of and manipulation by the facilitators on the outcomes, facilitators should be neutral and not have their own agendas to follow, make sure that all parties are heard and can participate, even if it takes longer and loops are necessary.

• The attribution of participants should be considered when receiving opinions and comments. We do not know if she/he is speaking on behalf of some organization or just expressing personal views. It would be better if the secretariat differentiates the accessibility of them. For example, those who are nominated/appointed by institutions/organization can provide oral views while self-registered individuals are only allowed written comment via chat box. (e.g. as I belong to UNEP but we don't have corporate policy shared among us so I can only express my personal views. So, differentiate it from UNEP corporate stance makes me comfortable to contribute to the process).

• Nous suggérons la création d'un groupe whatsapp afin de permettre les échanges plus, cela permettra a chaque participant de veiller a son téléphone a tout moment. Je pense que c'est plus efficace plusieurs groupes en créer cette plate-forme d'échangeee.

• Talleres explicativos para miembros nuevos.

• Consideration for time differences should be given. Rather than having a set starting time, we suggest having a combination of starting times that are suitable for various regions.

• Considering the numbers of attendants at IP3, the numbers of attendants at VWG is significantly low. We suggest encouraging more stakeholders to attend by sending out a reminder with agenda in actual email rather than providing a link or attached files. Follow up with IP3 attendants such as private companies and academia via industry organizations and international organizations.

• Sending out a questionnaire each time with meeting readout for feedback or comment might be a possibility.

• To ensure that the progress and efforts put into the VWG are carried forward, we see a lot of value in the Bureau conducting regional meetings to present and discuss the outcomes of the VWG process. There may also be an opportunity to continue some of the technical work, including technical webinars on substantive issues.

• We support the creation of a policy and expert technical group to review proposed targets and indicators and develop and propose new ones as appropriate. We hope the Bureau will seriously consider the co-facilitators proposed way forward on the creation of such a group.

• Efforts to engage and promote the Beyond 2020 process with stakeholders from all sectors, with a focus on further enhancing engagement health and labour, would contribute to support and strengthen the ICCM5 and Beyond 2020 outcomes.

• We see value in the recent initiatives by the Secretariat regarding industry involvement in the Beyond 2020 Framework, including the development of a guidance document, and support efforts to engage with industry directly as part of this process.

• Co-facilitators could consider more actively inviting comments from the various regions/stakeholder groups during the online meetings.

• Issues that could require more discussion and information merit to be referred to smaller groups. As the co-facilitators report should be welcomed as the starting point stakeholders could be invited to submit general comments on the progress made or remaining issues.

• As written submissions are central for understanding other stakeholders views so I can only express my personal views. It is necessary to work on summaries comprehensive in the form of matrices that indicate the elements necessary for the decision or to do analyses. It is necessary of the same that one is under the name an evolution of efforts in the light of the results of groups of work of a consultation to another for the actualization and the information of those who have integrated the process new. The process lacks of statistic and it is very important that the numbers accompany the discussions.

• Parties or all stakeholders involved the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 should have to receive a written note before and after the virtual meeting this helps the parties to reach an agreement before any decision this might limit any miss understanding do to the communication barriers while doing the meeting online.
- It would be crucial to provide more information to the focal points and stakeholders on the priorities and plans under SAICM.
- The quantity of meetings of the 4 groups was overwhelming, for delegations small and that follow issues of common relevance.
- Present data on the situations in the countries and regions.
- Ensure the participation equitably and representative of all regions (ej. Central America - GRULAC).
- More technical meetings to help digest all the background documents and outcomes of prior meetings.
- Include a representative of health, labour and agriculture ministries in the Bureau meetings, in line with the WHO, ILO and FAO proposal during the governance VWG. Ensure space for sectoral meetings (health, labour, environment, agriculture) and side events. Add to meetings' agenda points related to multisectoral participation and the role of each participating sector.
- Include all the work done so far in the reference document(s).
- Sufficient time to prepare for VWG meetings as well as the written feedback is needed. This wasn't the case in the first period of VWGs. Documents and text to be discussed in VWG meetings should be made available at least 2 weeks in advance to enable proper preparation. The time to provide written comments should be 4 weeks at least for the same reason.
- In order to increase engagement we should increase cooperation and coordination with relevant stakeholders, such as the BRS Secretariat, the Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury, the Secretariat of the Global Environment Facility, the participating organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals and other intergovernmental organizations, and enhance the synergies with the medium-term strategy on chemicals and waste of the United Nations Environment Programme on issues of common relevance.
- The scheduling of the future meetings should be announced well in advance, allowing participants to book the needed time in their calendars. Also "rotating" common meeting times should be considered so that the burden of online working can be shared more equally. Enough time between meetings should be allowed for participants to prepare especially if written inputs are requested in advance of the meetings (keeping in mind the need for regional/stakeholder coordination for many participants). E.g. VWG Finance had a realistic scheduling of meeting, also not to overburden the participants. For tricky topics/sections, this would also allow some in-between meetings consultation time with a smaller group of stakeholders if needed and requested by the co-facilitators. The meeting schedule of the VWG Governance was very ambitious and a lot of time was also spent because participants were not able to well prepare and this caused also tension in the group.
- Less frequency of the meetings, with appropriate time to study meeting report and provide comments.
- Provide summary of discussions so far including agreed points and differentiated views.
- Prioritize above all other matters (including apparent pace of progress of discussion) transparency and participation by all stakeholders. That includes being ready for discussions to be slow or suspended in case full participation cannot be attained.
- Enough time in between VWG meetings to prepare documents and written input.
- Appreciate the efforts thus far by the co-facilitators and Secretariat to engage stakeholders. Having more time between meetings and varying meeting times might help with further engagement. Smaller meetings might be easier to manage but could impede overall progress - it would be preferable to have broad participation for all meetings so that everyone has the benefit of participating in the full discussion. Written submissions should continue to be used to complement, but not replace, the discussions. It would also be helpful to double check the meeting calendar on the website to ensure it is accurate.
• Universities and research institutes should be involved in the NENA region.
• Provide information, possibility of online presentations.
• Documents and Text to be discussed in VWG meetings should be made available at least 2 weeks in advance to enable proper preparation.
• The time to provide written comments should be 4 weeks at least for the same reason.
• We felt the technology (Webex) worked relatively well; however future meetings may benefit from use additionally of other tools, such as Mentimeter, Slido, Miro etc in order to increase engagement. Increased engagement may also be achieved through translation and interpretation of and during the virtual working meetings and, in our view, we should also consider holding the same meeting across different time-zones in order to encourage and support participation and engagement.
• The posting of all relevant documents including stakeholder submissions on the SAICM website was very helpful and something we would wish to see continued in future.
• Any new, draft versions of the text, as updated during the Virtual Working Groups following comments from stakeholders and alterations from the Co-Chairs should be clearly sign-posted to stakeholders in advance of any future meetings and uploaded on the SAICM website.
• Multiplier les réunions régionales afin que ceux dont les agendas permettront de participer aux différents forum en ligne soient imprégnés de la vision et des objectifs poursuivis par le groupe dans chaque domaine.
• Reuniones informativas regionales con preguntas claves para que los países puedan responder por escrito después de la reunión.
• Que la agenda de una reunión no sea extensa.
• Пока нет.
• Limit what is covered under each virtual meeting. Rather have short focused meetings with the view to coming up with text or solving disputes.

Q40. In your view, and within the mandate of the intersessional process, what are the priority areas that require further discussion in order for progress to be made in 2021

Note: The responses below have not been edited nor translated. For transparency matters they remain as they were introduced in the system

• Discussion on progress made against targets and indicators; Strengthening governance mechanism both at national and international to support implementation; Financial mechanism to support implementation and institutional strengthening.
• التمويل المالي , الهيئة الامتثال والتنفيذ
• تحديد نقاط النهج الاستراتيجي لادارة المواد الكيميائية من خلال الهيئة المشتركة ما بين دول مجلس التعاون الخليجي.
• the structure of the new framework/instrument; more agreement to financing issues; once the framework is agreed upon, then the SAICM governance/procedural documents should be reviewed and updated; the role of focal points should be agreed to and discussed.
• Indicators.
• To start the meeting all country has not the same. The connection and other things are not the same then assume that one that.
• Targets and Indicators, Gender Equality (e.g. first discussion on a Gender Action Plan, Gender Focal Point).
• A clear indicator framework is needed.
• Target and indicator, mechanism to support the implementation of beyond 2020 framework.
• Governance and targets.
• Private Sector Involvement. Funding of SICAM. Indicators and Milestones.
• Governance.
• Targets, indicators and milestones; and Financial considerations.
• Governance.
• Rule of procedure should be considered in parallel with the governance and implementation mechanism. I am not quite sure if SAICM stakeholders should discuss the science-policy interface before a relevant resolution at UNEA5, noting that now the order of ICCM5 and UNEA5 is reversed.
• Mechanisms of financing.
• Further discussion beyond 2020.
• Substance for SAICM Beyond 2020 on financing for chemicals management beyond the process in its narrow sense; a higher level of commitment, incl. legal obligations (if necessary through mandates to other actors and processes like specialized agencies, BRS conventions etc.); making SAICM more human rights oriented.
• Stricter implementation and enforcement.
• Targets and indicators.
• Resource mobilization and joint action strategies.
• Industry involvement, targets and milestones and indicators.
• Discussion on chemical regarding wastewater.
• Issues of concern.
• More work is needed on science policy and on the indicators. Do not recommend starting new groups or dialogue -- keep going with the existing groups and work.
• Mostly all of them. Vis a vis allocation of resources, could there be a commitment by developed countries to join and share as much info as appropriate and for existing chemicals; enhance sustainable chemistry and the acceleration of its adoption to assist SAICM 2.0, while supporting SDGs, and the benefits of the business chemistry to most interested parties.
• Aspect of "Clean energy sustainability ".
• Finance is difficult in a virtual setting. Governance and Targets highest priority. Some work left on IoC.
• Online training on Chemicals and Waste Management.
• Identifying gaps/challenges in addressing Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 despite many National Governments efforts put in to address environment management issues, these includes but not limited to Local Community Management initiatives undertaken, Environment Policies updated to combat the chemical and waste management, stakeholders involvement in managing chemicals and waste and reports of National or Local Platforms formed to address the strategic approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.
• Développement Communautaire.
• The set of Targets to be agreed is a priority, preferably together with indicators that can follow up progress. Other issues to discuss further can be the SPI and the CH/Japan proposals on reporting and review.
• Objectives and targets is a group that progress in other groups depends on, so there should be further discussion there, as well as on issues of concern. There should be also further discussions on the place, nature and role of the co-chairs’ summaries (how are the comments provided by the stakeholders are taking into consideration in these summaries? how far are they balanced outcomes of stakeholder's comments and discussions?). Clarifications on these points will help to speed up progress in 2021.
• Es menester considerar la reactivación post COVID-19 de los actores interesados en el SAICM y como esto influenciaría en alcanzar una agenda ambiciosa más allá del 2021.
• Countries leaders commitment for sound chemical waste management, stakeholders and multi-sectorial collaboration with continuous funding opportunity.
• Issues of Concern.
• Legal frameworks on chemicals and waste; Relevant enforcement and compliance mechanisms; Strong institutional frameworks and coordination mechanisms among relevant stakeholders; Industry participation and defined responsibility across the life cycle; Inclusion of the sound management of chemicals and waste in national health, labour, social, environment and economic budgeting processes and development plans. Governance and Mechanism for Implementation, Issues of Concern, Financial Capacity. Science Policy interface.
• Issues of concern and finance.
• Endocrine disruption, mixtures, chemicals in products.
• Regional policy.
• We need more Regional briefing to be provided.
• Financement des actions des organisations de la société civile pour sensibilisation large public dans le but de l'atteinte des objectifs de la SAICM.
• Targets, indicators, and milestones; Issues of Concern.
• Financing, issues of concern.
• Objectives, targets and indicators, governance and mechanisms to support implementation, financial considerations.
• Issues of concern.
• Support to developing countries to implement their obligations.
• Go back to the texts and issues of concern and really discuss all the items that were just brushed over or eliminated by the facilitators without the consensus of everybody participating.
• The issues that involves politics (e.g. finance, governance) are not suitable topics for this intersessional process. Technical issues such as indicators, baselines, reporting, stocktaking including the Global Chemicals Outlook will be better for further elaboration.
• Les domaines prioritaires sont ceux qui sont impliqué directement dans la gestion des produits chimiques. Nous avons par exemple l’Agriculture, avec l'utilisation des pesticides, l'industrie, santé, etc.
• To make progress a single document including the four working groups outcomes are needed. This will help us getting an overview of the overall ambition of the Framework and what is missing.
• Finance.
• Cooperación Internacional.
• Targets and indicators, Governance since we did not have enough to cover all the topics during previous VWGs.
• Private sector contribution including capacity building could also be a VWG topic because the discussion at sub-group was held during governance VWG and there are stakeholders including Japan could not fully participated. It is an important topic and it will be helpful if we had additional time to hear industry’s area of contribution to C&W cluster.
• General:
  - A comprehensive review of the whole text to ensure overall coherence and consistency, including with the Rules of Procedures and other relevant documents, and address potential gaps (as noted in the Governance VWG final report)
  - Further discussion on the science-policy interface
  - Targets: Further work to achieve clear, relevant, meaningful, actionable, measurable, and flexible targets and indicators, as per the proposals of the VWG final report. Further work to achieve fuller representation of all stakeholders within work on targets and indicators.
  - Governance:
    - a governance structure and institutional arrangements that properly reflects the contribution and addresses the needs of all sectors and stakeholders.
    - Mechanism(s) to effectively track and measure the framework’s implementation and assess the overall effectiveness of the framework in meeting its vision, goals and objectives.
    - functions that would be helpful in implementing the Beyond 2020 framework, including on the functions and characteristics of a science-policy interface.
• IOC/EPI: further discussion on mechanisms/processes for the development, coordination and implementation of IOC/EPIs, including a process to review existing ones.
• Financial considerations: How to better leverage financial resources, in particular from the private sector, to support the implementation of the Beyond 2020 Instrument and to ensure that such contributions are effectively tracked and understood.
• The set of Targets to be agreed is a priority, preferably together with indicators that can follow up progress.
• Other issues to discuss further can be the SPI and the CH/Japan proposals on reporting and review.
• Measurable objectives in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and science-policy interface.
• Gouvernance et mécanismes pour soutenir la mise en œuvre.
• Mécanismes de financement des actions et le régime du futur instrument.
• Perspectiva mundial de la gestión de residuos, El costo de la inacción.
• Considérations financières et les indicateurs.
• Les objectifs, les cibles et milestones nécessitent un grand débat pour mettre des dates péremptoires pour la réalisation des objectifs globaux de SAICM.
• Decisions needs priority in key areas of chemical management, parties obligation and national capacity and project for supporting the chemical and waste management in developing countries needs should need discussion.
• экологически безопасные альтернативы устаревшим технологиям и химическим веществам
• Sustainable chemistry, sound management of waste and chemicals.
• Mecanismo de financiamiento integrado, objetivos e indicadores, planes de implementación, involucramiento de otros stakeholders.
• Mayor comunicación, actualizar la página Web, montar documentos con antelación.
• Financiamiento, y "targets".
• The main areas on which it is important to make further progresses are target, indicators and milestones and issues of concern.
• Chemical safety.
• Iplanes y programas regionales y nacionales indicadores de evaluación cual cuantitativos /programas efectivos (planes en las regiones y paises).
• Governance and Finance.
• Fortalecimiento de la armonización regulatoria.
• Saber de las experiencias de los grupos en los países.
• Disponibilidad Financiera, Asistencia Técnica, Cambio Climático, Equidad de Genero, etc.
• Those where not much progress has been made virtually.
• Gestión de residuos hospitalarios.
• Multisectoral participation in the process.
• Selection of outcome-oriented targets and indicators (rather than process oriented) that are agreed at face-to-face ICCM5; - Priority should be on gaps identified by GCOII, e.g. lack of progress on HHPs, follow up of ICCM4 resolution on HHPs.
• Principles (including human rights, workers and women's rights), finance.
• How to best include the existing issues of concern in the new framework. What additional means there are to make best use of the SAICM work done so far.
• VWG1 on Targets, indicators, and milestones and VWG3 on Issues of concern could continue their work.
• Priority areas which are not yet finished in a satisfactory manner.
• For progress to be made in 2021, we need to have further discussions on the need for governments to speed up the implementation of policies and programs to increase support for non-chemical alternatives, including agroecology to replace the chemicals or groups of chemicals of global and regional concern including highly hazardous pesticides.
• Targets, IoCs, SPI, finance.
• Science-Policy Interface, Emerging Policy Issue, Mechanism to support implementation.
• Strategic objectives and targets, definition of IoC, how to handle wastes.
• Financing of the Strategic Approach.
• Topics per VWG that have not been discussed during the first round of VWGs.
• Discussion of science-policy interface, continued work on targets and indicators.
• POPs and obsolete pesticides.
• Issues of concern, finance, gender.

It's less a prioritization as an appraisal of what might be realistic to be further developed in virtual work, as agreement on all text for the OPS update etc. is important. The areas that could be advanced in virtual work are (i) Targets and perhaps the indicators; and (ii) Modalities for Issues of Concern.
• Capacity Building; and Development of policy frameworks for financing SMC and waste.
• Response to the Covid pandemic.
• There were a range of outstanding areas from the work mandated for each of the virtual working groups which should be taken forward ahead of any future face-to-face negotiations.
• Given the postponement of face-to-face negotiations, the Bureau should review future work plans and minimize the number of topics that cannot currently be discussed via intersessional virtual working, acknowledging the slower pace and efforts to increase wider participation in these discussions that may be needed. We should proceed with virtual discussions as the default way of working in order to make progress with this framework during the pandemic, aiming to finalise text where possible and maintain momentum.
• Particular priority areas for discussion for the UK include (i) Iterative Target/Indicator development - we have proposed target development with a parallel sub-group on indicators/ accountability feeding in their thoughts iteratively and ensuring we bring together aspects of the Governance VWG. We need a more joined-up discussion of reporting/ accountability, targets and indicators given the interlinked nature of these topics. We should aim to identify possible indicators which could be used and discuss reporting and accountability of the framework further – particularly around how reporting and accountability could work in the absence of agreed indicators. (ii) Science Policy Interface discussions should continue as a priority; (iii) Innovative financing – Green Finance; finance standards/taxonomies and how to build on the integrated approach; (iv) Issues of Concern – We support suggestion of multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral groups to review current and proposed issues of concern. These groups could be open-ended and convened by current lead IOMC organisations. We would also support suggestion from VWG3 that lead agencies of the IOMC, Governments and other relevant stakeholders compile a report on the progress made in the implementation of Conference resolutions on emerging policy issues and other issues of concern. The UK would therefore welcome the opportunity to present these views to stakeholders in any renewed virtual working meetings.
• L'engagement politique de Haut niveau, le mécanisme de financement, notamment l'engagement du secteur privé, le mécanisme institutionnel, le transfert technologique, de l'expertise et le renforcement des capacités.
• Goberranza y cuestiones financieras.
• Reducción de riesgos.
• oka нет позиции.
• Agreement on what the new framework will look like and procedures are important to sort out before we meet face to face, as well as some text and definitions. For example, the inclusion of waste and how to define waste should be resolved.