

## Preparations for the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management

Summary of submissions received in response to the secretariat's consultation note

27 March 2008

---

### Background

1. On 26 July 2007,<sup>1</sup> the secretariat issued a consultation note on preparations for the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM2), which is to take place from 11-15 May 2009. Stakeholders were invited to comment, by 28 February 2008, on the consultation note which summarized views expressed by regional groups on the role of the meeting and proposed a provisional agenda, venue, date, participation formula and budget for the meeting.

2. The consultation note was discussed at the meeting of EU-JUSSCANNZ countries, held in Paris on 12 February 2008, and at the meeting of the Latin American and Caribbean region, held in Panama City from 14 to 16 February 2008. Submissions were made by the African and the Central and Eastern European regions; the European Union; the Governments of Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, the United States and Yemen; the Association pour la Valorisation de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion d'une Gestion Rationnelle des Produits Chimiques (AVEPGRC); the Development for People and Nature Association (DPNA); the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA); the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN); the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC); and the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC). In addition, during regional meetings in 2006 and 2007 prior to the issuing of the secretariat's consultation note, the African, Asia-Pacific and Central and Eastern European regions and the EU-JUSSCANNZ countries made some preliminary observations on their expectations for ICCM2.

3. The consultation note, submissions and a compilation of views expressed at earlier regional meetings may be viewed on the SAICM web site at <http://www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/iccm/ICCM2/iccm2.htm>. The secretariat thanks all stakeholders who provided feedback on the proposed arrangements for ICCM2. The views expressed by stakeholders are summarized in the annex to the present document. A similar document has been prepared concerning preparations for the first meeting of the ICCM's Open-ended Legal and Technical Working Group (October 2008) and is available on the SAICM web site at <http://www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/OELTWG/Open-ended.htm>.

### Further consultations

4. In order to resolve outstanding ICCM2 (and OELTWG) planning issues the secretariat will facilitate a teleconference on 7 April 2008 teleconference for the stakeholder representatives listed below:

---

<sup>1</sup> Reissued on 17 December 2007 after editing and translation.

- (a) Governments will be represented by the five official SAICM regional focal points (Argentina, Japan, Nigeria, Romania and the United Kingdom).
- (b) Intergovernmental organizations will be represented by FAO (presumptive host of the OELTWG meeting), ILO (chair of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals), UNEP (convenor of the ICCM) and WHO (UNEP's principal institutional partner in organizing ICCM2).
- (c) Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) will be represented by the Environmental Health Fund (for public interest NGOs), the International Council of Chemical Associations (for industry), the International Trade Union Council (for the labour sector) and the International Society of Doctors for the Environment (for the health sector).<sup>2</sup>

5. It should be noted that in the absence of an ICCM or OELTWG bureau, the above group has been invited informally by the secretariat to assist it preparing for the OELTWG meeting and ICCM2 by providing a link to stakeholder groups.

#### Outstanding issues

6. The secretariat invites participants in the 7 April 2008 teleconference to consider, in particular, the following questions and issues, and to consult constituents, as appropriate:

a) *General approach.* Is ICCM2 to be an occasion for “strategic decisions” or for the “sharing of experience and information” (or both)?

b) *Agenda structure.* Is the basic structure of the agenda, built upon the ICCM functions set out in paragraph 24 of the Overarching Policy Strategy appropriate? If not,

(i) What main additions and deletions are required?

(ii) What is the preferred order of items?

c) *Reporting.* [Agenda items 4 (a) and (b), ICCM functions (a), (b) and (d).] Since the issuing of the secretariat's consultation note in July 2007, the Canadian-sponsored project to develop reporting modalities has produced a “baseline report” and draft reporting indicators that will be tested by pilot countries during 2008. In the circumstances, the secretariat had in mind *not* to proceed with its own separate exercise to facilitate stakeholders' reporting to ICCM2, which would have significant staff resource implications, risk duplicating efforts under the project and would lack an agreed framework. However, several stakeholders have expressed reservations that any use of the draft reporting materials developed under the Canadian-sponsored project prior to consideration at ICCM2 could wrongly imply endorsement of the draft materials.

(i) If the products of the Canadian-sponsored project are considered not (partially and tentatively) to fulfil reporting needs at ICCM2, what else is expected? Do stakeholders wish the secretariat to facilitate a general

---

<sup>2</sup> In the absence, for the time being, of any agreed procedure for determining NGO representation in SAICM consultations, the secretariat invited all registered SAICM NGO focal points to confer amongst themselves and nominate representatives in three categories: industry, public interest NGOs and trade unions. A health sector NGO proposed an additional category of “health/science”, subsequently modified to “health”.

reporting exercise, in addition to the project work, and on what terms?  
(Timing, process, structure, resources etc.)

(ii) Do stakeholders see further work being undertaken prior to ICCM2 on the draft materials produced by the Canadian-sponsored project (when and how)?

(iii) Is there support for the proposal of one stakeholder to create a new agenda item entitled “review and update of SAICM”, separate from item 4 (b): “Evaluation of and guidance on implementation.”

d) *Implementation of and coherence among international instruments and programmes* [Agenda item 4 (c)]. Given the caution expressed by several stakeholders regarding a possible ICCM2 response to recent work on synergies by the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, what is envisaged with respect to the ICCM’s function of “promoting coherence among chemicals management instruments at the international level?”

e) *Strengthening of national chemicals management* [Agenda item 4 (d), ICCM function (g)]. Several stakeholders have acknowledged the importance of the ICCM function of “promoting the strengthening of national chemicals management” but there has been very little comment on the proposed agenda item relating to this function. Are the proposals in the draft provisional annotated agenda appropriate? (ICCM2 would review reports on SAICM implementation, the QSP and IOMC activities; make recommendations; endorse guidance - What recommendations? What guidance?)

(f) *Financial and technical resources for implementation* [Agenda item 4 (e), ICCM functions (h) and (i)].

(i) Should the function of evaluating the performance of the financing of SAICM be dealt with under a separate agenda item, as proposed by one stakeholder?

(ii) What documents will be required to support discussion on financial and technical resources?

(g) *Emerging policy issues* [Agenda item 4 (f), ICCM function (j)].

(i) Is there support for the proposal of one stakeholder for OELTWG to agree on a procedure on how to submit proposals on emerging issues for consideration by ICCM2?

(ii) Is there a need for a procedure, such as a submissions process based on the SAICM web site, to be in place even before the OELTWG meeting?

(iii) Should the proposal for a procedure to govern additions to the SAICM Global Plan of Action be addressed under this agenda item or under a new, separate agenda item as proposed by one stakeholder?

(iv) What inputs are expected for the emerging issues discussion beyond the reports of IFCS Forums V and VI?

(v) Is any documentation required from the secretariat to support the emerging issues discussion (beyond information papers containing reports and submissions of stakeholders)?

(h) *Information exchange and scientific and technical cooperation* [Agenda item 4 (g), ICCM function (k)]. Should the future of IFCS and its relationship to SAICM be addressed under this agenda item and the agenda item be amended, as proposed by one stakeholder? Or should it be addressed under item 5 (“collaboration with intergovernmental organizations”), as proposed in the draft annotated provisional agenda?

(i) *Collaboration with intergovernmental organizations* [Agenda item 5].

(i) Should collaboration with non-governmental organizations also be explicitly addressed somewhere in the agenda, as queried by one stakeholder?

(ii) Several stakeholders supported the notion of ICCM2 making inputs to both WHA62 and the CSD. Stakeholders may wish to reflect on possible procedural implications and planning requirements for the above, e.g. action in 2008 via the WHO Executive Board and WHO regional meetings to get SAICM on the WHA62 agenda; action in 2008 or 2009 to secure CSD recognition of the ICCM’s role; and drafting of ICCM2 resolutions.

(iii) Should “collaboration with intergovernmental organizations” be a separate agenda item or should it be merged with item 4 (c): “Implementation of and coherence among international instruments and programmes,” as proposed by one stakeholder?

(iv) Should the future of IFCS and its relationship with SAICM be addressed under this agenda item or under item 4 (g): “Information exchange and scientific and technical cooperation,” as proposed by one stakeholder?

(j) *High-level dimension of ICCM2.*

(i) Is it the intention of those stakeholders supporting a health theme, that this should apply for the entire high-level segment or just for a specific element such as a round-table discussion? (If the former, would there not, therefore, be an opportunity for general statements?)

(ii) If a keynote address were to be scheduled, as supported by one stakeholder, when should this be delivered and by whom?

(iii) The round-table concept, which was supported by several stakeholders, would require detailed and careful planning and possibly some specific resources to ensure appropriate participation and documentation. Is support for the idea sufficient for the secretariat to proceed with planning?

(iv) Given the reservations expressed by several stakeholders, should the option of developing an ICCM2 declaration be set aside?

(k) *Links with WHA62 and Stockholm COP4.* While the broad intent of interaction with WHA62 seem clear enough (e.g. the sending of an ICCM2 message to the WHA underlining health issues relating to chemicals management), the possibilities for synergies with Stockholm COP4 have been less clearly articulated. What are stakeholders’ expectations, if any, in that regard?

(l) *Rules of procedure.* Albeit with a caveat expressed by one stakeholder, there appears to be general support for the use of the SAICM PrepCom rules of procedure as a basis for developing the ICCM rules and as interim rules for the ICCM until the

latter's own rules are agreed. The consideration of the rules of procedure is now a matter for the OELTWG, in the first instance.

(m) *Bureau.* Stakeholders may wish to consider proposals made for the establishment of an interim bureau to assist in final preparations for ICCM2 and for the OELTWG to serve either as this interim bureau or also as the bureau of ICCM2 itself. The proposal of several stakeholders for the creation of an extended bureau with multi-stakeholder representation may also be noted.

(n) *Venue and dates.* Is the clash with a CSD session raised by one stakeholder a serious enough problem to require rescheduling of ICCM2? (Secretariat note: this will be very difficult in terms of securing the current venue for different dates and maintaining the link with WHA62.)

(o) *Participation.* What is the agreed target for funded participation: one, two or three per eligible Government (plus NGOs)?

(p) *Budget.* The secretariat emphasizes the need for early donor commitments to enable ICCM2 planning and formal invitations to proceed.

(q) *Further preparations.* The secretariat notes the suggestion of some stakeholders that further development of the ICCM2 agenda and procedures for inputs to ICCM2 be taken up at the OELTWG meeting in October 2008. The secretariat would note that this would be very late if the preparation of significant additional documents or a submissions process were to be required as a result of OELTWG discussions. The deadline for submission of ICCM2 documents for editing and translation by UNON Conference Services is likely to be approximately 10 weeks after the OELTWG meeting. The informal group participating in the 7 April planning teleconference may wish to consider reconvening for further telephone and e-mail consultations, as the need arises in the coming months.

## Summary of submissions

Issue	Submissions
Mandate	Several stakeholders noted that the mandate of the ICCM is to undertake a periodic review of SAICM and to perform other functions as set out in paragraph 24 of the Overarching Policy Strategy. <sup>3</sup>
Convening ICCM2	One stakeholder acknowledged that according to ICCM resolution I/1, future sessions of the ICCM are to be convened by the UNEP ED, working in collaboration with IOMC POs, UNDP and other intergovernmental organizations, but sought recognition of other stakeholders referred to elsewhere in resolution I/1. <sup>4</sup>
Agenda	<p><b>Agenda items cited below refer to the draft provisional agenda contained in the secretariat’s consultation note.</b></p> <p><i>General approaches</i></p> <p>One stakeholder considered that the main purpose of ICCM2 will be to review progress against the 2020 target, take strategic decisions and programme, prioritize and update SAICM as necessary. With this in mind, the stakeholder saw it as imperative that the conference be a forum for policy discussions in order to strengthen SAICM, and that it is not narrowed to a technical, “business as usual” conference. ICCM2 should consider needs to strengthen SAICM implementation and focus on any new or emerging issues. There should be a formal ICCM2 outcome, such as a resolution or similar.<sup>5</sup></p> <p>Another stakeholder wished to orient the ICCM2 agenda around sharing experiences and information on implementation and planning, e.g., identification of priorities and capacity assessments, and viewed ICCM2 as an opportunity for chemicals professionals to network, learn about and benefit from the efforts and insights of activities across regions, countries, industry and organizations. This could occur through presentations and case studies, including in relation to applied experience in chemicals assessment and management and technical assistance tools and approaches (e.g., OECD HPV assessments, eChemportal, QSAR toolbox, etc.) that are available and could be used by participants in their chemical management efforts, and a training session from the OECD on available tools. The greatest transfer of lessons could stem directly from countries, sub-regions and regions, sharing their experiences and approaches with implementation of priorities along with sufficient time to discuss issues or steps involved and progress.<sup>6</sup></p>

<sup>3</sup> Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union and ICCEA

<sup>4</sup> IPEN.

<sup>5</sup> Norway.

<sup>6</sup> The United States.

Issue	Submissions
	<p>One stakeholder stressed that ICCM2 should not reopen text agreed at ICCM1, particularly the Dubai Declaration, the Overarching Policy Strategy or the agreed elements of the Global Plan of Action.<sup>7</sup> Another stakeholder agreed that ICCM2 should not revisit controversial items but instead focus on practical outcomes, how well the process is working, taking the time to share experiences across regions, priorities, needs, challenges and lessons learned thus far in order to best facilitate a discussion around implementation, progress and solutions rather than repeating unnecessary and contentious negotiations.<sup>8</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder noted that by the time of ICCM2, there would be only eleven years remaining to realize SAICM’s 2020 objective. With that in mind, SAICM implementation was not yet on track to success: both the pace and the spread of SAICM implementation would need to be greatly accelerated. ICCM2 will be successful if, and only if, it helps to overcome SAICM’s slow and uneven start. The meeting would need to solidify high-level national and international support for SAICM’s objective across all relevant sectors and set the stage for the establishment of an adequate SAICM implementation regime.<sup>9</sup></p> <p>While one stakeholder called for the issues on the draft provisional agenda to be “somewhat substantiated,”<sup>10</sup> another preferred that there should be <i>less</i> detail in the draft annotated provisional agenda in order to allow room for flexibility in discussions if required.<sup>11</sup> One stakeholder felt that the draft provisional agenda did not adequately reflect the mandate given in the Overarching Policy Strategy.<sup>12</sup></p> <p>Several stakeholders supported the development of the ICCM2 provisional agenda on the basis of the ICCM functions set out in paragraph 24 of the Overarching Policy Strategy,<sup>13</sup> while several others cautioned that the ICCM functions, alone, did not necessarily constitute agenda items.<sup>14</sup> One stakeholder acknowledged that the secretariat did not have the authority to elaborate an agenda beyond the ICCM functions and called for the OELTWG to undertake this task.<sup>15</sup></p>

<sup>7</sup> The European Union.

<sup>8</sup> The United States.

<sup>9</sup> IPEN.

<sup>10</sup> Norway.

<sup>11</sup> The European Union.

<sup>12</sup> Switzerland.

<sup>13</sup> Norway, Switzerland and ICCA.

<sup>14</sup> The United States and IPEN.

<sup>15</sup> IPEN.

	<p>One stakeholder agreed that, in addition to items relating to the ICCM functions, the provisional agenda should include several standard items such as those relating to budget matters and collaboration with intergovernmental organizations.<sup>16</sup> Another stakeholder felt that the addition of items beyond the official functions should be subject to a process of approval by all stakeholders through consultation prior to the adoption of the provisional agenda.<sup>17</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder wanted ICCM2 to address the huge challenges that workers, trade unions and communities are facing because of unsustainable chemicals management.<sup>18</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for due allowance to be made for a review of available scientific reports and materials.<sup>19</sup></p>
	<p><i>General comments on agenda items proposed in the provisional agenda</i></p> <p>Several stakeholders called for the agenda items to be reordered as follows: 4 (b), 4 (c), 4 (a).<sup>20</sup> Several stakeholders found the agenda items proposed in the draft provisional agenda prepared by the secretariat to be appropriate and to reflect the work of ICCM1 and subsequent inter-sessional work at the regional level.<sup>21</sup> One stakeholder considered that ICCM2 should focus on elements that facilitate discussion, information exchange and technical cooperation, and should emphasize agenda items 4 (b), (d), (f) and (g).<sup>22</sup></p>
	<p><i>Modalities for reporting by stakeholders on progress in implementation [Agenda item 4 (a)]</i></p> <p>Several stakeholders called for this item to be moved further down the agenda.<sup>23</sup> One stakeholder called for it to follow a new item entitled “Reports on implementation of SAICM for the period 2007-2008.”<sup>24</sup></p>

<sup>16</sup> Switzerland.

<sup>17</sup> ICCA. [Secretariat note: It is not clear what additional consultation process was envisaged beyond the current exercise.]

<sup>18</sup> ITUC.

<sup>19</sup> SETAC.

<sup>20</sup> The European Union and ICCA.

<sup>21</sup> Mexico and SETAC.

<sup>22</sup> The United States.

<sup>23</sup> Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union and the United States.

<sup>24</sup> Central and Eastern Europe. [Secretariat note: It is not clear how this proposed new agenda item on reporting would relate to the existing item 4 (b), “Evaluation of and guidance on implementation, which was intended to cover reporting on SAICM implementation.”]

	<p>Several stakeholders reflected on the possible need for further work on the draft reporting modalities developed under the Canadian-sponsored project prior to ICCM2, on the possible establishment of a contact group at ICCM2 and the need to allow sufficient time at ICCM2 for further discussion and negotiation.<sup>25</sup> One stakeholder which had participated in the International Project Steering Committee (ISC) for the project to develop modalities for reporting on SAICM implementation, had expressed concerns about the complexity of the draft reporting indicators for industry and wished to highlight its concerns on this matter for further consideration prior to ICCM2.<sup>26</sup></p>
	<p><i>Evaluation of and guidance on implementation [Agenda item 4 (b)]</i></p> <p>Several stakeholders identified this agenda item as a key component of ICCM2, and expected it to include facilitation of further implementation of SAICM towards the 2020 target, an update on implementation progress so far, lessons learned from each of the regional groups on what has worked well, what has worked less well, how to improve the implementation so far and what guidance etc. is required.<sup>27</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for ICCM2 to indicate clearly what the role of the bureau or focal points (regional/national) would be in implementation.<sup>28</sup> Another stakeholder saw getting further attention and involvement from sectors other than the environment sector, such as health and labour, as a further key issue for ICCM2.<sup>29</sup></p> <p>Several stakeholders requested the deletion or amendment of the reference contained in the draft annotated provisional agenda to the draft reporting indicators being taken account of in the preparation of reports for ICCM2 on SAICM implementation.<sup>30</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for the draft annotated provisional agenda to be amended to reflect more strongly the ICCM function of “taking strategic decisions and programming, prioritizing and updating SAICM as necessary,” and proposed a separate agenda item called “review and update SAICM.”<sup>31</sup></p>

<sup>25</sup> The United States and ICCA.

<sup>26</sup> ICCA.

<sup>27</sup> Africa, the European Union and IPEN.

<sup>28</sup> Africa.

<sup>29</sup> The European Union.

<sup>30</sup> Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union.

<sup>31</sup> Switzerland.

	<p>One stakeholder proposed that, since there are no agreed and operating modalities for reporting, each organization should be able to choose its own mode and specifics for reporting to ICCM2, including piloting the approach developed under the Canadian-sponsored project. It was of the opinion that it would be preferable to demonstrate tangible achievements and positive progress through real-world examples that have already made significant contributions, especially if directed at the developing and emerging countries. It recommended that there be an “assessment of progress with a plus/delta approach (+/--) after 3 years experience”; “learning experience or lessons learned”; and “significant achievements/opportunities missed.”<sup>32</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder underlined the need for preparation of the agenda item by the OELTWG in order for ICCM2 to undertake a substantive review of progress against the 2020 target and take strategic decisions aimed at getting implementation on track to achieve the target.<sup>33</sup></p>
	<p><i>Implementation of and coherence among international instruments and programmes [Agenda item 4 (c)]</i></p> <p>One stakeholder foresaw that an update of activities underway in the ad hoc joint working group on enhancing cooperation and coordination between three specific chemicals conventions could be informative. However, it did not believe that ICCM2 should take a decision to further consider the outcome of that process as suggested by the secretariat as it is beyond the purview of ICCM2 to consider how autonomous conventions should function.<sup>34</sup> Another stakeholder agreed that while there was clearly an inter-relationship between international instruments, such as the Stockholm Convention, that are legally binding for countries that have become Parties to them and the voluntary approach of SAICM, there is a need for caution in the exact manner in which this link is formulated in the ICCM2 agenda.<sup>35</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder proposed that the present agenda item should emphasize national plans of countries and the global plans of IGOs and NGOs, with the specific country focus highlighted as appropriate for capacity-building through trainings and workshops. Similarly the SAICM QSP should be a high priority for this agenda item.<sup>36</sup></p>

<sup>32</sup> ICCA.

<sup>33</sup> IPEN.

<sup>34</sup> The United States. [Secretariat note: see footnote 6 of the draft annotated provisional agenda contained in the secretariat’s consultation note.]

<sup>35</sup> ICCA.

<sup>36</sup> ICCA.

	<p>One stakeholder considered that the present agenda item should be combined or taken together with agenda item 5, “collaboration with intergovernmental organizations” with a view to discussing ways in which countries and regional groups could avail themselves of the information and other assistance available outside of SAICM to facilitate chemicals management. Proposals and ideas for additional collaboration with the World Health Assembly following ICCM-2 and the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), which has chemicals in its 2010-2011 work programme, could be discussed. Updates from other crucial sectors, e.g., agricultural chemicals and labour, could also be received under this item.<sup>37</sup></p>
	<p><i>Strengthening of national chemicals management capacities [Agenda item 4 (d)]</i></p> <p>One stakeholder expressed support for this agenda item, as proposed.<sup>38</sup> Another stakeholder envisaged discussion on national/regional chemicals management priorities and practices under the item.<sup>39</sup></p>
	<p><i>Financial and technical resources for implementation [Agenda item 4 (e)]</i></p> <p>Several stakeholders underlined the importance they attached to discussion at ICCM2 of financial issues, including a review of the QSP and consideration of further activities of the QSP for its remaining lifespan and the long-term, sustainable financing of SAICM implementation.<sup>40</sup> Several stakeholders called for ICCM2 to work towards a more substantial global financial mechanism than provided so far to support initial SAICM implementation.<sup>41</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder requested that the agenda item on resources for implementation be divided into two so that the ICCM function of “evaluating the performance of the financing of SAICM” was treated separately from the function of “ensuring that the necessary financial and technical resources are available for implementation.”<sup>42</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder proposed that the item be moved to later in the agenda and envisaged that it would entail presentations on available financial and technical resources by various international organizations that include chemicals management as part of their mandate as well as a presentation on the results achieved to date through the QSP.<sup>43</sup></p>

<sup>37</sup> The United States.

<sup>38</sup> ICCA.

<sup>39</sup> The United States.

<sup>40</sup> Africa, the European Union, Norway, IPEN and ITUC.

<sup>41</sup> IPEN and ITUC.

<sup>42</sup> Switzerland.

<sup>43</sup> The United States.

*Emerging policy issues [Agenda item 4 (f)]*

One stakeholder underlined the importance of ICCM2 considering necessary cooperative actions on priority emerging issues identified in the reports of IFCS and others.<sup>44</sup> Another sought amendment of the draft annotated provisional agenda to clarify that it is not just international scientific and policy forums which may raise emerging issues. (Any participant may do so.)<sup>45</sup>

Several stakeholders called for the ICCM to discuss the proposal for guidelines on the identification of new issues for inclusion in the SAICM Global Plan of Action [from the working group of certain EU-JUSSCANNZ countries chaired by Spain] either under the emerging issues agenda item, 4 (f), or under a new agenda item.<sup>46</sup> One stakeholder suggested that this proposed procedure and possibly other procedures for addressing emerging issues at ICCM2 should be considered by the OELTWG and that procedural agreement should be secured. It observed that in the absence of a procedure agreed in advance, governments and stakeholders would not have clear guidance on how to submit proposals on emerging issues to ICCM2.<sup>47</sup>

One stakeholder noted that it was preparing a global workshop on emerging chemical issues with participation of scientists from developing countries.<sup>48</sup>

*Information exchange and scientific and technical cooperation [Agenda item 4 (g)]*

One stakeholder saw the ability of the ICCM to identify and make use of information resources at all levels as an important contribution to SAICM implementation.<sup>49</sup> Another stakeholder envisaged discussion on charting SAICM's progress and use of information and reporting tools under this item.<sup>50</sup> One stakeholder considered that the future of IFCS and its relationship to SAICM should be discussed in depth at ICCM2 and should be addressed in the context of SAICM's role in promoting the exchange of scientific and technical information. It proposed amendment of the title of the present agenda item to read "Information exchange and scientific and technical cooperation and relationship to IFCS."<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Africa.

<sup>45</sup> The European Union.

<sup>46</sup> The European Union, Norway, IPEN and ITUC.

<sup>47</sup> IPEN.

<sup>48</sup> SETAC.

<sup>49</sup> Africa.

<sup>50</sup> The United States.

<sup>51</sup> Switzerland.

*Collaboration with intergovernmental organizations [Agenda item 5]*

One stakeholder expressly supported inclusion of this item,<sup>52</sup> while another suggested that its proposed contents could be dealt with under item 4 (c) “Implementation of and coherence among international instruments and programmes.”<sup>53</sup> Others implicitly accepted the agenda item insofar as they offered comments on the proposed topics within it.<sup>54</sup> Another stakeholder sought clarification as to where collaboration with non-governmental organizations would be addressed in the agenda.<sup>55</sup>

One stakeholder considered that how international organizations, industry bodies and other stakeholders have adopted SAICM and what this has meant would be among the key issues for ICCM2.<sup>56</sup> Several stakeholders underlined the importance of ICCM2 making inputs to the World Health Assembly and to the CSD, which would be considering chemicals in its 2010-2011 work cycle.<sup>57</sup> One noted that drawing the CSD’s attention to SAICM was important for the entire process of meeting the JPOI 2020 target.<sup>58</sup>

Several stakeholders saw consideration of the contribution of IFCS to SAICM implementation and the future of IFCS, including its possible integration into SAICM as important tasks for ICCM2.<sup>59</sup> One noted that the theme of Forum VI was closely linked with SAICM’s own objective of achieving the JPOI 2020 goal.<sup>60</sup> Another stakeholder called for the OELTWG to agree on the procedure by which the modalities of future contributions to SAICM implementation by IFCS will be addressed at ICCM2.<sup>61</sup> One stakeholder was of the view that should IFCS decide to continue in some fashion, it should ensure it is self-sufficient financially and that continuity of its operations does not rely on financial assistance from SAICM which is already fully subscribed.<sup>62</sup> Another stakeholder felt that it would be most appropriate to discuss the future of IFCS and its relationship to SAICM under agenda item 4 (g), “Information exchange and scientific and technical cooperation.”<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> Switzerland

<sup>53</sup> The United States.

<sup>54</sup> Africa, the European Union, Norway and IPEN

<sup>55</sup> ICCA

<sup>56</sup> EU.

<sup>57</sup> Africa, CEE, EU, Norway.

<sup>58</sup> Africa.

<sup>59</sup> Africa, Norway, Switzerland and IPEN.

<sup>60</sup> Africa.

<sup>61</sup> IPEN.

<sup>62</sup> The United States.

<sup>63</sup> Switzerland.

	<p><i>Activities of the secretariat and adoption of the budget [Agenda item 6]</i></p> <p>Several stakeholders expressly supported inclusion of this item.<sup>64</sup></p> <p><i>Venue and date of the third session of the ICCM [Agenda item 7]</i></p> <p>One stakeholder expressly supported inclusion of this item.<sup>65</sup></p> <p><i>Other matters [Agenda item 8]</i></p> <p>One stakeholder expressly supported inclusion of this item and called for additional items to be identified and notified sufficiently in advance of ICCM2.<sup>66</sup></p> <p><i>Adoption of the report [Agenda item 9]</i></p> <p>One stakeholder expressly supported the proposal in the secretariat’s consultation note for preparing and adopting the ICCM2 report.<sup>67</sup></p> <p><i>Additional issues proposed for consideration</i></p> <p>One stakeholder called for provision to be made in the agenda for clarification of the role of regional focal points with regard to establishment of a bureau and proposed that regional focal points serve as facilitators for nomination of bureau members and also for regional meetings and positions during the ICCM session.<sup>68</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder proposed that the conference should, in addition to the items already on the agenda, follow up on what has been discussed in other forums, such as the IFCS.<sup>69</sup></p>
--	---

---

<sup>64</sup> Switzerland and ICCA.

<sup>65</sup> ICCA.

<sup>66</sup> ICCA.

<sup>67</sup> ICCA.

<sup>68</sup> Africa.

<sup>69</sup> Norway.



High-level segment	<p>Many stakeholders supported the scheduling of a one-day high-level segment within ICCM2<sup>70</sup> and several envisaged this taking place at the end of the session, for example to facilitate greater participation by Health Ministers.<sup>71</sup> One noted that ICCM2 would be an opportunity for Ministers to meet for the first time since the adoption of SAICM and for them to signal where there have already been successes in SAICM implementation, to maintain momentum and to raise the profile of chemicals issues again.<sup>72</sup> One called for senior private sector representatives to be engaged in proposed ministerial-level events and underlined the importance of fixing the timing of the high-level segment in order to plan for appropriate attendance.<sup>73</sup> Another attached importance to multi-sectoral representation among Ministers.<sup>74</sup> One stakeholder felt that the ICCM could fulfil its function of providing a “high-level international forum” without scheduling a Ministerial segment and it would be sufficient to allow for constructive discussion and decision-making by high-level civil servants.<sup>75</sup></p> <p>Bearing in mind the scheduling of ICCM2 just before WHA62, many stakeholders supported a health-related focus for the high-level segment.<sup>76</sup> Several stakeholders proposed that the high-level segment should have a health and environment theme or address the health impact of chemicals, e.g. how to achieve more joined efforts on epidemiological research on the impact of chemicals on human health and the cocktail of chemicals present in daily life and at the work place, such as the effects of organic solvents on the central nervous system, carcinogenic effects, long-term teratogenic effects, reprotoxicity and hormone disrupting effects. Topics could also be identified from the SAICM Global Plan of Action work area on human health protection, i.e. activities 2 to 6. Other suggested topics included the financial link between chemical safety and health and “the cost of inaction,” and how to secure further involvement and commitment of industry.<sup>77</sup> Several stakeholders suggested that consideration be given to issues that could feed into the CSD process, since chemicals would be on the CSD agenda in 2010 and 2011.<sup>78</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder supported all four options for the high-level segment suggested in the secretariat’s consultation note (keynote speakers, a high-level segment, special events such as a round table, a formal declaration).<sup>79</sup> Another stakeholder favoured a combination of two or three of the options.<sup>80</sup> One stakeholder supported the inclusion of a prominent keynote address in the ICCM2 programme.<sup>81</sup></p>
--------------------	---

<sup>70</sup> Africa, Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union, Norway, the United States and ICCA.

<sup>71</sup> Central and Eastern Europe and Norway.

<sup>72</sup> The European Union.

<sup>73</sup> ICCA.

<sup>74</sup> Norway.

<sup>75</sup> Switzerland.

<sup>76</sup> Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union, the United States and DPNA.

<sup>77</sup> Central and Eastern Europe and European Union.

<sup>78</sup> The European Union and the United States.

<sup>79</sup> ICCA.

<sup>80</sup> Africa.

	<p>One stakeholder found the idea of a round-table event for Ministers an intriguing notion which bore further exploration, assuming it could be done in a cost neutral fashion. Such a round table should have a novel focus, e.g. a round-table discussion involving health ministers.<sup>82</sup> Another stakeholder supported a round table on chemical toxicology.<sup>83</sup></p> <p>The possible drafting of a declaration was not supported or was treated with caution by several stakeholders,<sup>84</sup> though one of these indicated that it could support such an outcome if it was considered to be useful and valuable.<sup>85</sup> One stakeholder preferred to aim for concrete actions and concrete decisions rather than a high-level declaration.<sup>86</sup></p>
Links with WHA62 and Stockholm COP4	Several stakeholders supported having an interface between ICCM2 and WHA62 and Stockholm COP4. <sup>87</sup> Several proposed seeking opportunities to raise public health issues relevant to SAICM implementation at WHA62. <sup>88</sup>
Rules of procedure	<p>There was widespread support among stakeholders for using the PrepCom rules of procedure as the basis for development of ICCM rules of procedure by the OELTWG.<sup>89</sup> One of these stakeholder signalled that it would wish to modify the rules to provide for decision-making on the basis of consensus, meaning a consensus among Governments.<sup>90</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder supported use of the PrepCom rules of procedure in the initial phase of ICCM2 and subsequent adoption of the draft ICCM rules developed by the OELTWG, assuming the latter group had reached consensus.<sup>91</sup></p>

<sup>81</sup> The United States.

<sup>82</sup> The United States.

<sup>83</sup> DPNA.

<sup>84</sup> Africa, Central and Eastern Europe, Switzerland and the United States.

<sup>85</sup> The European Union.

<sup>86</sup> Switzerland

<sup>87</sup> Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union, DPNA and ICCA.

<sup>88</sup> Central and Eastern Europe and the European Union.

<sup>89</sup> Africa, Asia-Pacific, Norway, the United States, ICCA and IPEN.

<sup>90</sup> The United States.

<sup>91</sup> ICCA.

	<p>One stakeholder proposed that additional rules, built upon the PrepCom rules, should be established for the SAICM implementation regime as a whole and should enable full multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder participation and a transparent process consistent with the SAICM objectives. Each meeting of the ICCM should elect a SAICM President and bureau whose term of office would run through the next meeting of the ICCM, and who should be available to provide guidance and assistance to the SAICM secretariat in the discharge of its duties. The roles and functions of SAICM regional groups should be spelled out in the SAICM rules. Provisions should allow for other SAICM inter-sessional work groups and expert groups as needed and as approved by the SAICM bureau.<sup>92</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for current rules that allow civil society to speak when time is available (after the roster of governments) to be changed in favour of equal access to recognition by the chair.<sup>93</sup></p>
Bureau	<p>One stakeholder supported using an interim bureau until ICCM rules of procedure are adopted.<sup>94</sup> Several stakeholders expressed support for this and other proposals relating to the ICCM bureau as contained in paragraph 10 of the secretariat's consultation note.<sup>95</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder proposed that, in order to facilitate preparations for ICCM2, the OELTWG bureau should also serve as the bureau for ICCM2 on the basis of an informal agreement.<sup>96</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder proposed that the bureau for ICCM3 should be elected either at or immediately after ICCM2.<sup>97</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder envisaged that making a decision with regards to a permanent SAICM executive body would be an important ICCM2 outcome.<sup>98</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for provision to be made for the establishment of a SAICM Extended Bureau along lines similar to those used by the SAICM Preparatory Committee. This Extended Bureau should include multiple representatives from each region as well as representatives from: intergovernmental organizations; public interest NGOs; trade unions; and the private sector.<sup>99</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder advised that it would be difficult for its region to achieve nominations for bureau representatives by e-mail and that it would be better to do this at a prior face-to-face meeting.<sup>100</sup></p>

<sup>92</sup> IPEN.  
<sup>93</sup> ITUC. [Secretariat note: The secretariat is not aware of the existence of such rules. Rule 20.1 of the PrepCom rules makes no distinction between Government and NGO speakers.]  
<sup>94</sup> United States.  
<sup>95</sup> Central and Eastern Europe and DPNA.  
<sup>96</sup> Switzerland.  
<sup>97</sup> Switzerland  
<sup>98</sup> Norway.  
<sup>99</sup> IPEN.

Venue and dates	<p>Many stakeholders expressed support for scheduling ICCM2 in Geneva from 11 to 15 May 2009, immediately after the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention and before the 62<sup>nd</sup> World Health Assembly.<sup>101</sup></p> <p>Several stakeholders also supported the scheduling of final consultations for regions and other groups in Geneva on Sunday 10 May 2009.<sup>102</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder expressed concern that the ICCM2 dates would clash with a CSD17 negotiating session in New York (4-15 May 2009). The important second week of the CSD, when the main negotiations take place, coincides with ICCM2.<sup>103</sup></p>
Participation	<p>Many stakeholders stressed the importance of multi-sectoral, multi-stakeholder and regionally balanced participation in ICCM2 and called for travel funding to be provided for at least two representatives from each eligible Government, as proposed by the secretariat, subject to the availability of resources.<sup>104</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for funding of a minimum of three participants from each developing country and for invitations to set out clearly the number of participants that would be funded from each country.<sup>105</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder, while acknowledging the benefit of broad-based participation, proposed that for budgeting purposes the aim should be to support the participation of one representative per eligible country and a maximum of two, should funds be available.<sup>106</sup></p> <p>Another stakeholder referred to the need for NGOs to have the opportunity to participate in ICCM2.<sup>107</sup> One stakeholder called for NGOs to be duly accredited and for this to reflect their level of active contributions to the implementation of SAICM.<sup>108</sup></p>
Languages	<p>Many stakeholders expressed support for holding ICCM2 in the six official UN languages.<sup>109</sup></p>
Budget and fundraising	<p>One stakeholder indicated that a number of its members were planning to provide financial support for ICCM2 and encouraged early pledges from others to enable ICCM2 arrangements to be firmed up.<sup>110</sup></p>

<sup>100</sup> Africa.

<sup>101</sup> Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union, Norway, Switzerland, the United States and ICCA.

<sup>102</sup> Central and Eastern Europe and ICCA.

<sup>103</sup> Africa.

<sup>104</sup> Africa, Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union, Norway, DPNA, ICCA and ITUC.

<sup>105</sup> Latin America and the Caribbean.

<sup>106</sup> The United States

<sup>107</sup> AVEPGRC.

<sup>108</sup> ICCA.

<sup>109</sup> Central and Eastern Europe, the European Union, Norway, Yemen, DPNA and ICCA.

<p>Further preparations for ICCM2</p>	<p>One stakeholder concluded that if the OELTWG were only to discuss ICCM rules of preparation, some other mechanism to prepare for ICCM2 would be needed. This could include regional representatives and NGO focal points working in a telephone/e-mail group in cooperation with the secretariat.<sup>111</sup></p> <p>Another stakeholder felt that although some regions or subregions might wish to meet in advance of ICCM2, this could be accomplished through focal point teleconferences. It felt that issues beyond the ICCM rules of procedure, including the agenda for ICCM2 and initiatives such as the Canadian-supported work on reporting modalities and the draft proposal by Spain for amending the Global Plan of Action could be dealt with in a similar consultation process as that used by the secretariat in preparations, thus far, for ICCM2.<sup>112</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder called for a good preparatory process in order to avoid the conflicts which it felt had marred ICCM1. It called for the undertaking of basic preparatory work for ICCM2 starting with the meeting of the OELTWG, including provisions for other inter-sessional preparatory efforts as needed.<sup>113</sup></p> <p>Several stakeholders agreed that it would be beneficial if stakeholders developed positions and proposals on key issues and circulated them in advance of the session.<sup>114</sup></p> <p>One stakeholder noted that the current absence of an ICCM bureau placed the SAICM secretariat in a very difficult position in preparing ICCM2 as it has no authoritative body to turn to for guidance. It suggested that it would be very helpful if the OELTWG agreed to the selection of an interim ICCM bureau to work with the SAICM secretariat in further preparing and convening ICCM2. While the secretariat had done an excellent job so far given the limitations of operating without a bureau, this deficit should be addressed on an interim basis in advance of ICCM2. Without a bureau to assist in the final planning for ICCM2, it was unlikely that ICCM2 would be adequately prepared and be a fully successful meeting. It felt that the further elaboration and planning for the ICCM2 agenda should be an important topic for the OELTWG.<sup>115</sup></p> <p>Several stakeholders proposed the establishment of an agreed procedure by which regions, governments and stakeholders could submit topics for consideration at ICCM2. It should be formalized and agreed at the OELTWG so that those who wished to propose positions and proposals to ICCM2 would have agreed guidelines to follow and be assured of appropriate consideration of their proposals at ICCM2.<sup>116</sup></p>
---------------------------------------	---

<sup>110</sup> The European Union.

<sup>111</sup> The European Union.

<sup>112</sup> The United States.

<sup>113</sup> IPEN.

<sup>114</sup> Norway and ICCA.

<sup>115</sup> IPEN.

<sup>116</sup> IPEN, ITUC.