

**Twenty-second meeting of the Bureau of the  
International Conference on Chemicals Management for its fifth session**  
Friday, 2 September 2022, from 18:30 – 20:00 EET

## **REPORT OF THE TWENTY SECOND MEETING OF THE ICCM5 BUREAU**

### **1) Opening and welcome**

The President of the Fifth Session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5), Ms. Anita Breyer welcomed all participants to the twenty-second meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau. She referred to the Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4) that just finished and was held in Bucharest, Romania from 29 August-2 September 2022. She thanked the secretariat for its work and the delegates, IP-Co-Chairs, thematic groups co-facilitators and the Bureau members for their involvement. The President gave a short overview on the meeting. She said that we can all rejoice on the hard work and progress as well as results achieved during this week. She added that we, after all, achieved our main objective to have one single text, still not totally clean, but that provides the overall articulation and framework of our expected new instrument. She mentioned that we are in a good shape in the final sprint towards Bonn. She also said that we succeeded in sorting out the structure, the concepts behind the strategic objectives, as well as got some clear idea on the means of implementation. The President noted that the meeting has been adjourned and will resume in a second session in a place and date to be determined. Finally, she added that the main purpose of this bureau meeting will be to review of progress made by the IP4 meeting. The President mentioned that we will need to take a decision on a silent procedure for budget adjustments required to cover IP4.2, as necessary, and to discuss on any other intersessional work that may be decided.

### **2) Adoption of the agenda**

Ms. Breyer presented the provisional agenda for the meeting. She invited Bureau members to raise additional points they may have under AOB.

The agenda was adopted without any further requests from Bureau members.

### **3) Adoption of the 21<sup>st</sup> meeting report of the ICCM5 Bureau, held on 12 July 2022**

The President asked the Bureau members if they had comments on the report of the Bureau meeting held on 12 July 2022, which has been uploaded on the SAICM webpage. She mentioned that the editorial comments provided by the WEOG region were incorporated. The Meeting report was circulated on 22 August 2022.

The ICCM5 Bureau adopted the report of its twenty-first meeting and thirteenth teleconference without additional comments from the Bureau members.

**4) Review of progress made by the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020**

Ms. Breyer opened this agenda point by proposing to start with reflections from the IP Co-Chairs.

Ms. Williams (IP Co-Chair) started by saying that we met the objective of having one single consolidated document. She believed that the essential elements to create our framework were now present. The language is much clearer and more concise. Progress had been made in limiting the number of targets and many of the new ideas and concepts that had been raised since IP3 had been incorporated albeit they may still need to be fleshed out. It was disappointing not to have greater clarity on any intersessional work to be completed ahead of IP4.2 and it would be good to understand what the barriers were, if any, to undertake some possible work.

Ms. Torres (IP Co-Chair) also pointed out the huge progress made on having one single document, but she said that additional work is needed. She echoed comments made by participants on the targets and indicators and the need for further work. She also mentioned that there are very few financial specialists among the delegates, since very few are economists and know about financial implications of the work. The language is now more understandable for the outside world. Ms. Torres mentioned that the survey on the name of the future instrument may be launched during the intersessional period. Both Co-Chairs agreed that they did not foresee any changes to the substantive text of the document, aside from the technical review, but they were willing to consider how the text might be made more coherent.

The president then gave the Bureau members the opportunity to provide their views on the meeting.

Mr. Torabi (Regional Representative of the Asia-Pacific Region) thanked the president and the Co-Chairs for their leadership throughout the meeting and asked a question for clarification on the basis for the intersessional work and what would happen if the region opposes the decision taken in this respect. He said that the regions now have trust in the process and in the IP Co-Chairs and this should not be lost.

Mr. Tengrove (UNEP's legal adviser) mentioned that it is up to the Co-Chairs to take forward the work of the IP4 meeting with the objective to be finalized at the resumed meeting. This was taken as a procedural decision at IP4 because the document continues to rest at IP4 and will be continued at IP4.2 and it is not referred as an ICCM5 document. It is a mandate that the IP4 has given to the Co-Chairs, and a specific region is not in a position to oppose such process. The decision of what happens to the paper lies with the Co-Chairs. It is not up to the bureau to decide.

Mr. Barbieri (Regional representative for Latin America and the Caribbean), Ms. Tunstall (Regional Focal Point for WEOG) and Mr. Domagalski (CEE Bureau member) emphasized that delegates want to be sure that the substance of the text will not be touched or amended and are confident that Co-Chairs will take care of this. In this regard they agreed to the proposal for technical and legal revision but with a document that will clearly reflect and explain any resulting modifications.

Ms. Williams confirmed that an explanatory note will be provided for any proposed change to the text, so it will be very clear what will be done to the text. If a change is done it will be based on streamlining, removing duplication, amending errors or omissions or purely editorial.

Ms. Wilburn (Health sector representative) mentioned that regarding potential intersessional work, WHO plans to have a virtual meeting to address the text on multisectoral engagement. This is planned for January 2023.

Ms. Breyer took the floor to mention that the SAICM Secretariat Budget needs to be adjusted through silent procedure so we would like to launch silent procedure to organize IP4.2 as soon as possible. She

mentioned that there was unanimous decision among delegates to adjourn the meeting and reflected that various regions requested to increase the representation of developing countries. Reference was made to paragraph 7 of the ICCM Resolution IV/4 The Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 that decides that the intersessional process should be open to all stakeholders and requests the secretariat to support, subject to the availability of resources, the participation of stakeholders eligible for funding as identified by the regions and sectors through the Bureau, up to eight from African States, eight from Asian-Pacific States, three from Central and Eastern European States, five from Latin American and Caribbean States and two representatives of each of the health, trade union, and public interest sectors of non-governmental participants, in order to support balanced regional and sectoral participation.

Mr. Barbieri reiterated the comment by the President regarding the increase of representation up to 60% and this will benefit the ownership of the process.

Ms Breyer then gave the floor to the SAICM Secretariat to go over the silent procedure decision.

Ms. Eigenmann (United Nations Industrial Development Organization, UNIDO, current chair of the IOMC) mentioned that the IOMC is checking on option to host the IP4.2 meeting in WHO or ILO premises in Geneva. She added that a final decision on this regard decision could be taken in about two weeks.

Ms. Tunstall and Mr. Kapindula (Africa Bureau member) welcomed the initiative of offering a meeting in Geneva.

Mr. Tengrove reminded the bureau members that the rules of procedures encourage the Bureau to plan meetings back-to-back to other environment or health related meeting. Mr. Kapindula indicated that the decision to hold IP4.2 in Nairobi or Geneva might have implications on the required funds and expressed the wish that this decision should not lower the availability of funding for an increased funded participation.

Mr. Torabi and Mr. Domagalski thanked the donors for their contributions towards this meeting and that they were aware that the venue of the meeting will depend on the available funds. Both supported the proposition of having at least 60% of financed delegates from the developing countries and believed that this should help to increase transparency and inclusiveness. In this regard it was suggested to also increase the NGO participation accordingly.

The President requested the Secretariat to introduce the proposed draft decision to be taken by silent procedure as recommended by the plenary of IP4 and related to the budget adjustments required to cover the convening of IP4.2.

Ms. Nalini Sharma (SAICM Coordinator) went through the concept of draft decision to convene the second session (IP4.2) of the fourth meeting of the intersessional process in a place and date to be determined. The decision also recalls that the intersessional process is open to all stakeholders and requests the secretariat to support, subject to the availability of resources, an increased number of eligible participants for funding. The draft decision also decides to adopt a revised Programme of Work and budget for SAICM Secretariat for the period 2021–2023. Ms. Sharma also welcomed the possible offer from WHO or ILO to hold the IP4.2 meeting because this would demonstrate IOMC collaboration and support multi-stakeholder engagement in the process.

Ms. Breyer reiterated that the discussions this week allowed to increase the level of trust of the stakeholders that their views are heard, and she said that the immediate launching of these silent procedure decision-making process will support the spirit of cooperation and constructiveness that we have built up this past week.

## **SAICM/ICCM.5/Bureau.22/Report**

---

However, since the possible offer for having IP4.2 at Geneva (including resulting financial implications) was not yet finalized the Bureau could not yet compare the Geneva offer to the option of organizing IP4.2 in Nairobi. Thus, the text for the silent procedure for IP4.2 budget could not be finalized and decided upon at this meeting. Thus, there was a general consent that the Bureau should postpone the decision by approximately two weeks so that the facts for deciding on whether Geneva (given the offer materializes) or Nairobi should be the venue of IP 4.2 are known as soon as possible.

Ms. Breyer then closed the agenda item and thanked all participants for their willingness to cooperate and find consensus.

### **5) Next teleconference of the Bureau**

Following a brief discussion on the date for the next teleconference of the Bureau, it was decided to informally check with the presidency and, send a doodle pool to find out the most suitable date.

### **6) Any Other Business**

The President opened the floor for AOB but there were none.

### **7) Closure of the meeting**

The ICCM5 President thanked the SAICM Secretariat for organizing and participating in the Twenty-second meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau.

## **Annex**

### **Participants**

**Bureau Members:** Ms. Anita Breyer (Germany, ICCM5 Bureau Member Western Europe and Others Group), Mr. Szymon Domagalski (Poland, ICCM5 Bureau Member Central and Eastern Europe), Mr. David Kapindula (Zambia, ICCM5 Bureau Member Africa), and Mr. Dinesh Runiwal (India, on behalf of the ICCM5 Bureau member Asia and the Pacific).

**Regional Focal Points:** Mr. Santos Virgilio (Angola representing Africa), Ms. Suzana Andonova (North Macedonia, representing Central and Eastern Europe), Mr. Francisco Barbieri (Argentina representing Latin America and the Caribbean), Ms. Victoria Tunstall (Canada representing Western Europe and Others) and Mr. Abbas Torabi (Iran representing the Asia Pacific Region).

**Representatives of non-governmental participants and the IOMC:** Ms. Sara Brosché (Public Interest Organizations), Mr. Uggi Kim (on behalf of Mr. Rory O'Neill (Labour)), Ms. Servet Goren (Industry), Ms. Susan Wilburn (Health), and Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (IOMC).

**SAICM Secretariat:** Ms. Nalini Sharma, Mr. Pierre Quiblier, Mr. Rafal Brykowski, Mr. Jose de Mesa, Mr. Eduardo Caldera Petit,

**Observers:** Ms. Judith Torres (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process), Ms. Kay Williams (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process), Ms. Jutta Emig (German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection) and Ms. Jacqueline Alvarez (UNEP-SAICM Secretariat).