

**Twenty-seventh meeting of the Bureau of the  
International Conference on Chemicals Management for its fifth session**  
Geneva, Switzerland, 22-23 June 2023

## **REPORT OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH 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-seventh meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau.

Ms. Breyer introduced Ms. Magdalena Frydrych (Poland), new CEE Bureau member replacing Mr. Szymon Domagalski, and Mr. Sajad Motaharnia (Iran), new Regional Focal Point for Asia and the Pacific replacing Mr. Abbas Torabi. She also announced a few replacements that applied for this in-person meeting only: Mr. Satyajit Mishra (India) representing the Bureau member for Asia Pacific Region on behalf of Mr. Shri Naresh Pal Gangwar (India); Mr. Marco Crugnola (Switzerland) representing the Regional Focal Point for Western Europe and Others on behalf of Ms. Victoria Tunstall (Canada) and Mr. Germán Edmundo Proffen (Argentina) representing the Regional Focal Point for Latin America and the Caribbean Region on behalf of Mr. Francisco Barbieri (Argentina).

Ms. Breyer stressed that, in view of the little time left until the resumed IP4 and ICCM5 meetings, the goal of the Bureau meeting is to reach an agreement on the next steps towards the finalization of intersessional process recommendations for ICCM5. She also reminded the extended Bureau that at ICCM5 there is very little time to finalize open texts. This huge challenge can only be met if all members take on their responsibility to find solutions quickly and work with their constituencies in that spirit and feedback on potential issues that the bureau may need to address. She encouraged all participants to be open to dialogue, and to find common solutions.

Mr. Jose de Mesa (SAICM Secretariat) provided house-keeping information.

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

Ms. Breyer presented the provisional agenda for the meeting that was circulated on 23 May 2023 as well as the revised version circulated on 9 June 2023. The President raised four items to be taken up under AOB, namely; feedback on preparation for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Berlin Forum; consultations at the High-level Political Forum; the World Health Assembly outcomes; the IOMC workshop outcomes; and she invited members to raise additional points under AOB. With no further items raised the agenda was adopted as amended.

### **3) Adoption of the report of the twenty-sixth meeting of the ICCM5 Bureau, held on 28 March 2023**

The President asked for comments on the report of the twenty-sixth Bureau meeting, which was held online on 28 March 2023.

Mr. de Mesa confirmed that the editorial corrections provided by Ms. Tunstall were incorporated. The report was adopted as amended.

#### 4) IP Co-chairs consultations on the approach to IP4.3

Ms. Breyer presented an initial idea of the roadmap expected in the coming months until ICCM5. This timeline was further elaborated based on the discussions and the final agreed version presented under Agenda item 5 and is presented in *Table 2*.

Ms Susan Wilburn (Health) asked for a clarification on inclusion of the Global Consultation on Chemicals and Waste Issues of Concern, to be held on 11-12 July 2023 in Geneva, Switzerland.in the timeline. Ms. Jacqueline Alvarez (SAICM Secretariat) explained that these global consultations are UNEA driven and do not fall directly in the context of intersessional process and only activities that are part of this process are proposed in the timeline.

Ms. Kay Williams (IP Co-Chair) asked the representatives of the regions to share views, ideas, and points of concern on the way forward with regards to the consolidated text. She emphasized the positive outcome of speaking to extended Bureau members ahead of the meeting and to a broader stakeholder community at the IOMC workshop on the day before this Bureau meeting and pointed out that, while the complexity of sound management of chemicals and the language used in our process may still raise challenges for some actors to understand the issues and get engaged (i.e. investors). Communicating to all actors is needed and will lead to positive changes. She further confirmed that the Secretariat is preparing a limited number of recommended draft resolutions that are not part of the consolidated text under the guidance of the Co-Chairs, as requested at the resumed IP4 meeting in Nairobi. She stressed the concern that the two days planned for IP4.3 will not give sufficient time to solve pending issues in the consolidated text using our standard Thematic Group approach and encouraged members to share suggestions on the best way to resolve these issues to have a finalized text that can be transmitted to ICCM5 where final negotiations will take place.

Ms. Valentina Sierra (GRULAC ) informed the meeting that the GRULAC region agreed during an informal consultation on the importance of simplifying the consolidated document and recognized the challenge in solving the text on targets. She added that while financial mechanism, means of implementation and health protection should be better reflected in the document the region will be open to find agreement with others in these areas.

Ms. Servet Gören (Industry) supported the proposal of the Co-chairs to clean the text and reinforced that the focus should be to work on a balanced approach to existing elements of consolidated document from IP4.2 but not adding new elements. She agreed on and expressed willingness to show flexibility.

Ms. Susanna Andonova (CEE) informed the meeting that countries in the region support the proposal of the Co-chairs to simplify the text, which should be finalized at the resumed IP4 meeting. Ms. Frydrych added that while they are expecting new inputs from the region, based on the feedback received so far, stakeholders are open to speed up the process but not create new work and reduce the square brackets. Furthermore, focus should be on targets, financing and capacity building, on having a clearer document, and on considering the creation of thematic groups for IP4.3.

Ms. Williams commented that ultimately all brackets must be removed in order to have a clean text to be adopted.

Mr. Santos Virgilio (Africa) expressed the commitment of the region to work together on targets and to be flexible. He emphasized the need for a clear message to mobilize investors and realistic objectives to be achieved including phasing out pesticides, code of conduct, financial mechanisms He called for more engagement of all stakeholders and reflection of Rio Principles in the framework instrument.

Mr. Crugnola (Switzerland) asked for some clarifications about the consolidated document and the status of proposed non-papersand what would be used as a basis for discussion. With regards to targets and financial

considerations, he suggested to take into consideration previous discussions and to have a backup option. He further added the importance of being open to compromises and clarity and asked how or why the current version of the consolidated document is not translatable.

Ms. Frydrych, Mr. David Kapindula (Africa) and Ms. Sara Brosché (IPEN) emphasized the importance of keeping the process transparent. Clarification on the status of the consolidated document as the basis of the discussion was strongly recommended.

Ms. Brosché suggested to distinguish between different audiences, with the High-Level Declaration having more aspirational text and the consolidated text being focused on technical and more detailed elements. She indicated the need to have dialogues on removing brackets before the resumed IP meeting and to avoid adding new brackets that would open new conversations. She proposed identifying what needs to be adopted at the conference and what can be placed in resolutions to be further worked on after ICCM5.

Mr. Rory O'Neill (Labour) urged the need to have an understanding what needs to be negotiated at ICCM5 and what can be done later.

Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (IOMC) stressed the importance to have a document where the implementation part reflects the involvement and responsibility of more actors and stakeholders from all sectors and not from environment only. She further added the need to continue working on indicators after ICCM5. She recalled that IOMC had proposed new text at IP4.2, which are not currently reflected. She also stressed that the draft resolutions (such as those on the Emerging Policy Issues and Issues of Concern) need to be published as early as possible to enable stakeholder preparation. She noted that communication needs improvement and asked for explanation to be provided on the process, mandates of the thematic groups at IP4.3 and clarity on the status of non-papers as well as on the process for translation.

Ms. Wilburn recognized that advancement has been achieved with the inclusion of the health sector in the document and reiterated the importance of having informal groups and of keeping the intersectoral and multistakeholder approach so that stakeholders see themselves reflected in the document. She noted that the human rights and gender issues should be reflected more broadly and that the issue of Highly Hazardous Pesticides needs to be addressed. She also recalled that since SAICM is a non-binding instrument, it would be useful to have cross-references with legally binding instruments. She also noticed that the reference to the information document submitted by the Africa region on the terms of reference of Focal Points is missing in the consolidated document, which is important to assist Focal Points engage across sectors in their countries.

Ms. Williams summarized and addressed raised suggestions or concerns. She indicated that further work is needed on specific issues, including the financial mechanisms since the current financial considerations text is largely narrative. She noted that the process has been long, and representatives often have changed, resulting in some not being aware that brackets in the text were inserted by their predecessor thereby making it difficult to remove brackets from the consolidated document. She noted also that some new text proposals (e.g. implementation programs) are running in parallel with other text (e.g. Issues of Concern) that could be integrated to some extent. She clarified that while IP4.3 is a continuation of IP4.2 and there is willingness to retain the transparency the intent of the non-papers would be to explore potential solutions to the mentioned dilemmas by moving or integrating text. She added that the IP Co-chairs appreciate the suggestion for and are open to having informal dialogues between now and IP4.3 to test potential solutions but pointed out that these could lead to concerns of less transparency. She explained that the large number of brackets may create difficulties in the translation of the document as it affects both clarity and meaning of the text. She stated that resolutions will be shared six weeks in advance (see timeline in *Table 2*). She also raised the issue of potential limitations to number of groups/activities to be organised in parallel during the two days of IP4.3 as participation of all stakeholders' groups and delegations need to be ensured. She added that if no agreement can be found at the stage of finalization, that there is a risk of text will be deleted. Therefore, the Co-chairs will have to request small and informal discussions among disagreeing participants to reach an agreement on pieces of text that were not agreed upon and come back with a solution; the role of regional focal points in this process will be essential.

Ms. Judith Torres (IP Co-chair) added that during the calls with the extended Bureau members, the Co-chairs invited them to reflect on the ambition and whether it is possible or practical to implement as the text of the framework instrument is now. She added that the text is difficult to read and there is a need to make it understandable, and called on members to identify where issues should be reflected – either in the high-level declaration, or in the framework instrument text, or in resolutions while noting that all stakeholders' priorities should be reflected, particularly in the target text.

Ms. Breyer, reemphasised that point that the bureau needs to be a solution finding body and appreciated the sharing of the concerns and views of various constituencies. She noted however, that given the limited time available the Co-Chairs cannot be realistically expected to dialogue on the many brackets in the text. The challenge confronting the bureau now is how deal with all these issues in the 2 days available for IP4.3 in the context of a consideration of what issues can be addressed after ICCM5 and that there are 3 elements to the ICCM5 outcomes, namely the framework instrument, the high-level declaration, and the resolutions. Having heard the Co-Chairs proposal on a way forward, she asked the meeting to now consider solutions and a way forward.

Ms. Eigenmann noted that it is important to clarify the scope of what constitutes IP recommendations. Mr. Satyajit Mishra (Asia-Pacific) added the importance of consultation on the recommendations.

Ms. Alvarez explained that the IP process recommendations will include the consolidated document as agreed at IP4.3 and the resolutions related to the intersessional process prepared by the Secretariat, and those submitted during the IP4 meeting.

Ms. Andonova asked for clarity on the extent to which the mandate of Co-chairs allows them to be strict in trying to speed up the process. Mr. O'Neill highlighted that the unwillingness of one party to agree could jeopardize the text under discussion. Ms. Breyer provided clarifications on the rules of procedures in this area.

Ms. Williams explained that non-papers will focus on a few issues with the aim to propose text to facilitate the achievement of consensus at IP4.3 and will be published with the draft resolutions ahead of ICCM5. She added that the IP Co-chairs would consider useful to have dialogues on those areas where compromise still needs to be reached.

Expressing support to the IP Co-chairs, Mr. Virgilio suggested using the regional meetings to find agreements. Ms. Gören was in favor of empowering Co-chairs to work on specific issues (i.e. financial considerations, targets, implementation).

Mr. Kapindula suggested to identify outstanding contentious issues in the consolidated text along with their proponents. Mr. Motaharnia expressed concern about the general level of acceptance that proposed compromises as they may be seen as sacrificing ambition and which do not reflect the level of engagement required for a successful process. Mr. O'Neill observed that the process is mature and encouraged the facing of issues with a sense of ambition and cooperation.

Ms. Frydrych expected to have more discussions within the region and indicated the need to work on targets, capacity building and finance and address the challenge that there is insufficient time to fully negotiate the Co-Chairs proposed solutions. Ms. Williams reiterated that at IP4.3 there will not be time to discuss all the text and stressed the importance of using this Bureau meeting, regional briefings, or other opportunities to identify areas where there is no agreement yet. Mr. Crugnola added that stakeholders should be informed that the consolidated text will be the basis for negotiation and where there is no convergence, the non-papers will be used to find suggested solutions. Ms. Eigenmann agreed with this as a transparent way forward.

Mr. Mishra suggested to have a consultation with Bureau members before the non-papers are shared with all stakeholders.

Ms. Brosché welcomed the proposal of having the non-papers for “outstanding points” as an alternative mechanism to help discussions and suggested reminding all stakeholders that this document is not a legally binding instrument. Mr. Kapindula advised to identify and find solutions at this Bureau meeting and consult with the constituencies.

Ms. Williams confirmed that, based on the positive feedback received, the Co-chairs will produce non-papers; these will not be the basis of the discussions but will be an alternative text to be used where agreement is not reached. She also agreed with having conversations to find solutions before IP4.3.

Ms. Torres reminded that discussions started in 2017 and that the stakeholders’ community is mature enough to negotiate on the “outstanding sticking points”. Ms. Breyer recalled that much was achieved already.

## 5) Preparations for Regional Meetings, IP4.3 and ICCM5

Ms. Breyer recalled that there was an agreement that the regional meetings will take place in Bonn just ahead of IP4.3 to give the chance all constituencies to prepare for a successful IP4.3 and ICCM5. She proposed to have a common agenda for all regional meetings to facilitate common progress and to move in the same direction.

Mr Kapindula suggested that it would be useful for the Co-Chairs to do online briefings with regions prior to the regional meetings to clarify the reasoning behind the proposal.

Ms. Andonova asked the co-chairs to give a deadline to submit input/comments on the consolidated text. Ms Breyer expressed doubt about the feasibility of this approach.

Mr Germán Proffen (GRULAC) proposed to identify the priorities for each region and where there might be flexibility.

Ms. Williams confirmed that the regional consultations, taking place in July, will aim to clarify the “sticking points” for each region with the understanding to facilitate the conversations at the regional meetings in September just before IP4.3.

Mr. Pierre Quiblier (SAICM Secretariat) informed the meeting that the set of resolutions will be ready six weeks before ICCM5, they will be presented at IP4.3. The focus of IP4.3 will be to finalize the text on the new framework instrument and resolutions will not be discussed at IP4.3 but sent for ICCM5 deliberations. Ms Alvarez informed that resolutions would cover inter alia implementation, programmatic aspects, IoC and future arrangements. Ms. Alvarez added that the resolutions are still being packaged, that CRPs with resolutions will be considered as well because they are still part of the IP4 process.

The secretariat will also prepare and present the programme of work and budget proposal. Next ICCM presidency is expected to come from the Asia Pacific region. The rules of procedures will remain even if the new instrument is adopted.

As soon as ICCM5 starts new CRPs can be submitted for ICCM5.

Ms. Breyer presented the “way forward”. A discussion followed leading to a final list agreed by all Bureau members in *Table 1*:

*Table 1*

---

### Proposed way forward as agreed at the Bureau meeting on 22-23 June 2023

---

- The IP4.2 consolidated document remains the basis of discussion at the resumed IP4 meeting.
  - The Bureau agreed that the Co-Chairs, in cooperation with co-facilitators and the secretariat, will develop non-papers, inter alia, on targets, finance and capacity building.
  - The non-papers aim to propose text to facilitate the achievement of consensus at IP4.3.
  - In July 2023 Co-Chairs will hold virtual briefings with each region, open to all stakeholders, to clarify the process and understand the outstanding sticking points for participants.
  - The non-papers will be developed and published at least six weeks ahead of the resumed IP4 meeting, i.e. 11 August 2023.
-

- Following the publication of the non-papers, at the beginning of September 2023, a set of virtual briefings, open to all stakeholders, for each region will be held.
- The face-to-face regional meetings, immediately preceding IP4.3 and ICCM5, will be an opportunity for resolving specific issues.

Ms. Alvarez added that on top of the three areas already identified for the non-papers (see *Table 1*), new topics may be identified during the conversations and Ms. Williams stressed that there will not be time to discuss on the non-papers. Ms. Frydrych asked for clarification whether thematic groups will meet during IP4.3. Ms. Williams proposed that there will be flexibility towards creating small groups to solve diverging issues.

Mr. Rafal Brykowski (SAICM Secretariat) presented the Timeline of the Consultations and relevant deadlines ahead of IP4.3 and ICCM5 (*Table 2*).

*Table 2: Timeline*

<b>Consultations ahead of IP4.3 and ICCM5</b>	
22 – 23 June 2023	In-person Bureau meeting, Geneva, Switzerland
Mid-July 2023	IP Co-Chairs virtual briefings on the process for preparing non-papers
Mid- August 2023	Teleconference of the Bureau (date tbc)
Early September 2023	IP Co-Chairs virtual briefings to present non-papers
20 September 2023	In-person Bureau meeting, Bonn, Germany
21-22 September 2023	In-person Regional meetings, Germany
<b>Other relevant deadlines</b>	
By week of 3 July 2023	ICCM5 invitations to be sent
28 July 2023	Deadline for submission of nominations for travel support for eligible participants
28 July 2023	Deadline for submission of ICCM5 side events and exhibition space requests
31 July 2023	Deadline for submission of ICCM5 information documents
10 August 2023	Confirmation by the Secretariat of selected ICCM5 side events and exhibition space requests
11 August 2023	Publication of IP4.3 meeting documents, as well as draft resolution text
13 August 2023	Publication of ICCM5 meeting documents
31 August 2023	Deadline for registration of non-funded participants

Other relevant information was also presented by Mr. Brykowski (see *Table 3*).

*Table 3: Other relevant information*

- No new information documents and CRPs will be accepted for IP4.3 discussions.
- The IP process recommendations will include the consolidated document as agreed at IP4.3 and the resolutions related to the intersessional process prepared by the Secretariat, and those submitted during the IP4 meeting.
- The focus of IP4.3 will be to finalize the text on the new framework instrument and resolutions will not be discussed at IP4.3 but sent for ICCM5 deliberations.
- The resolutions that are part of the recommendations will be posted in advance.

## **6) Practical arrangements for Regional Meetings, IP4.3 and ICCM5 including side events**

Mr. De Mesa presented updated information on the arrangements for the regional meetings, including invitations and registration, ICCM5, IP4.3 and Regional meetings documents, venue and organization of the regional meetings, travel support, visa information, ICCM5 side events and exhibitions, IP4.3 and ICCM5 organisation of work, housekeeping and information note to participants and sustainability of the meetings.

The invitation will include information on the credentials according to the rules of procedures and it would be necessary that all stakeholders provide their credentials. Mr. Quiblier specified that the invitation is sent to foreign affairs and the national focal points, and it is up to them to consult and agree on the nominations.

With regards to the side events, it is expected to have 2-3 side events (from Monday to Thursday) during ICCM5 with one theme per day, according to the following schedule (subject to change) presented in *Table 4*:

*Table 4: Side events*

<b>Schedule side events during ICCM5</b>	
Monday 25 September 2023	Climate, biodiversity, and agriculture
Tuesday 26 September 2023	Health and labour
Wednesday 27 September 2023	Human rights, science, and education
Thursday 28 September 2023	Economic, value chain and innovation
Friday 25 September 2023	No side events

With regards to the organisation of work, it is expected to work until 2 a.m. Regional meetings on 21-22 September 2023 will have interpretation for GRULAC region (Spanish/English) and Africa region (French/English), whereas IP4.3 will have no interpretation. There will be interpretation at ICCM5 for plenary and High-Level Segment. Web streaming (listening mode) will be available at ICCM5 for the opening session, High-Level Segment and press conferences.

## **7) ICCM5 High Level Segment**

Ms. Jutta Emig (ICCM5 Presidency) presented the information on the preparation of the invitations to the High Level Segment as well as the Agenda of the High Level Segment. The High-Level Segment will be reflecting the SAICM approach, and all influential stakeholders will be invited. The importance of sending the invitation as soon as possible was reiterated in order to inform and block the event in the agenda for the High-Level people. While the High Level Declaration is expected to be part of the High Level Segment, further information on the format of the High Level Segment should be provided shortly. Both invitation letters (to Ministries and to all stakeholders) will be sent shortly.

Questions followed regarding the invitation of Ministers and their role. Ms. Alvarez explained that Governments are going to agree and adopt an overarching framework through the High-Level Declaration. It will be a moment for stakeholders from all sectors to further commit, to look ahead and beyond, and to have visibility. The instrument will be relevant to a broad array of stakeholders.

With regards to the High-level Declaration, Ms. Emig informed that an email and a reminder were sent requesting to submit inputs for the High-Level Declaration; deadline of submission is 14 July 2023. She emphasized the importance of receiving elements for the text from the submissions and clarified that the Berlin forum will not be used to negotiate the text for the declaration. Negotiations of the High-Level Declaration will take place at ICCM5 and will build from inputs received by all stakeholders/constituencies, and from the Dubai declaration, and other SAICM related founding texts.

Mr. Crugnola asked to share information on which industries will be invited as this will promote a larger participation of stakeholders from industry sector and other sectors. Ms. Sierra added that it would help the regions as well. Mr. Quiblier confirmed that the invitations were sent to the permanent missions in Nairobi, New York, and Geneva, copying SAICM focal points and to other stakeholders including private sector, IGOs and NGOs.

## **8) Next teleconference of the Bureau. Any other business.**

Ms. Breyer proposed an online Bureau meeting to take place in the week of 25 July or 15 August 2023. Ms. Williams was in favor of 15 August 2023 as this will be after the deadline for submissions of non-papers. A doodle will be sent around to confirm the date.

Ms. Eigenmann informed that she will not be present at the next Bureau meetings as she will be soon leaving UNIDO and Mr. Jorge Ocana (UNITAR) will represent IOMC in the extended Bureau. Ms. Eigenmann was warmly thanked and congratulated for a leadership role and valuable contribution to the work of the Bureau.

The next in person Bureau meeting will be on 20 September 2023, in Bonn.

#### **9) Any other business**

Ms. Eigenmann informed on the outcomes the Seventy-sixth World Health Assembly. A resolution (resolution A76/R17, called “Impact of chemicals, waste and pollution on human health” [The impact of chemicals, waste and pollution on human health \(who.int\)](#)) was adopted on 24 May 2023 . She further explained to whom the resolution is addressed and its reference/linkages to the new SAICM instrument. The resolution requests to submit the new SAICM instrument to World Health Assembly when completed. Acknowledgements of this resolution were shared by some Bureau members.

Ms. Emig provided information on the Berlin Forum on Chemicals and Sustainability that was rescheduled to take place virtually on 4-5 September 2023. The theme is “Just transition towards pollution free planet”, it will be two days with four thematic sessions: food security, human health and environment, labour and occupational health, and innovation for just transition.

Ms. Eigenmann presented the outcomes of the IOMC multi-stakeholder expert workshop on advancing chemicals and waste management in economic sectors and industries that was held on 20-21 June 2023, in Geneva. Main take-aways included the multi-stakeholder / sectoral participation nature of the meeting, open discussions, engagement of different industry-linked actors, to investment communities, new stakeholders from downstream sectors, new conversations with financial sector on green chemistry, climate change and biodiversity.

Positive feedback on the IOMC workshop was shared: Mr. O’Neill on the participation of new investors; Ms. Servet on engaging more people and the use of a new language (i.e. in the governance sector, implementation and upstream of the chain); Ms. Wilburn on the productive dialogue on new subjects, openness towards potential sectors where to develop programs in health sector, setting cross-cutting criteria on how to involve industry, policies for sustainable procurement, advancements in removing chemicals from products; Ms. Williams on involvement of financial institutes and use of more understandable language (sound versus sustainable).

With regards to the Quick Start Program (QSP), Ms. Alvarez explained that there will be a placeholder in the draft ICCM5 resolutions and ICCM5 will decide on how to use the funds.

#### **10) Closure of the meeting**

Ms. Breyer thanked all presents for their participation and their work done on how to proceed. She encouraged to communicate and remind their constituencies that there will not be much time available in Bonn for discussions and be open to find solutions.



## Annex

### Participants

**Bureau Members:** Ms. Anita Breyer (Germany, ICCM5 President), Ms. Magdalena Frydrych (Poland, ICCM5 Bureau Member Central and Eastern Europe), Ms. Valentina Sierra (Uruguay, ICCM5 Bureau Member Latin America and the Caribbean), Mr. David Kapindula (Zambia, ICCM5 Bureau Member Africa) and Mr. Satyajit Mishra (India, ICCM5 Bureau member Asia and the Pacific).

**Regional Focal Points:** Mr. Santos Virgilio (Angola representing Africa), Mr. Sajad Motaharnia (Iran representing the Asia-Pacific), Ms. Suzana Andonova (North Macedonia for Central and Eastern Europe), Mr. Germán Edmundo Proffen (Argentina representing Latin America and the Caribbean) and Mr. Marco Crugnola (Switzerland representing Western Europe and Others).

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

**SAICM Secretariat:** Mr. Pierre Quiblier, Mr. Rafal Brykowski, Mr. Jose de Mesa, Ms. Meera Laurijssen, Ms. Eleonora Simeone, Ms. Prisca Chulley.

**Observers:** Ms. Judith Torres (Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process) online, 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), Mr. Alf Wills (ICCM 5 Presidency) online.