



Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4)
Bucharest, Romania, 29 August – 2 September 2022

Report of the 7th Africa regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

Note by the secretariat

1. The secretariat has the honour to circulate, in the annex to the present note, the document entitled “*Report of the 7th Africa regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management*”. The document presented in the annex has been developed by the SAICM secretariat in consultation with the SAICM Regional Bureau Member and the SAICM Regional Focal Point. It has been submitted by the SAICM secretariat and has not been formally edited.

Annex: Report of the 7th Africa regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, held on 27 – 29 June 2022, Accra, Ghana

1. Opening of the meeting

1. The seventh Africa regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) was opened by, Mr. David Kapindula, ICCM5 Bureau member for Africa, and Ms. Kay Williams, ad-interim Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process at 9.00 am on Monday, 27 June 2022 at the Holiday Inn Accra Airport, Accra, Ghana.

2. Mrs. Cynthia Asare-Bediako, Director-General, on behalf of Dr. Kwaku Afriyie, Hon. Minister, Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation, Republic of Ghana, provided welcoming remarks. She highlighted the active role that Ghana plays in the implementation of all the chemicals and waste related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) as well as the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). She underlined the fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention which adopted the landmark amendment, proposed by Ghana and Switzerland, to ensure that all transboundary movements of e-waste, whether hazardous or not, are subject to the prior informed consent of the importing state and any state of transit. She further emphasized the sound management of chemicals is an integral part of Ghana's development strategies to achieve the SDGs. She referred to the 2022 Planetary Boundary Report which concludes that rates of production and release of hazardous chemicals used to make plastics, pesticides and industrial chemicals exceeds these planetary boundaries. She noted that while Africa imports chemicals and is often used as dumping grounds for older electronics and electrical products and as well as hazardous chemicals, it does not have the capacity to manage the related challenges. Misuse and misapplication, lack of awareness and education has resulted in the emergence of cancers and certain diseases. She concluded by highlighting the critical importance for Africa to join forces with the rest of the global community to set a new agenda for an ambitious beyond 2020 instrument for the sound management of chemicals and waste and Ghanaian initiatives of relevance to both BRS and SAICM implementation.

3. In his opening remarks, Mr. Kouame Georges Kouadio, Regional Focal Point for Africa, on behalf of the Minister of the Cote d'Ivoire, thanked the Government of Ghana for hosting the meeting. He underlined the opportunity provided by SAICM to address persisting technical and scientific challenging issues and financial needs. He noted that while chemicals products used daily remain invisible, their health effects are very apparent, and it is the responsibility of each individual to protect their health and the environment. He expressed his apologies with regard to his coordination role and announced his resignation from his position. He will, nevertheless, remain committed to achieve the meeting's and SAICM's common objectives.

4. Ms. Kay Williams, as ad-interim Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process, in her opening remarks, expressed her honor and gratitude for being invited to the Africa regional meeting. In expressing her best wishes for constructive and fruitful discussions, she emphasized her full availability to answer any questions and provide clarification to ensure a good understanding of the intersessional process. She expressed her hope that the meeting will enable the African region to be well prepared to provide its valuable contribution towards a successful outcome at IP4 with both most promising ambitions and concrete results.

5. Ms. Nalini Sharma, SAICM Coordinator, thanked the government of Ghana for hosting the meeting, as well as the UNDP Ghana Office for their logistical support. She

highlighted the ICCM5 Bureau decision and rationale, as well the objectives, for holding the regional meeting and the establishment and outcomes of the four Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) not intended to replace the IP4 discussion but to prepare delegates for it and thanked the region for its inputs. She expressed both her gratitude to donor countries for their continued financial support for holding regional meetings and IP4 as well as ICCM5 President (online), IP Co-Chair, Kay Williams and SAICM regional representative David Kapindula for their presence and support and SAICM Secretariat readiness to support meeting participants and the region in their contribution to the process.

6. Opening remarks were provided by Ms. Anita Breyer, President of the Fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) who thanked the host government of Ghana for hosting and for inviting her to the regional meeting. She expressed her deep regrets for her absence due to medical reasons and stated that Africa remains very close to her heart because of numerous missions with her husband on the continent on which her son was also born. She reviewed the important development steps of SAICM and the various objectives and milestones of its intersessional process, to emphasize the need to reach an agreement in Bucharest. She stressed that the objective of this meeting is to ensure that the Africa region is well prepared for IP4 in Bucharest. She thanked the Co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) for their availability to present the work done in their respective groups and discuss the results achieved with the regional meeting participants. She lastly thanked the SAICM Secretariat for its valuable work in preparing the meeting.

2. Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda

7. After having been advised by the Co-chair to limit speaking time to no more than 2-3 minutes per intervention to ensure that all are given the opportunity to speak and that all agenda items are accorded the necessary attention, no additional points arose under this agenda item and the participants adopted the agenda as set in document SAICM/RM/AFR.7/1. The list of participants is presented in Annex to this report

8. Issues of nomination of regional coordination were raised in this agenda item and further discussed. It was proposed to nominate Mr. Santos Virgilio from Angola as SAICM regional focal point of the African region.

(b) Objectives and expected outcomes of the SAICM GRULAC regional meeting

9. David Kapindula presented the overall objectives and expected outcomes of the regional meeting. He called on the participants to seize the opportunity provided by this meeting to get familiarized with the work done and the outcome documents developed under the intersessional process and to get well prepared for IP4.

10. The President of the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) stimulated participants' thoughts with strategic perspectives on the expected outcomes of the regional meeting in the context of both the IP4 and the ICCM5. She highlighted both the COVID 19 pandemic which exacerbated deeper environmental global crises of toxic pollution, climate change and biodiversity loss and the ongoing Russian aggression against Ukraine which triggered major global food and energy disruptions. She stated that the "beyond 2020" SAICM instrument is the only international instrument that can potentially deliver what the world needs to "build back better" and the just transition that is inherent to the overall vision of the SDGs. Emphasizing that making real progress requires

addressing “the outside world”, she encouraged participants to be open to compromise and courageous to formulate clear and easy to understand messages that are required to secure support from political leaders. She stressed that the outcomes of the VWGs were not intended to replace formal face-to-face deliberations at IP4 and/or negotiations at ICCM5 but rather aimed to further build understanding and prepare delegates for these negotiations for which co-facilitators are available to provide any needed clarifications. In this context, the comparison document should help to capture the evolution of the recommendations on key issues including the outcomes of the VWGs, and to build a common understanding on how the text evolved during the intersessional process in preparation for IP4.

11. She expressed her appreciation for the very positive developments and decisions taken earlier in the year, including the UNEA5 decision to convene an open-ended working group to prepare for the establishment of a science policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution. She also referred to encouraging discussion at the side event co-organized by the SAICM Secretariat and IOMC Participating Organizations on the margins of Meetings of the Conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (BC COP-15, RC COP-10, SC COP-10). The side event introduced a concept of an integrated approach to the sound management of chemicals and waste and its possible dimensions that can stimulate the commitment and engagement of the various stakeholders and sectors and as such could contribute to the ambitious and comprehensive global framework expected to be achieved under the ongoing Intersessional Process and the forthcoming IP4 meeting in Bucharest.

12. The representative of Cote d’Ivoire underlined the importance of high-level representation in the upcoming meetings and Mali referred to the importance of the recent adoption of the decision on a plastics treaty for SAICM. South Africa stated that the reason for failure of SAICM remains to be addressed and support is needed to avoid repeating them. In this regard, the role of the Special Programme is very important in providing adequate means of implementation. She emphasized that all stakeholders need to work together while governments need to take their responsibilities in providing the essential technical and financial capacities and in following up on their commitments.

3. Update from the BRS Conventions and Minamata Convention Secretariats, IOMC members and UNEP

13. Ms. Marylene Beau, the representative of the BRS Convention Secretariat, presented the 2022 face-to-face and high-level segment of the meetings of the Conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions. He highlighted the 28 decisions adopted by BC COP-15, 16 decisions by RC COP-10 and 22 decisions by SC COP-10, among those 7 are joint decisions. Under the Basel convention, he underlined the landmark amendments proposed by Ghana and Switzerland to Annexes II, VIII and IX, which ensure that all transboundary movements of e-wastes, whether hazardous or not, are subject to the prior informed consent of the importing state and any state of transit. He also highlighted the adoption of waste related technical guidelines and the additional work initiated on technical guidelines. For the Rotterdam Convention he reported the amendment to list two chemicals in Annex III and the expert appointments in the chemicals review committee, the adopted programme of work of the Compliance Committee for the biennium 2022-2023 as well as decisions related to the implementation and enhancement of the effectiveness of the Convention. Finally, he reported on the COP 10 of the Stockholm Convention which amended its Annex A with two new chemicals and on the work of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee and the new technical guidelines and guidance. He concluded by reporting on decisions on joint issues related to technical assistance, international

cooperation and coordination, clearing house mechanism and adopted budgets for the three conventions for the biennium 2022-2023. He provided practical information related to timelines for calls for nomination of experts to be represented in Small Intersessional Working Groups on the strategic framework and other specific issues such as, in updating technical guidelines on POPs, on e-wastes, plastics waste, and waste lead acid batteries for Basel and for calls for information for Basel (national reporting; electronic approaches to the notification and movements documents; further consideration of plastic waste etc.), for Stockholm (exemptions; DDT; PCB; Brominated diphenyl ethers; BAT and BEP; implementation plans; Operation of the POPs Review Committee; financial mechanism; national reporting; and global monitoring plan), Rotterdam (status of implementation; compliance committee) and joint issues (synergies in preventing and combating illegal traffic and trade in hazardous chemicals and wastes; and dates and venue of the next meetings of the conferences of the Parties to the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions).

14. Ms. Claudia Ten Have presented an update on Minamata COP-4 on behalf of the Minamata Convention Secretariat. The presentation included the advances made on Annex A and B, explaining all phasing out of mercury-added products, as well as the dates agreed for this process. She addressed the progress and milestones of the effectiveness evaluation group. She reported on the status of national reporting on the Minamata convention in the African region and underlined that all but six Africa Parties have not completed and submitted their national reports. She further showed how the videos from the latest session can be found on YouTube.

15. Ms. Gabi Eigenmann, from UNIDO and IOMC chair provided a presentation on behalf of the IOMC, with a video, displaying IOMC advances, composition, and membership, as well as activities and outcomes provided by the IOMC toolbox including technical guidance and information tools. She also provided a presentation on the work of the IOMC on an integrated approach for chemicals and waste management and described the three key following dimensions:

- Development of Chemical Management System and Capacities in all countries including key ministries (e.g., environment, health, and labour);
- Integrated approaches to manage chemicals and waste in key industry sectors and product value chain (e.g., agriculture, textiles, and electronics); and
- Integration with broader economic, social and Sustainable Development Objectives (e.g., decent work, innovation policies).

16. Mr. Alexander Mangwiro from UNEP Africa Office made a presentation on the outcomes of the UNEA5 of relevance to chemicals and waste management issues. He highlighted the omnibus resolution, the establishment of an Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee with the mandate to forge an international legally binding agreement by the end of 2024 to end plastic pollution, and the establishment of a science policy panel on the sound management of chemicals and waste and pollution prevention.

17. The representative from Cote d'Ivoire stressed the importance of science and the need to link to academia to attract the needed competence and establish a solid scientific ground.

18. The representative from Association de l'Education Environnementale pour les Futures Générations (AEEFG) called for a stronger representation from the health sector and highlighted the essential role of research in chemical safety. Underlining that Africa is not a producer but an importer of chemicals, the level of hazards is more important than the quantity of product, which calls for a bigger role of WHO to play in prevention.

19. The representative from Centre de Recherche et d'Education pour le Developpement (CREPD) noted that most countries are parties to the BRS Conventions and that cooperation at country level is essential to implement the obligations of the conventions and that cooperation with SAICM along with actions at the local level with WHO involvement is very important.
20. The representative of Mali stated that Africa failed to register some products listed in the Annexes of the Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions and called on BRS and SAICM Secretariats to help register these products.
21. The representative of Ghana asked for further explanation on possible implications to SAICM on the IOMC proposal on the integrated approach to chemicals and waste management.
22. The representative of GAPROFFA called for more attention within SAICM to provide alternatives and solutions.
23. The representative of Kenya expressed his appreciation for the IOMC toolbox, which has been used.
24. The representative of Gabon stated that, with regard to product registration requests there is a need to have an agreement on these prior to the COPs. He referred to ChemObs which provides a clear and convincing solution to the technical capacity needs in terms of scientific data and cooperation with WHO and that ICCM5 could be a good opportunity to highlight the results of this project. He called attention to the illegal trafficking of chemicals, which remains important in Africa. With regard to the recently adopted instrument on plastics, he advised that it will have to take into account previous experiences and pay special attention to the nomination of focal points to progress effectively in its development.
25. The representative of Tanzania asked for further details on support to be provided by Minamata to implement the Convention and how to improve the industry involvement as well as further details to be provided on the establishment of the Science to Policy Panel.
26. The representative of Ecological Restorations, Ghana raised the question of science policy interface in the sound management of chemicals and that the science should be made more attractive to decision makers.
27. The BRS secretariat highlighted the ongoing activities with FAO and the possibilities to engage the SAICM national focal point more actively at the national level. She recalled the COP criteria agreement and that all were met for the adoption of amendment on listing products in Annex C. He stated the ongoing and continued cooperation between BRS and SAICM with many common areas of interest and BRS Secretariat commitment to continue to engage in the process leading to IP4 and ICCM5.
28. IOMC Chair on behalf of IOMC informed participants that a longer presentation on the integrated approach to chemicals and waste management will be shared and that IOMC is committed to engage all relevant sectors at national level in all countries with health and environment and labour sectors well-coordinated to provide an enabling framework for capacity development. She reminded that industry involvement is important and that the proposed focus on chemicals intensive industry sectors is promising in this regard. Inputs from countries on this proposal are welcome and more detailed presentation will be provided

prior to IP4. She underlined the GEF8 replenishment and enhanced contribution to SAICM as a very good sign for fostering an integrated and coordinated approach.

29. The representative of UNEP responded to questions raised on the proposed Science Policy Panel and that the Secretariat positions recruitment was done and that an OEWG is planned, and that focal point and Bureau members nominations are expected to be received. He stressed that the role of focal points is crucial in shaping the Panel's development and in ensuring that its communication is clear and accessible. With regard to the plastic instrument nomination process, he reminded participants all information and reminders have been provided and all is transparent and very clear in this regard.

4. Substantive preparation for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

(a) SAICM roadmap towards IP4 and ICCM5, including the overview of the intersessional process

30. Kay Williams, Co-Chair of the Intersessional Process introduced document SAICM/RM/AFR.7/2: Road map leading to IP4 and ICCM5. She informed participants IP4 is scheduled from the 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania. Regional and stakeholder consultations are also scheduled to take place the weekend before IP4 from the 27 to 28 August 2022. She presented the following three steps:

- Step 1: Compile the outcomes and recommendations of the VWGs into one document as presented in SAICM/ICCM.5/Bureau.TC.11/2
- Step 2: Prepare a comparison document – evolution of text from SAICM OPS, IP.4/2 and VWG outcomes
- Step 3: Face to face regional meetings in preparation for IP4 to be scheduled as follows: (virtual briefings and online discussions may be convened to further build common understanding on key issues, and to introduce SAICM to new stakeholders, upon request).
 - GRULAC, 6-7 May, Montevideo, Uruguay
 - CEE Regional Meeting, 12-13 May 2022, Prague, Czech Republic
 - WEOG / EUJUSSCANNZUK, 23 June 2022, online
 - Africa Regional Meeting, 27 – 29 June 2022, Accra, Ghana
 - Asia-Pacific Regional Meeting, 5 – 7 July 2022, Dead Sea, Jordan

31. She stated that the primary meeting document for consideration at IP4 will be SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020”. Furthermore, as agreed at the 20th ICCM5 Bureau meeting, the VWG outcomes will be included as addenda to this meeting document. In addition, the outcomes of the regional meetings and any stakeholder submissions prior to IP4 in 2022 as well as the comparison document (SAICM/RM/LAC.6/INF.1) mentioned above can be included as information documents. Outlining the expected outcomes of IP4, she emphasized that IP4 is expected to produce one single document for negotiations at ICCM5.

32. The issue of absence or lack of adequate reflections of the African group positions and points in the VWGs outcomes was raised by several participants. While all efforts should be made to reach an agreement at IP4, it was recognized that there is still a lot of work to be

done. In light of the need to meet results and outcomes from all, regional groups, it was felt that all this work could only be done through an additional OEWG prior to ICCM5.

(b) SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” text not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, and strategic objectives

33. Kay Williams introduced the document SAICM/RM/AFR.7/3 which presents: SAICM/IP.4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, for consideration by the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management. She further introduced text not considered during the Virtual Working Groups on vision, scope, principles and approaches, and strategic objectives in preparation for IP4. She proposed that participants break out into smaller groups and review the text. She provided the groups with some guiding considerations and questions to support their discussions.

34. On general recommendations, there was agreement that the focus should be on the objectives and not on targets. There was no need to refer to plastics in the second sentence of the second general recommendation, and the prevention dimension should be emphasized.

35. On “Vision”, the following text was proposed: *“To save the planet and protect human health and environment from the adverse effects of chemicals and their waste”*. Option 1 in general was preferred to option 2 as it was considered comprehensive, simple and inclusive. However, the notion of long term should not be highlighted and short and medium should be reflected as well or no reference to any time frame should be made. The vision also reflects only the negative aspect of chemical products, and the positive contribution and benefits of chemicals should also be mentioned. Similarly, the social dimension should be added to the environmental and health focused one. “Chemicals and waste” should be kept along with “to ensure”.

36. On “Scope”, It was recommended that for translation purposes “circular economy” should replace “circularity”. The cultural dimension should also be reflected. And that “all wastes” should be covered. “not limited” should be deleted along with “resource efficiency”, “industry and mining” which are covered by “circular economy”. The following text was proposed: *“The scope encompasses the environmental, economic, social, health and all different development purposes in order to save resources and enhance sustainable development without harming the environment”*.

37. On “Principles and approaches”, it was felt that it was more a menu fit for a footnote and that operating/guiding principles would be more useful.

38. On “Strategic Objectives” (SO), the group recommended to set them in active mode and verb rather than passive voice. The proposed outcomes drafted by the IP Co-Chair were considered very useful and could be used as a basis for discussion. It was noted that there is lack of reference to funding and financial mechanisms in strategic objectives D and E. It was noted as well that before “addressing gap” it was important to “identify gaps” in the proposed outcomes. Issues of concern should be considered in light of the Science Policy Panel development. In SOB: “transparency” should be added to “informed decisions and actions”. In SOC: “completely” should be added before “addressed”. In SOD: “effectively” should be added before “prevented” and “risks” should be replaced by “harm”. In SOE: All brackets should be removed and “sustainable” should be added before “financial resources”.

(c) **SAICM/IP4/2 “Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020” and the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups held between October 2020 – February 2021**

39. The IP Co-Chair informed participants that under this agenda item:
- One and a half hours will be dedicated to each Virtual Working Group.
 - The Virtual working group Co-facilitator(s) will provide a 30-minute presentation, introducing the work of the Virtual Working Group, highlighting the methodology used, its outcomes and key issues that the regional group need to be made aware of.
 - The presentation will be followed by a one-hour discussion to provide further explanation and clarification with an overall aim to seek stakeholders’ views, build consensus and reach a common understanding of the outcomes of Virtual Working Groups.
40. The Co-chair gave the floor to co-facilitator of the Virtual Working Group 3 on Issues of concern.

i. Virtual Working Group 3: Issues of concern

41. The two co-facilitators Mr. Sam Adu-Kumi and Thomas Jahre Sverre (online) presented the outcomes of Virtual Working Group 3 on issues of concern. They introduced the mandate and process of their working group and highlighted that the group had 262 registered participants from all SAICM stakeholder groups: different sectors and all UN regions who met through four virtual meetings and three rounds of electronic feedback.

42. They presented the outcomes of the group’s work referring to the comparison table as displayed in document SAICM/RM/AFR.7/INF.1 and highlighted the broad agreement among the group that the emerging policy issues process has been useful in raising the profile of specific issues globally, but that a clear plan of action is needed. The co-facilitators concluded their presentation with a set of recommendations from the virtual working group aiming at agreeing to an omnibus resolution on the existing SAICM EPIs and other issues of concern.

43. The issue of who: individuals, groups, regions or countries could trigger the process of nominating a new Issue of Concern and who should be the experts to assess the request were raised by the representatives of Guinée and Ethiopia. Ethiopia asked for further clarification on the differences between the IOC and EPIs.

44. The Cofacilitator responded that the definition of IOC was agreed upon at ICCM 2 in its resolution 2/3 and that the virtual discussions were difficult and provided a broad range of views. The proposed expert body would be independent and would review Issues of Concern triggered by all stakeholders. Furthermore, the text proposed is just a basis for further work.

45. Concern was raised by South Africa on ensuring that existing EPIs and IOC should not be treated like the new ones. Further analysis is needed on why progress has not happened and why developing countries have made so little progress as noted in UNEP assessment report. The analysis on IOC initiated by UNEP should trigger further discussion before ICCM5.

46. With regard to criteria for IOC nomination, Tanzania asked for waste to be included and that Africa has little capacity to assess the health and environmental risks and which mechanism should Africa use to nominate an IOC. The importance of waste was echoed by Cote d'Ivoire who quoted the example of Probo Koala dumping and the pollution disaster that affected the country. He also mentioned that waste should include hospital and nuclear waste as well and that landfill management in Africa needs a renewed commitment and to be managed up to the best norms and standards. The issue of nano waste and battery waste were also perceived as issues of concern that need adequate attention and that SAICM is well positioned to address the links between chemicals and wastes.

47. The Co-facilitator responded that "waste" is a big issue and that while any stakeholder can trigger an issue there is a process that will consider the issue based on the findings of Science and Policy Panel once established to substantiate and address the "criteria" related issues.

48. The Co-chair concluded the discussion by emphasizing the breadth of SAICM which explains both its strength and weakness. The interface with the Science and Policy Panel will be key to assist the region in its assessment of: how to trigger the issue; and how the assessment should be done, and so on. The relationships with Conventions COPs will need to be examined on how an IOC will be brought to the attention of the Convention. The issue of universality of an IOC or region specific is also very important. Considering how these issues will be brought to an Ad hoc scientific committee is also important.

ii. Working Group 1: Targets, indicators and milestones

49. Ms. Silvija Kalnins, co-facilitator of the VWG1 presented (online) the outcomes of the Group. She started by referring to the documents needed for the discussion and introduced SAICM/RM/LAC.6/INF.1: Table comparing the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, document SAICM/IP.4/2 "Compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020" and the outcomes of the Virtual Working Groups and its relevant sections.

50. She introduced the mandate, methodology and process related to the technical working group established and mandated by IP3 and the VWG on targets and indicators established and mandated by the ICCM5 Bureau. In presenting the main outcomes of the work of the group, she highlighted the formulations of targets based on points of convergence of views expressed by stakeholders, which include 5 strategic objectives, 25 targets (30 brackets) and over 80 different indicators. She further proposed the two following options for moving forward: Option 1) continuation of work on targets, indicators, and milestones by a policy expert group; and Option 2) combine the work of a policy expert group with the work by a sub-group more technical in nature which would prepare specific work on indicators. After providing an overview of the structure of the outcome document she highlighted the issues raised but not addressed by the group, as well as the following main considerations for moving forwards:

- The need to consider targets together with the strategic objective formulations to establish a comprehensive indicator framework for the new instrument; and
- The need to consider targets in a reiterative process and together with the indicators, in order to capture and develop a comprehensive indicator framework

for the instrument, including considerations of resources and capacities for monitoring implementation.

51. The representative from South Africa noted that some issues on targets from the African group had not been captured in the outcomes of the VWG1.

52. The representatives from Tanzania and AEEFG, stressed that indicators are very important to reflect the African continent's specific needs and that indicators of coherence should be aligned with the SDGs and target 12.4, in particular.

53. The co-facilitator responded by highlighting the challenging broad based stakeholder nature of the process which is itself as important as the result. She noted the concern of the region that their inputs were not well reflected and encouraged a stronger sense of ownership in the process which needs to move at a pace acceptable to all stakeholders. She further encouraged participants to consider the objectives, targets, milestones and indicators all together. She called for some flexibility in considering for example that general targets with specific indicators that could be region specific and combined with milestones.

54. The representative from Gabon recalled the evaluation report that reveals that inefficiency resulted from a lack of adequate financial means and stressed the need for having indicators on access to financial resources by recipient countries to better assess the efficient use of the resources. The representative from Nigeria highlighted in this regard, that developed countries have an obligation and that meeting the expectations of every stakeholder will require additional finance for developing countries.

55. The co-facilitator reminded participants that progress on the targets, indicators and milestones depends on the commitment from all the stakeholders. The objectives are achievable but will require more listening and encompassing stakeholders' various points of view. She recognized that targets related to financing and IOC need more work and that financing remains a challenge but expects IP4 to provide the opportunity to include the inputs from Africa that is critical after all difficulties encountered in participating in the virtual process.

56. The representative from the CREPD recalled that the lack of funding was more critical than the lack of targets and indicators and that the focus should be on designing objectives and targets in coherence with SDGs and on achieving a practical and ambitious system.

57. The IP Co-Chair, in considering the number of comments received, noted the need to pull out considerations and concerns and avoid focusing on specific wording. She called for: simplicity to help identify indicators to measure the targets against; considering and agreeing on a framework to identify how to agree on indicators; and developing a synthesis to create this dynamic.

58. The co-facilitator stressed the need to review the recommendations of the VWG and in particular the need to establish a technical expertise-based group to provide recommendations on the development of an indicator framework. She stated that options related to designing a table between expected results and indicators could be difficult but should be explored. She reminded the African region is well aware of its own capacity constraints and representation challenges and encouraged the group to engage in consultation and coordination work as soon as possible to reach a group position.

iii. Virtual Working Group 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation

59. Ms. Karissa Kovner and Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn (online) presented the outcomes of the Virtual Working Group 2 on governance and mechanisms to support implementation. Karissa Kovner presented the detailed mandate of the working group based on reviewing the entire text of the compilation of recommendations. She presented the mandate on the Science Policy Interface. She further provided the organizational metrics of the process. She provided an overview of the outputs that can be categorized into three parts:

- Part I: Textual recommendations based on the convergence of views among stakeholders for Sections B, C, D, E, G, and H; She further highlighted the issues on which progress was made and on which more work needs to be done in each section of the outcomes' documents.
- Part II: Recommendations for the establishment of a Science-Policy Interface. Among the main recommendations in this regard, she highlighted that further dialogue needs to take place on the functions and characteristics of a Science Policy Interface, on the development of the potential options for its scope and placement; and
- Part III: Recommendations for further consideration of issues in the "Parking Lot," a document created by VWG2 to reflect areas of work or views that could not be addressed in the context of the mandate or that needed more time for further discussion and consideration.

60. She concluded her presentation by presenting the next steps and recommendations from the Co-facilitators which include the Japanese proposal for Taking Stock of Progress (Section G) and Updating the Instrument (Section H) and the overlap with related sections of SAICM/IP.4/2 for which this VWG was not mandated.

61. The representative from Tanzania recognized the importance of coordination and cooperation that is central to SAICM but reminded that the level of funding is crucial and should be the main component of the integrated financing approach that should be reflected. Along this line, the representative from the CREPD wondered how to capture the region's inputs into this VWG. He noted in particular Paragraph 8 in section B on industry involvement and asked who is to be involved in developing the Term of Reference of the industry involvement. Request for clarification was also expressed on the Japanese reporting proposal.

62. Questions were raised on the lessons learned from the previous SAICM cycle and its voluntary status which are poorly taken into account and the limited capacity of the focal point in assuming their varied tasks. Concerns were raised as well with regard to SAICM science policy work relationship with the upcoming establishment of the Science Policy Panel (SPP). While some countries favored that SAICM should not establish an SPI prior to considering the UNEP report on EPI, others considered that what is emerging from the SPI under SAICM could be a contribution and submitted to SPP for its consideration. In general, there was a convergence of views that SAICM should not duplicate the work of the SPP but build up and strengthen its relationship with the SPP.

63. In response to the concerns raised, the co-facilitator and IP Co-Chair clarified as follows:

- the component and relationship with SPP should be considered as a group and IP4 should ask what should be covered or not by the SPP; similarly, IP4 should define what should be covered by a Science Policy Interface (SPI);
- the parking lot related issues should also be addressed by IP4;
- the national reporting functions, the role of the national focal point and of coordinating mechanism should be addressed along with the role of the regional focal point. Focal point training capacity should also be considered;
- the industry involvement is the result of the IP3 reflection. Need to ensure that all stakeholders are welcome with funding space capacities;
- Japanese proposal responds to the need to find a better way to get better information to measure progress made by all stakeholders and to report on their activities. The objective is to create a dashboard that has easy technology-based reporting functions.

iv. Virtual Working Group 4: Financial considerations

64. Mr. Jonah Ormond (online) and Mr. Reginald Hernaus (online), co-facilitators of the Virtual Working Group 4 on financial considerations, presented the outcomes of the work of the group. Providing an overview of the mandate and process of the work of the group, he highlighted that 166 people registered for this VWG from all SAICM stakeholder groups, different sectors and all UN regions and participated in 4 virtual meetings and 3 rounds of electronic feedback. Presenting the outcomes of his group, he highlighted the consolidated views, recommendations and proposed cleaned redline texts; and the agreement from his group to include a chapeau paragraph to section VII on Financial Considerations with a proposed text to highlight the need for adequate, predictable and sustainable financing, technical assistance and technology transfer for the implementation of the Strategic Approach. He also highlighted the three following outcomes:

- Stakeholders unanimously supported strengthening the financing of the Secretariat with contributions from all stakeholders, although details on how these contributions should be reflected in the beyond 2020 instrument have not been agreed on.
- Stakeholders provided inputs to the draft resource mobilization strategy and the review document on cost-recovery mechanisms and other economic instruments for financing the sound management of chemicals and waste. The Secretariat will use these inputs to prepare revised versions of both documents; and
- The co-facilitators and stakeholders also launched an Open Discussion on Capacity Building and defined concrete mechanisms and actions regarding capacity building across sectors to support the beyond 2020 programme of work.

65. The representative of Mali stated that the integrated approach to financing raised a lot of hope since 2013 but did not deliver on its expectations. He proposed that an assessment and evaluation should be made on the integrated approach to financing. He also expressed his regrets that the Special Programme is too limited.

66. There was a convergence of views towards taking into account first the special case for Africa being an importer of chemicals before examining its funding needs and opportunities. While the increase from GEF funding was noted, it was also recognized as still not enough and that previous SAICM funding was well conceived but in facing reality still suffering from a lack of funding due to a lack of identification of a good financing mechanism. SAICM should be more creative and expand its funding beyond GEF.

67. A wide support for the proposed 0,5% tax on the production value of basic chemicals that will fund the sound management of chemicals and waste was expressed by the group. The tax is estimated to generate 11 billion a year and could pay for the cost of inaction and the externalities of importing countries. It was recognized that the case for establishing such a tax and how it would be used still needs to be made.

68. The co-facilitators highlighted in their response that while there was satisfaction on the GEF8 replenishment, the share of chemicals at 14% remains a disappointment and encouraged the African region to express their needs. The co-facilitators in this regard, expected that the consolidated text to be submitted to ICCM5 will have language on the role of GEF, will express the need for additional funding and will recognize the crucial role that GEF will play in the new SAICM framework. They confirm that the 0.5 % tax proposal is still on the table and recorded in the outcome document but that more details and fruitful discussion is expected at IP4.

5. Logistical preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

69. The representative of the SAICM Secretariat, presented an update on preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 and the fifth session of the Conference, respectively. She noted that IP4 is scheduled to take place in face-to-face mode from 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania and is expected to have a total of 250 participants. She further informed the participants that regional and stakeholder consultations and technical briefings are scheduled to take place the weekend before IP4 from 27 to 28 August 2022 and that in line with planning for the previous Intersessional Process meetings, there will be funding available for 8 African government representatives, as well as for the Bureau members.

6. Exchange of regional information and knowledge, reviewing progress towards the current SAICM objectives.

70. At the outset of the consideration of this agenda item the group, following an introduction from the representative of South Africa and noting the relevance of the FAO pesticides code of conduct, expressed its support for the development of a similar industry code of conduct code for chemicals management and wastes.

71. The following three presentations were made on chemicals and waste management initiatives and activities of relevance to the region:

- the Pilot Project to support African Countries in overcoming barriers in implementing the United Nations Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS);
- The Environmentally Sound Management of Waste and Used lead Acid Batteries; and
- The African ChemObs: the Integrated Health and Environment Observatories and Legal and Institutional Strengthening for the Sound Management of Chemicals in Africa

72. The representative of Zambia expressed their appreciation for the GHS activities and the success in incorporating the GHS in its legislation. He highlighted the good cooperation

between the ministries of health and environment on ChemObs and suggested that this project should be highlighted at IP4. He also referred to the work undertaken on POPs and the recently developed communication strategy and the national action plan on ASGM.

73. The representative of CREPD provided an update on the lead in the paint pilot project implemented in Cameroon which involves five ministries.

74. The representative of Gabon stated that his country was privileged to be part of the ChemObs project. The two ChemObs calculators have been used to take informed decisions on the risk related to population variables and site-level environmental information as well as on the associated economic costs resulting from chemicals exposure and invited the region to use the ChemObs decision making tools and promote its use in the region.

75. The representative of Guinée underlined the need to further disseminate successful projects in other countries and highlighted the WHO led project on ASGM and the health impact of mercury in gold mining.

76. The representative of Madagascar highlighted the difficulty in gathering and developing strong cooperation between various sectors.

77. The representative from Cote d'Ivoire shared his country's experience with the GEF obsolete pesticides elimination project which revealed the need to develop new laws on the destruction of obsolete pesticides. Highlighting the cooperation with the health sector on establishing an anti-poison center and the database developed with FAO to track pesticides, he asked how the ChemObs calculators could also include pesticides?

78. The representative of Benin underlined the importance of data and information and awareness raising programme and informed participants of Benin's resolution to develop a new law on chemicals and wastes.

79. The representative of AEEFG thanked SAICM for the work undertaken on lead in paint, which has led to a new law on elimination of lead in paint despite some resistance from the paint industry.

80. The representative of Kenya highlighted its multisectoral Committee on sound management of chemicals and waste working closely with the industry. He stressed the need to discuss ChemObs and promote its results at IP4 in the context of implementing and achieving targets. He emphasized the cooperation between health and environment within the Health and Environment Strategic Alliance of the Libreville Declaration and how it will help to implement and take action on chemicals and wastes issues.

81. The representative of South Africa stressed the need for adequate technology which remain expensive, and that technology transfer should be a priority for detecting for example mislabeling. She also expressed the need to develop a questionnaire on financial and capacity needs in the region.

82. In conclusion the group expressed the persisting challenge of intersectoral cooperation, the limited and targeted sources of funding which needs to be widened and that financial and technical assistance should also address national legislation and infrastructure and not only specific targeted issues.

83. The Co-chair called for a closed session held amongst regional representatives and stakeholders.

7. Other matters

84. The Co-chairs provided a brief summary of the closed session, including agreement to use the meeting documents as presented in the road map towards IP4 and ICCM5. They noted that the comparison table is a useful document. The group reflected on developing an African position mainly on financial considerations and industry involvement. Adequate, predictable and sustainable funding was emphasized and while the GEF8 replenishment is well noted it remains insufficient in light of the challenges faced in Africa for the sound management of chemicals and waste. For the industry involvement pillar, a wide consensus was reached on the additional cost of externalities affecting the region which justify the 0,5% proposed tax on chemicals products. The group also stressed that a request should be made to the Government of Romania to facilitate delivery of visas upon arrival of delegates who will attend IP4. The group also stated that interpretation services would be needed to hold its regional meeting during IP4.

8. Closure of the meeting

85. The Co-chairs thanked all participants and the Government of Ghana for hosting the meeting.

86. In her closing remarks, the ICCM5 President thanked the participants for their constructive discussion. She noted that she was very impressed by the knowledge, dedication and competence demonstrated on all issues by all participants during this regional meeting. She appreciated all the contributions made during the meeting which were very helpful in understanding the views and positions of the region. She assured these are well noted and will be taken into account at IP4. She expressed her sincere gratitude as well to the Co-Chairs, the IP Co-chair and the Government of Ghana for hosting the meeting.

87. The meeting closed at 17.30 on Wednesday, 29 June 2022.

Annex: List of participants

Government: Mr. Santos Virgílio (Focal point, Angola), Mr. Jules Christian Ndomo Tsala (Chef d'unité d'inspection de l'air et de l'atmosphère, Cameroon), Mr. Said Ali Thaoubane (Point Focal National de la SAICM, Comoros), Ms. Geneviève BAZOMA DONGUI (POINT FOCAL SAICM, Congo, Republic of), Mr. Kouame Georges Kouadio (l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, Côte d'Ivoire), Mr. Yasser Khalil (Egypt Ministry of Environment / Waste Management Regulatory Authority (WMRA), Egypt), Ms. Mulubrhan Tariku (Environmental pollution monitoring and controlling directorate director, Ethiopia), Mr. Serge Molly Alloo Alloo (Expert Régional produits chimiques et déchets dangereux, Gabon), Ms. Cynthia Asare Bediako (MESTI, Ghana), Dr. Sam Adu-Kumi (Programmes Coordinator and National Focal Point, Chemicals and Waste MEAs, Ghana), Mr. Ebenezer Appah-Sampong (EPA, Ghana), Mr. Joseph C. Edmund (EPA, Ghana)

Mr. Lovelace Sarpong (EPA, Ghana), Mr. Bangaly Dioumessy (Point Focal SAICM, Guinea), Dr. Lucy Ng'ang'a (Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Kenya), Mr. Melau William (Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Kenya), Ms. Moleboheng Juliett Petlane (Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture, Lesotho), Mr. Mansour Salem (SAICM Focal Point, Libya), Ms. Dina Rakotoarisoa (Point Focal SAICM, Madagascar), Mr. Patrick Nyirenda (Environmental Affairs Department, Malawi), Mr. Oumar Diaouré Cisse (Point Focal SAICM, Mali), Mr. Olubunmi Olusanya (Federal Ministry of Environment, Nigeria), Mr. Mo-Bashir Idriss (Environment Protection Agency, Sierra Leone), Mr. Keenadiid Mumin Cali (Deputy Director General (NFP), Somalia), Ms. Noluzuko Gwayi, (Department of Forestry, Fisheries & Environment, South Africa), Ms. Brenda Maphanga (Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment, South Africa), Mr. Daniel Ndiyo (Government Chemist Laboratory Authority, Tanzania, United Republic of), Mr. David Kapindula (Zambia Environmental Management Agency, Zambia).

IGO (Intergovernmental Organizations): Ms. Claudia Ten Have (online) (Minamata Convention on Mercury), Ms. Marylene Beau (online) (Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions), Ms. Gabriela Eigenmann (online) (UNIDO), Mr. Muhammed Omotola (UNEP), Ms. Nafisatou Cisse (WHO AFRO), Ms. Cynthia Davis (WHO AFRO).

NGO (Non-Governmental Organizations): Ms. Gharbi Samia (AEEFG, Tunisia), Mr. Silvani Mng'anya (AGENDA for Environment and Responsible Development (AGENDA), Tanzania, United Republic of), Mr. Kwame Ofori (Ako foundation, Ghana), Mr. Oludayo Dada (BASEL CONVENTION COORDINATING CENTRE FOR THE AFRICAN REGION, Nigeria), Mr. Wondwossen Sintayeho Wondemagegnehu (SouthSouthNorth, Ethiopia), Mr. Gilbert KUEPOUO (Centre de Recherche et d'Education pour le Développement, Cameroon), Mr. Griffins Ochieng (Online) (Centre for Environment, Justice and Development (CEJAD)), Mr. Emmanuel Odjam-Akumatey (Ghana), Ms. Sounkoura Adetonah (GAPROFFA, Benin), Ms. Rhoda Buor Boateng (ITUC-Africa, Togo), Ms. Jane Ragoo (CTSP, Mauritius), Mr. Franck Evrard Koffi (Online), (Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement), Mr. Jonathan Gokah (KASA GHANA, Ghana), Dr. Leslie Aneshimode Adogame (Sustainable Research and Action for Environmental Development (SRADeV Nigeria), Ms. Hanna-Andrea Rother (Division of Environmental Health, University of Cape Town, South Africa), Mr. Yahya Msangi (WELFARE TOGO, Togo).

Private Sector: Ms. Stella Simiyu (CropLife Africa / Middle East, Kenya / Belgium), Ms. Evelyn Luzenaka (CropLife Africa / Middle East, Kenya / Belgium).

SAICM Secretariat: Ms. Nalini Sharma, Mr. Pierre Quiblier, Mr. Rafal Brykowski (online).

ICCM5 President Ms. Anita Breyer (online) (Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear, Germany), Mr. Alf Wills (ICCM5 Presidency team, South Africa).

Co-facilitators Mr. Jonah Davis Ormond (online) (Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Barbuda Affairs, St. John's, Antigua and Barbuda), Ms. Silvija Nora Kalnins (online) (Head of Strategy and Development, Latvia), Mr. Reginald Hernaus (online) (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management, The Hague, Netherlands), Mr. Sverre Thomas Jahre (online) (Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment, Norway), Mr. Wajira Palipane (online) (Department of Labour, Sri Lanka), Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn (online) (Pollution Control Department, Thailand), Ms. Karissa Kovner (online) (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, United States).

IP Co-Chairs: Ms. Kay Williams (Defra, United Kingdom), Ms. Judith Torres (online) (Ministry of Environment, Uruguay).
