

Input to the SAICM Intersessional Process Co-chairs consultation process – Japan

Q. Does the consolidated text help us achieve our vision? (PPT p3)

Yes. The text will help us achieve our vision, since it is improved in various aspects from the current Strategic Approach, built upon the lessons learned. While we cannot say “the text WILL ENSURE the achievement of our vision”, the processes of stocktaking of the progress and update of the framework are to be built in, in order to finetune our direction toward the vision.

Q. What are the gaps, enhancements or improvements to be made in the text? (PPT p4)

Discussion on the scope of the document will be needed to ensure the coherency and relevance of the text.

Q. Does the text adequately strengthen and enhance sectoral and multistakeholder engagement and ownership including for the private sector? (PPT p4)

Ownership of the text will depend on the engagement in the process to develop the text. Broader representation will enable increased ownership of the text.

Q. Does the text fully reflect the ways of working and responsibilities of all stakeholders? (PPT p4)

We assume that stakeholders other than governments would provide a response to this question from their viewpoint.

Q. Could the placement of some text in the document be modified, or moved out of the consolidated text and into a resolution? (PPT p4)

The contents below may be moved to a resolution, rather than in the consolidated text:

- A statement of needs (p3 in the consolidated text)
- Engagement, endorsement, and recognition, including formal recognition by UNGA, other relevant international bodies and relevant MEAs (p5 in the consolidated text), given that it is a one-off action to be taken by other bodies and will not be appropriate to last in the consolidated text to be adopted.
- The first bracketed paragraph in D. Enhanced Sectoral and Stakeholder Engagement of VI. (p15 in the consolidated text), given that SDGs and the relevant forum may not exist beyond 2030.

Paragraph 1 in D. Enhanced Sectoral and Stakeholder Engagement of VI. (p15 in the consolidated text) may be modified to state some kind of action (e.g. all relevant sectors and stakeholders at the local, national, regional

and international levels are invited to be involved in and commit to the sound management of chemicals throughout their lifecycle and waste), rather than to state the importance of the involvement and commitment of all relevant sectors and stakeholders.

Q. What parts of the document could be considered static versus dynamic i.e., be more easily amended? (PPT p4)

The contents below may be moved to Annexes, to easily and flexibly modify the contents and detailed procedural matters.

- Targets and indicators (P7-8 in the consolidated text), given that regular update of the targets based on the progress in achievements of the targets, addition of new targets and indicators would be necessary even after the adoption at ICCM5.
- Procedural matters of [Issue of Concern] (P11-13 in the consolidated text), given that finetuning of the procedure (including timeline and information requirements) may be needed in later dates. Some texts on “definition” or key concepts of the procedure may be left in the consolidated text.

Q. Additional recommendations for discussions at the resumed IP4 meeting:

- A policy resolution from ICCM5 on the name and adoption of the new framework.
 - An omnibus resolution from ICCM5 on transitional arrangement and early implementation.
 - We propose that the IP Co-Chairs prepare a draft text by 15 December.
 - Do you agree?
- (PPT p5)

Japan recognizes the need of the resolution to adopt the new framework, with some preamble texts to state the background and the need of the framework.

An omnibus resolution on transitional arrangement will be necessary (including the sunset clause of OPS and GPA, the role of EPIs and IOCs in the existing SAICM, and unspent funds of QSP) at ICCM. If all the possible recommendations should come out of the intersessional process, IP4.2 may need to discuss the omnibus resolution. However, due to time constraints at IP4.2, it may be advisable to defer the consideration to post-IP4.2.

The resolution at ICCM4 (IV/4) decides that the intersessional process should, among other things, consider the need for and develop recommendations regarding measurable objectives in support of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The IP4.2 may also need to elaborate the progress of the consideration of this aspect, either as part of the omnibus resolution or part of the consolidated text (time-bound targets under Strategic Objectives and their (measurable) indicators).

In addition to the omnibus resolution, a resolution may be needed for Budget and Work Programme for 2024 and 2025 to support the Secretariat for its implementation of the framework. In this regard, the date of ICCM6 may also need to be considered (whether it is to be held in 2025 as the regular basis, or in 2024 as an exceptional basis to support early implementation). These issues may not need to come from the IP process, and thus may not need to be part of the omnibus resolution.

If a high-level declaration is also issued at ICCM5, the inclusive process to draft the HLD should be determined at IP4.2.

Q. views on the additional issues not part of the text of the “beyond 2020” instrument/framework that must be included in the comprehensive set of IP recommendations, as well as views on how these recommendations should be developed, when the work should be done and in what form should they take would be useful to have in advance of the resumed IP4 meeting. For instance, views on whether the draft resolution text should be ready for discussion at the resumed IP4, discussed between the resumed IP4 and ICCM5 or discussed at ICCM 5 only would be welcome.

(explanatory note p2)

The potential items to be adopted at ICCM5, some of which may be part of the recommendations from IP, are described above.

Because the priority of the discussion at IP4.2 should be to develop a text of the beyond 2020 framework/instrument with fewer possible brackets, the time to be allocated for other discussion will be limited. For example, the sunset clause of OPS and GPA, and the application of the current Rules of Procedures will be prioritized over the other elements of an omnibus resolution, while the discussion on the unspent QSP fund and the role of EPI and IOC in the current SAICM could start even after ICCM5. ICCM5 may only take note of the need to discuss these elements in the ICCM6.