

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

With regard to the proposal to review and make recommendations on the text, we believe a high level review with some limited and targeted recommendations could be helpful in the lead up to IP4.2 and could help to ensure we have a more complete text coming out of the meeting. However, we are concerned that recommendations could potentially undermine the work by the co-facilitators on the text and could be perceived as a lack of transparency in the process. We suggest the co-chairs work with the co-facilitators in developing any recommendations ahead of IP4.2.

On the proposal to develop an omnibus resolution, we think it is premature to begin developing resolution text on many of the issues proposed by the co-chairs. We also have concerns that negotiating resolution text on these issues at this point will distract from the work to finalize a consolidated text, which we consider the core work of IP4.2. We think a resolution to adopt the instrument and including its name being forwarded to the ICCM along with the recommendation, but we do think using the term “policy resolution” is a bit misleading and may imply it would need more substantive negotiation.

In addition, we believe it would be useful for the co-chairs to develop a brief paper of deliverables to ensure there is a common understanding of the mandate for IP4.2 and a schedule of the remaining work in the lead up to ICCM5.