

---

**Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4)**  
Bonn, Germany 23 – 24 September 2023

## **Report of the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020**

### **Introduction**

1. At its fourth session, held in Geneva from 28 September to 2 October 2015, the International Conference on Chemicals Management, in its resolution IV/4, decided to initiate an intersessional process for preparing recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020. The process was to be open to all stakeholders.
2. The first segment of the fourth meeting of the intersessional process (IP4) was held from 29 August to 2 September 2022 in Bucharest, Romania. On Friday, 2 September 2022, the Co-Chairs of the intersessional process outlined a proposal to adjourn that meeting and resume in early 2023 at a date and location to be determined by the Bureau in consultation with stakeholders, with a view to concluding consideration of the agenda. Convening of the resumed meeting was approved under a silent procedure that was launched on 10 October 2022 and concluded on 30 October 2022. By the result of that procedure, it was decided to convene a resumed session of the fourth meeting of the intersessional process.
3. The second segment of the fourth meeting of the intersessional process was held from 27 February to 3 March 2023 in Nairobi, Kenya. On Friday, 3 March 2022, the IP4 meeting accepted the Co-Chairs' proposal that the fourth meeting of the intersessional process be adjourned and reconvened on Saturday 23 September 2023, for two days, just before the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) in Bonn, to conclude considerations of the IP4 agenda.
4. The resumed fourth meeting took place from 23 to 24 September 2023 in Bonn, Germany.

### **I. Opening of the meeting**

5. SAICM Coordinator Pierre Quiblier called the meeting to order at 9.40 a.m. on Saturday, 23 September 2023. Welcoming remarks were made by Ms. Bettina Hoffman, State Secretary for Environment, Nature Protection, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection, on behalf of the government of Germany.
6. In her welcoming address, Ms. Bettina Hoffman stressed that pollution of the environment has reached an alarming dimension, reminding participants that the international community set itself a goal for 2020 to produce and use chemicals in ways that minimize dangers to humans and the environment. She emphasized that pollution from harmful substances is one dimension of the triple planetary crisis of climate change, biodiversity loss and pollution, and noted that some of the polluting substances are released through use of chemicals and relevant production processes.

7. She underscored that, while some instruments to control pollution exist, they are not used effectively enough, and stressed that policy makers, the private sector, and society need to recognize the importance of chemical safety. She said that while some countries have systems in place to control harmful chemicals, chemical pollution knows no borders and chemical safety can only be achieved through global cooperation.
8. Ms. Bettina Hoffman concluded noting that this is the last chance to ensure we can take measures to address the triple planetary crisis, stressing the need to deliver a text that can be the starting point for the negotiations during ICCM5. Underscoring that much work remains for a successful conclusion, she thanked all participants for their hard work so far.

## **II. Organizational matters**

### **Adoption of the Agenda**

9. The meeting agenda (SAICM/IP.4/1/Rev 1) was adopted on 29 August 2022 during the first segment of the meeting held in Bucharest as follows:
  1. Opening of the meeting.
  2. Organizational matters:
    - (a) Appointment of the IP Co-Chair;
    - (b) Adoption of the agenda;
    - (c) Organization of work.
  3. Development of recommendations for consideration by the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management for the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.
  4. Preparations for the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management.
  5. Any other business.
  6. Closure of the meeting

### **Organization of Work**

10. The meeting was Co-Chaired by Ms. Judith Torres (Uruguay) and Ms. Kay Williams (United Kingdom).
11. Co-Chair Torres reminded delegates that the rules of procedure of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, as provided in rule 23 of those rules, apply *mutatis mutandis* to the work and proceedings of this resumed fourth meeting of the Intersessional Process. She added that the meeting was being held in face-to-face mode and that, as set out in Conference Resolution IV/4, would be conducted in English only.
12. She drew attention to document SAICM/IP.4/INF/1/Rev.4, the Co-Chairs' scenario note, stating that the document set out a proposed structure and flow for the resumed meeting as well as expectations to achieve the objective of a finalized consolidated document that presents the core of the comprehensive set of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.
13. She outlined the work schedule for the two-day meeting, noting that evening sessions were envisaged. She added that informal break out groups would be established to clear and finalize text on outstanding issues, as necessary, with their mandates decided on an *ad hoc* basis according to the needs, and their outcomes presented to plenary for agreement.
14. She stressed that the main outcome of the meeting would be the draft framework instrument for consideration by ICCM5. She concluded that no formal meeting report would be adopted, but a report, prepared by writers from the Earth Negotiations Bulletin, would be posted on the SAICM website.

### **III. Development of recommendations for consideration by the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management for the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020**

15. Co-Chair Williams reminded delegates that, as agreed, there would be no new documents at this resumed meeting, with the exceptions of the revised inventory and analysis report on indicators (SAICM/IP.4/INF/30/Rev.1) and the revised CRP on measurability (SAICM/IP.4/CRP.7/Rev.1).
16. She further reminded delegates of the agreement at the resumed fourth session in Nairobi that the secretariat would develop, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs, draft resolutions based on the elements provided by the informal groups as well as other standard resolutions (SAICM/IP.4/13). The draft resolutions were not part of the consolidated text (SAICM/IP.4/12), but were directly relevant to the Beyond 2020 outcome and related actions, and proposals that need to be taken into account towards the implementation of the new instrument. They would be transmitted directly to ICCM5 as agreed, and would form part of the package of recommendations, including the framework instrument, which would be forwarded to ICCM5 for adoption. She further noted that Conference Room Papers tabled at previous meetings of IP4, in Bucharest and Nairobi, were still valid.
17. She underscored that the Co-Chairs had prepared non-papers for use as a tool to help build consensus in the consolidated document, drafted in close co-operation with the Thematic Groups' co-facilitators and with the agreement of the Bureau. She noted that the non-papers were circulated for information and comment on 11 August and would be presented at relevant points throughout the meeting, while stressing that the consolidated document that was the outcome of the Nairobi meeting remained the basis for negotiation.
18. She urged participants to work together so that they might leave the resumed IP4 meeting with a "clean" consolidated document and its Annexes. She said that where there was clean text, the Co-Chairs would ask for an agreement *ad referendum* and the text would be forwarded to ICCM5.
19. She noted that for paragraphs with brackets, the Co-Chairs would summarize the issue and make a proposal. If there was no agreement, the options, inputs, comments, or changes would be noted, and the text referred to a break-out group or taken on board for a further iteration. If participants did not agree on a proposal made after a couple of iterations, the text would remain as in the consolidated text with any remaining brackets and forwarded so to ICCM5.

#### **Introduction**

20. Co-Chair Williams noted that the first paragraph of the consolidated text, containing no brackets, addressed the importance of properly managing chemicals and waste for the health of both people and the environment, and noted that, despite progress, the targets set for 2020 were not achieved, and decisive and immediate action was needed to protect future generations.
21. One delegate suggested removing reference to waste, noting that it was not part of the original global goal of SAICM, and adding that it is a cross-cutting issue.
22. On a paragraph on strengthening collaboration and coordination among stakeholders and sectors, and building chemicals and waste management capacities in all countries, Co-Chair Williams suggested deleting reference to addressing the triple planetary crisis, and amending the second part of the paragraph to read "whilst its focus must be on preventing harm through building chemicals and waste management capacities in all countries, the intent of the framework is to catalyze a transformational shift towards green and sustainable chemistry".
23. One delegate suggested deleting reference to "green" chemistry. Speaking on behalf of a group of countries, another delegate noted that the second part of the paragraph was too specific, suggesting its deletion with inclusion of some elements in the subsequent introductory paragraph.
24. On a paragraph outlining the framework's intent to minimize chemical-related harm, emphasizing environmental protection, inter-sectoral collaboration, and the promotion of sustainable products and consumption through innovative approaches, Co-Chair Williams suggested retaining a bracketed sentence noting that the framework is cross-sectoral and action-orientated with strong governance and measurability structures that facilitate transparency and ownership of roles and responsibilities to assess progress and promote international standards". She suggested deleting a reference to "greener products".
25. Speaking on behalf of groups of countries, two delegates noted that they needed more time to discuss the proposed amendments, pending a decision on the previous paragraph.

26. On a paragraph highlighting the framework's alignment with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, emphasizing its relevance beyond 2030, Co-Chair Williams suggested noting that “progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals in all three dimensions (environmental, social and economic) was critical to create the conditions necessary to fulfil the strategic objectives and targets of the framework”.
27. One delegate strongly supported reference to the three dimensions noting that they constituted the basis of all environmental agreements and instruments. Another delegate suggested adding that the framework complements other international agreement and arrangements and supports “but is not intended to duplicate” their implementation, and reiterated the need to pursue a horizontal solution to the question of scope, suggesting referring to “chemicals and associated wastes”. Another delegate proposed reordering the three dimensions to economic, social and environmental for consistency with the original text of the 2030 Agenda.
28. Co-Chair Williams stressed that all suggestions would be taken into account and the text would be readdressed on the following day.
29. On reviewing the amended text, delegates agreed to clarify that the global goal on chemicals and waste, which was not achieved by 2020, referred to the global World Summit on Sustainable Development Goal on chemicals management.
30. On adverse impacts of chemicals on human health and the environment, one delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries requested retaining the brackets around the qualification that adverse impacts arise when the chemicals in question are not managed properly.
31. On a paragraph noting that scientific evidence alerts us that chemicals and waste pollution “is not sustainable” or “has exceeded planetary boundaries,” Co-Chair Williams suggested retaining the reference to sustainability. One delegate suggested retaining the reference to planetary boundaries. Following further discussions, the reference to planetary boundaries was deleted.
32. On the same paragraph, one delegate speaking on behalf of a group of countries suggested including a reference to the Global Waste Management Outlook. Others expressed concerns around the process, noting that the aim was to remove brackets and not to add new text. Co-Chair Williams noted that the reference to the Global Waste Management Outlook would not be included in the text and the request would be recorded in the meeting’s report.
33. On a paragraph describing the framework’s characteristics, delegates discussed a bracketed reference to the triple planetary crisis. Some delegates wanted to retain it, while others suggested its deletion. Some noted that spelling out climate change, biodiversity loss, and pollution sufficed as it refers to the triple planetary crisis. One delegate stressed that hunger and poverty are crises that position themselves far ahead of the triple planetary crisis, requesting his position to be reflected in the meeting’s report. Following a lengthy debate, the reference remained in brackets.
34. Co-Chair Williams suggested taking note of the discussion on the triple planetary crisis in the meeting’s report. One delegate suggested focusing on removing brackets rather than introducing text via the meeting’s report. UNEP’s Legal Adviser stated that it is up to each participant to request that specific interventions be included in the meeting’s report, adding that if interested delegates want to include such topics in the activities of ICCM5, they should make the statement again during ICCM5.
35. On the same paragraph, delegates decided to delete a sentence on “preventing harm through prevention and substitution of hazardous chemicals.” A reference to a transformational shift towards “green” and sustainable chemistry remained in brackets, following one delegate’s request.
36. On a paragraph addressing the framework’s aim, delegates agreed to remove the brackets around a sentence noting that the framework is “cross-sectoral and action-orientated with strong governance and measurability structures that facilitate transparency and ownership of roles and responsibilities to assess progress and promote international standards”.
37. On the same paragraph, delegates discussed a reference to vulnerable groups. Some suggested replacing it with “groups in vulnerable situations”. Others objected, preferring the original formulation, which was retained. Delegates agreed to remove reference to the production of “greener” products through innovation.
38. On a paragraph on the framework’s contribution to the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, delegates agreed to remove the brackets around a sentence noting that “progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals in all three dimensions is critical” for the framework’s success. They agreed to reorder the three dimensions to “economic, social, and environmental,” and to further add that the framework is not intended to duplicate other frameworks.

## Vision

39. The Co-Chairs proposed “Our vision is for a planet free of chemicals and waste harm and that promotes innovation for a sustainable future,” which can be translated into all six official UN languages. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries requested time to consult. Another delegate proposed modifying the proposed vision to refer to a planet “free of harm from chemicals and their wastes”, which received support from numerous delegates. One delegate generally supported the proposed vision as modified but omitting “their” wastes; another preferred “and associated waste,” which another delegate supported.
40. Co-Chair Torres proposed modifying the Co-Chairs’ proposal to read “Our vision is a planet free of harm from chemicals and waste that benefits from innovation for a sustainable future”.
41. Two delegates requested addition of “and its people” after “planet”. A group of countries objected, also expressing a preference for the original Co-Chairs’ proposal on a vision for a planet that “promotes” innovation for a sustainable future.
42. As there was no consensus on the new proposal, Co-Chair Torres said the entirely bracketed text in the consolidated document, offering three alternative visions, would be forwarded to ICCM5.

## Scope

43. The Co-Chairs proposed moving a paragraph on involvement of all relevant sectors and stakeholders across the life cycle, to the Introduction, which one delegate explicitly supported, and proposed a new paragraph, that “The scope of the framework instrument includes chemicals throughout the lifecycle across production and use as well as chemicals in products and waste. The framework instrument takes due account of the agreements that have been developed to date and is flexible enough to take account of new ones.”
44. Many delegates supported that proposal. Two delegates called for promoting sustainable development in the text and modification to “in their lifecycle”.
45. Two delegates called for reemphasizing the multisectoral dimension of chemicals and waste management.
46. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, supported by another delegate, preferred referring to the “framework” only. One delegate proposed changing “chemicals in products and waste” to “products, chemicals, and waste”. Another preferred changing “across production and use as well as chemicals in products and waste” to “including the production and use as well as the management of chemicals, products, and waste”, with another, speaking on behalf of a group of organizations, emphasizing chemicals and waste “management”. One delegate preferred “covers” rather than “includes”, while another suggested “encompasses”.
47. Two delegates queried “taking account of” existing instruments.
48. One delegate noted the importance of aligning with agreed language of the Sustainable Development Goals on chemicals and waste.
49. Another urged ensuring that the agreement covers lead, which kills 5 million people per year.
50. Subsequently, Co-Chair Williams proposed taking the two paragraphs on scope as they appear in the consolidated document to ICCM5, confirming that brackets around text sent to ICCM5 means the text is up for negotiation there.
51. In response to the query of one delegate, on behalf of a group of countries, the Co-Chair said the Co-Chairs’ proposal was not taken into account because there was no consensus on it and, where this was the case, the rule was to revert to the consolidated text. She said there was no alternative proposal so the paragraph would be taken forward to ICCM5 *ad referendum* as included in the consolidated document.
52. One delegate asked whether the Co-Chairs’ proposal, which would replace text in the consolidated document, could be taken to ICCM5 if it represents progress even if not fully agreed, preferring that to simply abandoning it by reverting to the consolidated document and thereby losing progress made. That suggestion received substantial support.
53. Co-Chair Williams responded that the Co-Chairs’ proposal had not gained consensus and no work done on it was recorded, although she expressed openness to the delegate’s suggestion with regard to scope.
54. The delegate clarified that there may be instances where no consensus exists on which of the texts to forward if both had brackets, but that no objection had been heard regarding forwarding the Co-Chairs’ proposed text to ICCM5 in order to keep the progress made at this session.

55. Some delegates asked if a Co-Chairs' proposal raised in plenary or in informal groups could also be taken forward to ICCM5, if that were the most advanced version of the text discussed.
56. Co-Chair Williams proposed forwarding the original Co-Chairs' proposal to ICCM5 in brackets, not negotiated, *ad referendum*, and, in answer to a query, she confirmed that every word was still open for discussion.
57. Numerous delegates expressed a preference for forwarding both the Co-Chairs' text and the text as it appeared in the consolidated document.
58. Ultimately it was agreed that both versions would be forwarded to the ICCM5.

## **Principles and approaches**

59. The Co-Chairs, noting brackets around the title, proposed changing it to "Considerations and approaches". One delegate supported that proposal with many other delegates expressed a preference for the original bracketed title.
60. On the only paragraph of Section IV, which gives guidance for implementation of the framework, with bracketed text highlighting "the Rio Declaration, including the common but differentiated responsibilities and polluters pay principles", the Co-Chairs proposed adding that implementation of the framework instrument "takes into account local, national, and regional circumstances and capabilities" and replacing the bracketed wording with reference to "the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the World Health Organization (WHO) Chemicals Road Map, and all International Labour Organization (ILO) fundamental Conventions, as appropriate, taking into account Annex B," with no reference to specific principles.
61. On Annex B, which is intended to amplify this section with a list of instruments and approaches from which guidance may be taken, several delegates expressed concerns. One remarked that it was outdated, with a lot of instruments missing from its list. Another suggested deleting Annex B altogether and just referring to a "clean, healthy, and sustainable environment" along with the recent United Nations General Assembly Resolution 76/300 on the human right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment.
62. Many delegates queried why the Co-Chairs' proposal had removed the paragraph's specific mention of "common but differentiated responsibilities" from the Rio Declaration. One delegate stressed the importance of finding a way to highlight important principles.
63. One delegate queried why the Co-Chairs proposed replacing a text with only one set of brackets—which had resulted from many hours of discussion—with a whole new paragraph, asking whether the process was supposed to address remaining brackets or replace them with wholly new approaches. Co-Chair Williams responded that their proposal was made in response to intersessional feedback received, which urged strengthening the paragraph, but it was for the delegates to decide if it should be used. She noted it might solve some problems in later paragraphs under the section on Principles and Approaches.
64. One delegate favored omitting reference to any specific instrument or process in the main text. Numerous delegates supported moving all principles and approaches to Annex B. One delegate suggested adding a paragraph in Annex B to clarify that it lists approaches for guidance, although another delegate preferred to remove Annex B altogether.
65. Two delegates preferred to state that implementation "should", instead of "will", be guided by principles and approaches. Others favored the Co-Chairs' proposal's reference to "will", one remarking that "will be guided" is soft anyway and the instrument is non-binding.
66. The Co-Chairs suggested that delegations interested in Annex B work together on a proposal.
67. In the subsection on Knowledge and Information, a paragraph on existing expertise within and among regions, Indigenous knowledge systems, and coordination and access to information, was agreed *ad referendum*.
68. The Co-Chairs proposed to delete an entirely bracketed paragraph stating that the implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste at all levels should be supported by the best available science. Their proposal was met with objections from numerous delegates.

69. Some delegates favored referring to implementation of ‘the framework’ rather than ‘the sound management of chemicals and waste’. Several delegations favored referring to chemicals and “their” waste rather than just “waste”.
70. On a paragraph on transparency, discussions focused on “appropriate” access to information on chemicals and their use as well as “appropriate access to” environmental information, with Co-Chair Williams suggesting retaining the first reference to appropriate access, to “information on chemicals and their use”, and deleting the second reference on appropriate access, to “environmental information”.
71. Many delegates agreed with the proposal while others suggested deleting both references to “appropriate” access, noting that access to information constitutes a fundamental right. Yet others preferred retaining both references.
72. Many supported reference to environmental “and health” information.
73. Delegates agreed on a paragraph addressing effective access to justice *ad referendum*.
74. On a paragraph on the contribution of the implementation of the sound management of chemicals and waste to the full enjoyment of human rights and human well-being and dignity, many delegates expressed their support, with two, one speaking on behalf of a group of countries suggesting inclusion of reference to the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 76/300 on the human right to a clean, healthy, and sustainable environment.
75. Two delegates suggested addressing the cross-cutting issue of waste by referring to “chemicals and their waste”. One delegate, supported by a few others, suggested a compromise referring to the contribution of “the framework’s” implementation rather than the contribution of implementation of “the sound management of chemicals and waste”.
76. Delegates discussed the title of a paragraph on people in vulnerable situations being disproportionately affected by exposure to chemicals and waste. Many supported references to “groups in vulnerable situations”. One delegate suggested “groups in society that are particularly vulnerable” or “people in vulnerable situations”. Another delegate suggested referring to “groups in vulnerable and at-risk situations”.
77. On a paragraph on gender equality, discussions focused on reference to the implementation of a Gender Action Plan. Many delegates supported retaining the reference, while one suggested removing it and another, keeping it in brackets. One delegate, supported by others, suggested referring to “gender-responsive” rather than “gender-inclusive” approaches.
78. On a paragraph on preventive approaches, delegates discussed whether to refer to prevention “of exposures to” or “of uses of” hazardous chemicals. Many delegates supported the Co-Chairs’ proposal to refer to prevention of exposures to hazardous chemicals. Two delegates, one speaking on behalf of a group of countries, preferred preventing uses of hazardous chemicals, opining that this formulation is broader.
79. On the same paragraph, many delegates supported the Co-Chairs’ proposal to refer to the development and use of safer and more sustainable chemicals.
80. On a paragraph on the precautionary approach, Co-Chair Williams suggested removing brackets around the principle that lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for “postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation or harm to human health,” but keeping brackets around the same principle with regard to “not implementing preventative measures”.
81. Numerous delegates expressed support for that suggestion. Others favored deleting the paragraph given it singled out one Rio Declaration principle, which would lead to other delegates wanting to include their preferred principles as well, as in the case of this paragraph and the following one stating that trade policy measures for environmental purposes should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or disguise restriction on international trade. One delegate urged that if the text were kept it should quote the relevant Rio Principle language verbatim. Other delegates preferred specifically referring only to “principle 15 of Rio” and deleting the rest.
82. One delegate noted that the Rio Declaration refers to the precautionary ‘principle’ but the paragraph in question referred to “approach”, preferring to refer simply to “precaution”. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, voiced support for this if the paragraph were kept, while another, favored keeping “principle”.
83. The Co-Chairs noted overwhelming support for the precautionary approach in itself, but different views on referring only to the Rio Declaration or pulling out specific language from it, and postponed discussion on a paragraph on trade restrictions.
84. The paragraph on just transition was agreed *ad referendum*.

85. On an entirely bracketed paragraph on collaboration and participation, during a discussion on networks, partnerships and mechanisms for effective capacity-building, work, and exchange of information, the Co-Chairs proposed to replace some part of bracketed text on “strengthened North-South and South-South cooperation with technology transfer, access to financing and exchange of information in line with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities” with “and a strengthened technology transfer on mutually agreed terms”.
86. One delegate asked whether this proposal was intended to replace the entirety of the bracketed text, noting the “mixing up” of technology cooperation, technology transfer, and financing in this paragraph and saying that the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities is not related to everything, particularly South-South cooperation. The intervention received support from one delegate while others suggested deleting the bracketed text. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, requested deletion of the entire paragraph if the content is addressed elsewhere in the text as noted in a footnote.
87. One delegate suggested replacing technology transfer ‘on mutually agreed terms’ with more detailed language from Sustainable Development Goal 17.7. Others preferred keeping the consolidated text paragraph as written, including explicit reference to common but differentiated responsibilities.
88. The Co-Chairs said they would produce a further iteration based on those comments.
89. Subsequently, delegates addressed a bracketed paragraph noting that implementation of the framework should be guided “by the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, including the common but differentiated responsibilities and the polluters pay principles” and, as appropriate, by Annex B (containing a list of conventions and other instruments). Following discussion, the paragraph was forwarded to ICCM5 with the brackets.
90. On Annex B, Co-Chair Williams reported that an informal group addressed the annex, mainly reordering it for easy access. Hearing that some additions had been made, some delegates said they would need further time to study the document. One delegate suggested including WHO’s Global Action Plan on Microbial Resistance. Two delegates proposed including reference to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, further adding that it should be noted that the list “includes but is not limited to” the listed conventions and instruments. Other delegates suggested deleting reference to the UN Human Rights Council Report on the rights of the child and hazardous substances and wastes, noting that is a report by the Special Rapporteur and not an intergovernmental decision. One delegate requested bracketing Annex B’s title, “Principles and approaches”. Another delegate, opposed by two others, suggested reverting to the text of the consolidated document.
91. Co-Chair Williams noted that the paragraphs agreed in plenary together with those containing brackets were agreed *ad referendum* and would be forwarded to ICCM5.

## **Strategic Objectives and Targets**

92. Delegates did not agree to unbracketed paragraph 1 introducing strategic objectives to guide stakeholders. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, urged inclusion of “and targets”. Another noted that this paragraph was a package with the next, bracketed, paragraph (1bis) that had been proposed by a group of delegates. This statement received substantial support. Another delegate suggested looking at 1bis in the context of Strategic Objective E while one, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, suggested its deletion.
93. Delegates agreed to keep 1bis bracketed, monitor related informal discussions taking place on finance, and come back to it at a later stage.
94. Subsequently, delegates addressed the bracketed paragraph, which notes that “in order to achieve these strategic objectives adequate [and sustainable] financial and non-financial resources need to be identified and mobilized; and necessary transparent and accountable partnerships need to be established to foster cooperation among stakeholders”.
95. Two delegates suggested deletion, noting that the paragraph was duplicative with the section on financial considerations. Two others noted that the paragraph was critical for the commitment regarding the strategic objectives and targets, suggesting retaining it and removing the brackets.
96. Co-Chair Williams suggested, and delegates agreed on, keeping the text in brackets, adopting it *ad referendum*, and forwarding it to ICCM5.

## **Strategic Objectives**



97. On Strategic Objective A, Co-Chair Williams emphasized that the objective's formulation as given in the consolidated document includes responsible actors and thus its formulation differs from the other four strategic objectives. She suggested, and delegates agreed on, discussing an alternative proposal by the Co-Chairs, which notes the need for legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms and capacity to be in place to support and achieve the safe and sustainable management of chemicals and waste.
98. A delegate, supported by many others, proposed adding that the safe and sustainable management of chemicals refers to their whole lifecycle.
99. Two delegates reiterated their preference for a reference to "chemicals and their waste", with Co-Chair Williams noting that this was a cross-cutting issue that would be discussed under the framework's scope. Two other delegates suggested further discussing reference to "capacity", with Co-Chair Williams pointing to the discussions under the relevant informal group.
100. Subsequently, delegates continued deliberations on this strategic objective, addressing a Co-Chairs' proposal stating the objective to have "legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms and capacities in place to support and achieve the safe and sustainable management of chemicals throughout the lifecycle and waste".
101. Delegates discussed cross-cutting issues on "sound management" versus "safe and sustainable management" and on chemicals and "their" waste. Two delegates suggested bracketing those parts until a final decision was made.
102. Co-Chair Williams noted that the final agreement on those cross-cutting issues will be applied throughout the document.
103. Deliberations also focused on the reference to "management of chemicals throughout the lifecycle and waste". One delegate suggested referring to "management of chemicals and waste throughout the lifecycle." Another proposed "management of chemicals throughout the lifecycle, including waste". Yet another expressed concerns, noting that waste is a stage of the lifecycle of chemicals. Two delegates supported the original Co-Chairs' proposal.
104. Following further discussions, delegates agreed to keep in brackets the reference to the lifecycle of chemicals: Strategic Objective A that "Legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms and capacities are in place to support and achieve the safe and sustainable management of [chemicals and waste throughout the lifecycle]". This Strategic Objective was agreed *ad referendum*.
105. Strategic Objective B, on generation, availability, and accessibility of knowledge, data, and information was agreed *ad referendum*.
106. On unbracketed Strategic Objective C, on issues of concern, one delegate asked how these are to be prioritized, particularly for developing countries, but others urged not re-opening unbracketed text. Delegates agreed Strategic Objective C *ad referendum*.
107. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, proposed to submit explanatory text on the strategic objectives. Co-Chair Williams proposed that could be done through a conference room paper with new text at ICCM5.
108. On Strategic Objective D, on safer alternatives and innovative and sustainable solutions, many delegates supported deleting a bracketed reference to "relevant" product value chains as it could engender uncertainty. Others favored keeping it. The text was left open.
109. Subsequently, delegates agreed to delete reference to "relevant" product value chains: Strategic Objective D: "Safer alternatives and innovative and sustainable solutions in product value chains are in place so that benefits to human health and the environment are maximized and risks are prevented or, where not feasible, minimized". This Strategic Objective was agreed *ad referendum*.
110. On Strategic Objective E, Co-Chair Williams noted that this objective was about mainstreaming and that some of the associated targets did not fit well under the existing formulation of the Strategic Objective. She asked whether delegates would agree to discuss an alternative formulation, put forth by the Co-Chairs in the relevant non-paper, which noted that enhanced implementation occurs through increased resource mobilization, partnerships, cooperation, capacity building, and inclusive decision making.
111. Many delegates supported the Co-Chair's proposal, while one delegate supported the original formulation. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, noted that further discussions on the proposal could continue depending on the outcomes of the discussions in the group on financial considerations. Some delegates suggested referring to "effective" rather than "increased" resource mobilization, while one delegate suggested referring to both increased and effective resource mobilization. One delegate, speaking on behalf of

a group of organizations, suggested referring to “integration into all relevant decision-making processes”, rather than “inclusive decision-making”.

112. Subsequently, following further discussions, Strategic Objective E: “Enhanced implementation occurs through increased and effective resource mobilisation, partnerships, co-operation, capacity building, and integration into all relevant decision-processes” was agreed *ad referendum*.

### **Targets**

113. Co-Chair Williams opened discussion on Targets using the consolidated text. She proposed three classifications of actors:

- countries: distinct legislative and enforcement authorities within relevant jurisdictions;
- private sector: the chemical and waste industry, value chain, major economic and retail sectors, finance, and investors; and
- stakeholders: all of the above plus intergovernmental organizations, international institutions, NGOs, and those involved in, but not limited to, labour, health, agriculture, environment, development, and science areas.

114. One delegate urged adding “governments” to the list of stakeholders and specifying stakeholders “within the instrument”.

115. Another cautioned that “stakeholders” was too broad and that no responsibility for specific targets was given to any specific actors, suggesting consideration of stakeholders in the context of specific targets.

116. Two delegates suggested either not defining a list of specific “stakeholders” or including academia and communities in general in the list.

117. Another delegate favored referring to “governments” rather than “countries” and queried how and where those labels will be used.

118. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, noted that the private sector is typically included in the category of stakeholders and queried its separation given the multistakeholder approach of this process.

119. The Co-Chairs explained that the proposed classification would only be for use within Section V part B, on Targets, in order to avoid having to specify actors within individual targets because numerous targets have many stakeholders. She announced the establishment of an informal group, facilitated by Mari-Liis Ummik (Estonia) to take into account these proposed groupings and discuss several targets that were cited during regional and virtual briefings and bilateral discussions as needing further consideration: A5, A7, B2, Alt B2, B3, and Alt D5. She mandated the group to report back to plenary on Sunday morning with clean proposals for these targets.

120. Subsequently, co-facilitator Ummik reported on the informal group’s discussions. She stressed that the group addressed Target A5 (export of substances that countries have prohibited nationally) without reaching agreement, despite the spirit of compromise. On Target A7 (use of Highly Hazardous Pesticides), participants in the informal group had almost reached compromise, with some details remaining to finalize discussions.

121. She said further work would be needed on Target B5 (educational, training, and public awareness programmes on chemical safety). On Target B2 (on stakeholders in the value chain using at the minimum a globally harmonized minimum cross-sectoral transparency standard to ensure that reliable information on chemicals is available and publicly accessible), the group was able to agree on one of the two alternative version, but further work would be needed. On Target B3 (data generation on chemicals, releases and emissions of chemicals and waste to the environment), the group initiated a discussion but could not clear the text due to lack of time.

122. Subsequently, Co-Chair Williams announced progress in the informal group and said no objections had been heard on using the three actor classifications proposed in formulating the targets. She called for cleaning up the targets from the consolidated text as much as possible in plenary so that discussions on other parts of the text could be taken on board.

123. Regarding the actor classifications, one delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, asked how they were to be enshrined in the text, noting that some stakeholder groups identified in Rio in 1992 were not reflected in the Co-Chairs’ classifications. Co-Chair Williams agreed that it would be helpful to have the groupings appear in the core text somewhere and asked for suggestions on how to make “stakeholders” more comprehensive.

124. One delegate asked how the cluster of informal stakeholders in developing countries, which cuts across sectors, fit into the classification. Co-Chair Williams said that would have to be addressed later.
125. She then asked delegates to focus on the content in the targets, not the bracketed dates.
126. On bracketed wording in Target A1 on legal frameworks and institutional capacities, the Co-Chair proposed retaining “by 2030” and opting for “countries” rather than “governments”.
127. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, urged that implementation and enforcement be put into the present tense as they are ongoing. This was supported by several other delegates.
128. One delegate, as well as another speaking on behalf of a group of countries, expressed concern about the date. Two delegates requested its deletion; another asked what having ‘been adopted’ by a deadline meant. Others stressed the importance of having a timeline, one citing the target’s links to the Sustainable Development Agenda deadline of 2030, another noting previous failed deadlines of 2000 and 2020, and a third commenting that having a deadline for “adoption” did not mean that development could not continue.
129. There was no objection to retaining “countries” in lieu of “governments” but the date was kept bracketed and the text left open.
130. On a date denoted as “20xx” in Target A4 on illegal trade and traffic of chemicals and waste, the Co-Chairs proposed to confirm a deadline of “2030”. Many delegates expressed support for this. One noted that the date was pragmatic and another that such trade and traffic was already illegal. One delegate noted problems preventing illegal trade and traffic of chemicals and waste despite strong national laws.
131. One delegate cautioned that there was a lot of illegal traffic in their region, such as in pesticides, but meeting the deadline would be difficult without capacity building first, which requires resources, and expressing doubt that the deadline could be reached, given the conversations going on. Two others expressed concern about committing to this deadline on behalf of all stakeholders or about feasibility given national complexities but expressed no preference for a different date.
132. The date “2030” was inserted and bracketed.
133. On Target B4, on appropriate guidelines and best available practices for assessments and sound management, one delegate suggested basing the discussion on the Co-Chairs’ proposal. This received support and was done.
134. Several delegates favored deleting a reference to applying standardized “guidelines”.
135. Two delegates noted that “standardized tools”, which had been bracketed in the consolidated document, are necessary because they reduce costs for industries and governments.
136. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, suggested reinstating wording from the consolidated document that it is “risk” that is to be assessed, and adding “hazards”, and called for deleting reference in the Co-Chairs’ proposed Target to “prevention of harm, risk reduction, monitoring, and enforcement”.
137. One delegate cautioned that risk analysis of hazard would not produce information on the global burden of disease and expressed preference for broader assessments.
138. Two delegates opposed the Co-Chairs’ proposed timeline of “by 2035” one suggesting until countries have means of implementation. This date was bracketed.
139. Delegates agreed to send the targets to the informal group. Co-Chair Williams prioritized getting clean text on content first and then considering dates.
140. Subsequently, Co-Chair Torres presented the outcome of the informal group discussion on targets to plenary. She noted the small group discussions had resulted in new bracketed text on Targets A7 (Highly Hazardous Pesticides in agriculture), B1 (data and information), B2 (value chains), B3 (data on production and emissions), B4 (guidelines, best practices, and risk assessments), new BX (exposure in humans), and Alt. D5 (safer agricultural practices), and noted that A1 and A4 had only been discussed in plenary.
141. There was substantial support for moving the informal group outcomes on targets to ICCM5 *ad referendum*, to replace the texts in the consolidated document.
142. In response to one delegate’s query, informal group facilitator Ummik noted that two versions of Target A7 had come out of the informal group. She said that in order not to send two almost-agreed alternatives to ICCM5 those two versions had been merged.

143. Co-Chair Torres explained that in other targets, where the informal group had extensive discussions but did not reach agreement, the consolidated text was not changed and would be forwarded *ad referendum* to ICCM5. One delegate explicitly supported this mode of procedure.
144. Several delegates, including one speaking on behalf of a group of countries, called for reintegrating bracketed text on regional data from earlier work of the informal group that had disappeared in the informal group's final outcomes, noting that some products are banned in some regions but still in use in others. Co-Chair Torres said that view would be considered.
145. In response to another delegate's query, the Co-Chair confirmed that Target A2 (Code of Conduct), which was entirely bracketed in that consolidated document, would be forwarded to ICCM5.
146. Another delegate queried whether it was ever agreed that the consolidated document version of A5, or the informal group's bracketed outcome on A7, would be forwarded to ICCM5 after lengthy discussions proved inconclusive, but ultimately agreed that the informal group's version of A7 represented progress that should be forwarded.
147. On Targets E1 (policies for sound management), E2 (partnerships and networks), E3 (financial resources), E4 (gaps between developed and developing countries), and E5 (cost recovery mechanisms) Co-Chair Torres reported some progress in the informal group. There was no objection to forwarding the work of the informal group on those targets to ICCM5 *ad referendum*.
148. Delegates agreed that all other targets would remain as in the consolidated document to be forwarded to ICCM5 *ad referendum*, given that they were not discussed either in informal groups or in plenary, although one delegate opined that this did not reflect what really happened.

### **Mechanisms to support implementation**

149. Co-Chair Williams suggested, and delegates agreed to, extending the mandate of the informal group established under institutional arrangements, co-facilitated by Noluzuko Gwayi (South Africa) and Karissa Kovner (United States), to address the section on mechanisms to support implementation.
150. Subsequently, the outcome of the informal group's discussions, which contained clean text, was agreed *ad referendum*.

### **Issues of Concern**

151. Delegates agreed to Co-Chair Williams' suggestion extending the mandate of the informal group on institutional arrangements, co-facilitated by Noluzuko Gwayi and Karissa Kovner, to address the section on issues of concern.
152. Subsequently, co-facilitator Gwayi announced that all brackets in the section on issues of concern and the Annex had been cleared. She said paragraph 2 on "including" capacity was still to be discussed and thanked participants for their spirit of compromise and the progress made.
153. The outcome of the informal group's discussions, which contained clean text, including the Annex, was agreed *ad referendum*.

### **Capacity building**

154. Co-Chair Torres introduced the section and invited delegates to address the text as included in the consolidated document.
155. On a paragraph on a government, voluntary peer review to support implementation efforts and build capacity, delegates discussed, among other things, whether the process should be peer-reviewed.
156. Two delegates, one speaking on behalf of a group of countries, supported using the Co-Chairs' non-paper as the basis for further discussion.
157. One delegate requested clarification on the Secretariat's role in facilitating the review process, including cost implications and on whether "peer review" meant review by members of the future framework. She further proposed considering aggregating the capacity-building paragraphs with those on financial considerations in a single section on "resources consideration" for coherence and consistency.

158. Another delegate stressed that peer reviews are an important aspect of the framework, highlighting their voluntary nature and emphasizing that they should be demand-driven, supporting parties that request such a review.
159. Yet another delegate stressed that peer reviews can be a waste of time and resources, urging utilization of the available resources for effective capacity-building measures, and suggesting deletion of the paragraph on peer reviews. Another requested clarifications on how the peer reviews will assist capacity building.
160. On the rest of the paragraphs under the section on capacity building, Co-Chair Torres noted that the consolidated text contained two alternative formulations.
161. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, expressed a preference for working on one of the two alternatives, adding that establishing an informal group might be an efficient way forward.
162. One delegate drew attention to its proposal for the establishment of a platform for a capacity building hub, submitted as an information document. Others opposed creating a database that would take resources from the Secretariat without any dedicated funding for it. One delegate requested including the proposals in the meeting's report.
163. Co-Chair Torres introduced a Co-Chairs' proposal as presented in the relevant non-paper.
164. Many delegates expressed support for the proposal. Others noted missing elements, including technology transfer, technology co-development, and references to financial resources, with most preferring to continue work on the basis of the consolidated text.
165. A discussion ensued on whether the mandate of the informal group on finance should be expanded to also address capacity-building issues. Co-Chair Torres announced that no amendments would be made to the mandate and the group would continue addressing the finance-related targets as mandated.
166. Two delegates requested clarity on the modalities for further discussions on capacity building, stressing that if another informal group were to be formed it should be on capacity building, as the issue of most interest. Co-Chair Williams confirmed that the consolidated document would be used as the basis for discussions and noted that it would be up to delegates to develop a text that everyone considered acceptable to transmit to ICCM5.
167. Subsequently, Co-Chair Williams noted that a wide range of views had prevented consensus and suggested forwarding the text in the consolidated document to ICCM5 for further consideration.
168. One delegate noted that a small informal discussion using the Co-Chairs' non-paper on capacity building as basis for deliberations had resulted in a new text and suggested forwarding it to ICCM5 for further discussion. Another delegate noted that they also conducted informal work, stressing that several different proposals exist.
169. Co-Chair Williams noted divergent views and suggested, with delegates agreeing, that the section on capacity building of the consolidated text be agreed *ad referendum* and forwarded to ICCM5, where additional proposals could also be discussed.

## **Financial considerations**

170. Co-Chair Torres introduced this part of the consolidated document, noting it includes a description of the integrated approach to financing and its three pillars, ideas to mobilize resources including new financial arrangements, and proposals to increase funding from all sources.
171. She drew attention to the relevant Co-Chairs' non-paper, which aimed to streamline the section on financial considerations, noting that some parts had been transformed into possible targets to enhance accountability and impact. The Co-Chairs' text also proposed a reference to the need for new financial arrangements to support implementation.
172. On the section's chapeau, Co-Chair Torres noted that two alternative formulations were contained in the consolidated document. She observed that one of them was mostly bracket-free, indicating a high level of consensus among stakeholders, and suggested addressing a streamlined version of that paragraph as contained in the Co-Chairs' non-paper. It notes that adequate, predictable, and sustainable financing, technical, assistance, capacity building, and technology transfer on mutually agreed terms are essential to achieve the objectives and targets of the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.
173. Two delegates agreed to the Co-Chairs' proposal. Others noted that additional work was needed on the basis of the consolidated text, taking into account the suggestions contained in the non-paper.

174. One delegate noted that the streamlined version of the chapeau was “moving towards the right direction” but said not including a chapeau at all should be considered and suggested moving to the substantive parts of the section.
175. Emphasizing that the suggestion under discussion was agreed language, two delegates proposed reinstating a sentence on the participation of representatives in the integrated approach to financing of all involved stakeholders and sectors at national, regional, and international levels.
176. One delegate suggested to incorporate technology transfer using agreed language from Sustainable Development Goal 17.7, which addresses the dissemination and diffusion of environmentally sound technologies to developing countries on favourable terms, including on concessional and preferential terms, as mutually agreed.
177. On the section on an integrated approach to financing, Co-Chair Torres proposed to replace four paragraphs of the consolidated document with two corresponding paragraphs from the Co-Chairs’ non-paper.
178. Many delegates supported the proposal. Some urged consistency on the use of “sound” or “safe and sustainable” management, favoring the former. Two delegates opined that safe and sustainable management is easier for decision makers to comprehend.
179. Some delegates stressed that many delegations had been working on the consolidated text, and suggested focusing on that and considering proposals contained in the non-paper at a later stage. One delegate suggested circulating that text, in particular if discussions were going to continue in an informal group setting.
180. Following discussions, Co-Chair Torres suggested, and delegates agreed on, establishing an informal group to continue deliberations with the mandate to consider the section on financial considerations, using the consolidated text as the basis for its work and the non-paper, if needed. The informal group was co-facilitated by Mr. Jonah Ormond (Antigua & Barbuda) and Mr. Premysl Stepanek (Czech Republic).
181. Some delegates expressed appreciation for the Co-Chairs’ efforts and expressed readiness to continue discussions in the informal group.
182. Subsequently, co-facilitator Ormond reported on the informal group’s progress, noting that the group had based their discussions on the consolidated document, taking into account the Co-Chairs’ non-paper of proposals. He said the group did not discuss the chapeau or paragraphs already discussed in plenary but made some progress on mainstreaming and private sector involvement and made a start on dedicated external financing. He thanked participants for their willingness to compromise. Co-Chair Torres mandated the group to continue its discussions to consider Targets E1, E2, E3, E4, and E5 of the consolidated document, taking into account paragraphs 10 and 12 of Section IX on Financial considerations in the consolidated document and proposed targets E1, E3, EX, and EY in the Co-Chairs’ non-paper.
183. The Co-Chairs announced that targets under Strategic Objective E would be discussed in the informal group on financial considerations.
184. Subsequently, co-facilitator Stepanek reported that the group worked on the basis of the consolidated document and noted diverging views on the section on dedicated external financing. The group was able to agree on a paragraph on the establishment of and engagement in multisectoral partnerships. Brackets remained in a paragraph on financing the Secretariat.
185. He said the group also addressed finance-related targets, almost reaching agreement on Target E1, but that additional work remained on Target E2, while the remaining targets had not been addressed due to lack of time. The group noted that E6 is not a financial target and recommended that it be addressed by the informal group on targets.
186. Noting that more time was needed to finalize discussions, Co-Chair Torres suggested the group continue its work.
187. Subsequently, Co-Chair Torres noted that brackets remained in various paragraphs, adding that some were not discussed, and suggested forwarding the text as contained in the consolidated document to ICCM5.
188. Following requests for clarification and explanations from co-facilitator Stepanek, Co-Chair Torres stated that: the chapeau and paragraphs 1-5, 10, 10alt, and 12-17 would be forwarded to ICCM5 as per the consolidated text; paragraphs 6, 8, 11, 18, 19, 21 contained no brackets and would be forwarded to ICCM5 as such; and paragraphs 6bis, 7, 9, and 20 would be forwarded to ICCM5 as contained in the informal group’s outcome document.
189. Two delegates recalled the discussion to relocate the section on financing the Secretariat under Institutional Arrangements.

## **Institutional arrangements**

190. Co-Chair Williams suggested, and delegates agreed on, convening an informal group on aspects of institutional arrangements, co-facilitated by Noluzuko Gwayi and Karissa Kovner, with the mandate to produce clean text on institutional arrangements and timeframes for reporting as described in footnote 21 of the consolidated document (SAICM/IP.4/12).
191. Co-facilitator Kovner reported back that the group was able to conclude its work, clearing all brackets in the text. She noted that a couple of brackets required input from other informal groups that were still in discussions, such as a set of brackets on issues of concern and the measurability annex.
192. Subsequently, the plenary resumed deliberations on the subsection on an international conference, subparagraphs i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi, vii, viii, ix, and x, xi, xii, xiii, xiv, xv, xvi, and xvii under the paragraph on the function of the international conference, which were then agreed *ad referendum*.
193. On a paragraph on stakeholders to be invited to attend the international conference, one delegate, with some support, said civil society should be included, and noted all stakeholders are full members, not “attendees”. Co-Chair Williams said this would be clarified throughout the document on the basis of further group discussions, and left the paragraph open. Another delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, said the industry sector should be listed among stakeholders specified in the paragraph.
194. On the subsection on the Bureau of the international conference, regarding two alternative bracketed paragraphs, the first was cleared *ad referendum* and the alternative was removed. One delegate speaking on behalf of a group of organizations, asked how diversity of stakeholders across multiple dimensions will be ensured in the Bureau, given the multistakeholder and multi-sectoral nature of this process as well as the principle of equitable geographical representation.
195. On the subsection on the Secretariat, subparagraphs i, ii, iii, and iv under paragraph 1 were agreed *ad referendum*.
196. Subsequently, Co-Chair Williams noted that most paragraphs had been agreed, adding that some remaining contentious points were clarified following agreement on the section on issues of concern. She invited delegates to address a bracketed paragraph, noting that “the international conference should invite stakeholders from the environment, health, labour and agriculture sectors involved in chemicals management and safety issues, as well as strengthening financial support for developing countries and countries with economies in transition to attend to the meeting”. She suggested replacing it with “the international conference should invite stakeholders from all relevant sectors to attend and participate in the meeting.”
197. A delegate requested deletion of “attend” as all stakeholders, not just governments, are participants. Two delegates proposed retaining the original formulation, adding reference to industry, and removing the brackets.
198. Following discussions, delegates agreed *ad referendum* that “the international conference should invite stakeholders from the environment, health, labour, industry, and agriculture sectors involved in chemicals management and safety issues, to participate to the meeting”.

## **Taking stock of progress**

199. Co-Chair Williams reminded delegates that the informal group on institutional arrangements was mandated to address the timeframes for reporting and invited them to focus on the remaining text under this section, which was clean in the consolidated document.
200. Delegates agreed *ad referendum* to seven out of eight paragraphs in this section without comment, as included in the non-paper containing the outcome of the informal group on institutional arrangements.
201. On a paragraph on a measurability structure, illustrating the different categories of indicators that may be used to track progress, Co-Chair Williams noted that the Co-Chairs produced a non-paper clarifying the types of indicators a measurability structure would include.
202. The proposal notes that a measurability structure illustrating different categories of indicators may include, but not be limited to: high level indicators to measure progress towards the vision, such as the global burden of disease attributable to chemicals and waste, and the global environmental burden attributed to chemicals and waste; headline indicators to support the measure against the strategic objectives; and impact indicators

- that measure actions taken; and progress indicators that track changes in status related to the effects chemicals and waste can produce or initiate.
203. One delegate requested clarifications on the global burden of disease, which were provided by the representative of WHO noting that such methodology is feasible.
  204. One delegate suggested clarifying that headline indicators will support “measurement” against the strategic objectives. Another delegate emphasized the need to have a proper set of indicators for every specific target, with Co-Chair Williams noting that work will need to continue once the new framework is adopted to define those indicators.
  205. A delegate bemoaned a lack of clarity on the high-level and impact indicators and suggested establishing a working group to address these indicators during the intersessional period between ICCM5 and the next international conference. Another drew attention to process indicators contained in the document, stressing their usefulness.
  206. One delegate, speaking on behalf of a group of countries, expressed appreciation for the proposal, noting that headline indicators will be burdensome to agree upon and opining that impact indicators are sufficient. The group further urged delegates to make an effort to adopt a set of indicators at this meeting, potentially linked to 2030-bound targets, adding that further intersessional work will be important to conclude the full set of indicators.
  207. One delegate suggested referring, under high level indicators, to the global environmental “and biodiversity” burden attributed to chemicals and waste.
  208. Another delegate offered editorial amendments on the chapeau and noted that the use of high-level indicators depends on how specific and developed the objectives are, adding that a number of assumptions will be needed to identify impacts related to the global burden of disease and the global environmental burden attributed to chemicals and waste. He suggested that impact indicators measure “results achieved” and progress indicators track “actions taken” related to the effects that chemicals and waste can produce or initiate.
  209. Co-Chair Williams suggested, and delegates agreed on, establishing an informal group, facilitated by Ms. Itsuki Kuroda (Japan), to further discuss the measurability structure, taking into account the Co-Chairs’ non-paper on measurability and the views expressed in plenary.
  210. Subsequently, facilitator Kuroda reported back on the group’s deliberations noting that, following hard work in a spirit of compromise, the group was able to largely agree on the paragraph on the measurability structure under the section on taking stock of progress. She said that additional discussions would be needed on the two high level indicators since they refer to the overall vision, which had not yet been finalized.
  211. The informal group further addressed Annex C, which lays out the measurability structure, largely clearing the text. Facilitator Kuroda noted that amendments would be needed on a figure illustrating the structure to reflect the agreement reached in the informal group, tasking the Secretariat in that regard. She stressed the need to further operationalize the measurability structure for tracking progress through a resolution.
  212. Delegates agreed to Co-Chair Torres’ suggestion to task the Secretariat with developing a draft resolution text on the measurability structure.
  213. Subsequently, Co-Chair Torres noted that most of the text (paragraphs 1-7) had been agreed *ad referendum*, but that two sub-sub-paragraphs that resulted from the work of the informal group on the measurability structure work remained bracketed, regarding high-level indicators to measure progress towards the vision in the areas of: “a. Global burden of disease attributable to chemicals and waste” and “b. Global environmental burden attributed to chemicals and waste”, along with one bracketed sentence in Annex C, which illustrates the different categories of indicators that may be used.
  214. One delegate noted that lacking an agreement on vision it would be impossible to agree on the two high-level indicators in brackets. Delegates agreed to forward that main text to ICCM5 *ad referendum*.
  215. In Annex C, two delegations, one speaking on behalf of a group of countries, suggested deletion of bracketed text on the measurability structure and its indicators addressing all the components of the framework “[through to the impact of the implementation programmes and financial flows]” (Figure 1), however, its deletion was opposed by another delegate.
  216. Upon one delegate’s query on whether “Figure 1” should also be in brackets and the informal group facilitator’s response that it was not bracketed, two other delegates called for bracketing the figure.
  217. Delegates agreed *ad referendum* to forward Annex C to ICCM5 with the brackets.



## **Revising and updating the framework**

218. Co-Chair Williams proposed establishing an informal group to further develop the text on Section XII of the consolidated document (revising and updating the framework), with a mandate to propose text on how to revise and update the framework instrument, including the relevant annexes.
219. The Co-Chairs said they would produce a further iteration of draft text based on these comments.
220. Subsequently, facilitator Stadler Trengove, UNEP Legal Officer reported progress in the informal group discussions, noting agreement on retaining the current process to revise or update the instrument but setting out a more flexible process for revising or updating any annex in light of new scientific evidence or new methodologies.
221. The Co-Chairs agreed to give the group more time to further the discussion and finalize any changes to the section.
222. Subsequently, one delegate requested insertion of a paragraph 1bis to state that the “international conference may update or revise any annex of the framework in light of scientific, policy, technological, or technical developments, or available new methodologies.” This was done and bracketed.
223. The section, including brackets, was agreed *ad referendum* for forwarding to ICCM5.

## **VI. Closure of the meeting**

224. On Sunday evening, Co-Chair Williams noted, and delegates confirmed, that two sets of recommendations would be forwarded to ICCM5. Part I of the package contains the draft framework instrument for consideration by ICCM5. Part II contains the draft resolutions, which include: Those that the secretariat was requested to prepare under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the intersessional process, the draft resolution on measurability developed by the secretariat following the request by the intersessional process at its resumed fourth meeting, and draft resolution text proposed during the fourth meeting of the intersessional process.
225. Co-Chair Williams thanked all delegates and closed the meeting on Monday 25 September at 1.05 am.