SAICM UN environment

STRATEGIC APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL CHEMICALS MANAGEMENT

6th Latin America and Caribbean regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, Montevideo, Uruguay, 6-7 May 2022

AGENDA ITEM 4 c) ii. Virtual Working Group 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation

Presenter : Karissa Kovner, USA

Virtual Working Groups

VWG 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation

Co-Facilitators: Karissa Kovner, USA
Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, Thailand

Make proposals that progress work on the following topics in lead-up to IP4. Specific tasks include:

(i) National, sub-regional, regional, international, sectoral and stakeholder cooperation and coordination
(ii) Science-policy interface
(iii) Mechanisms for taking stock of progress
(iv) Mechanisms for updating the framework
(v) Consider subsidiary and ad hoc bodies, including the OEWG

Detailed Mandate for Sections B, C, D, E, G, and H

Review the entire text of the compilation of recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, for consideration by the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management ([SAICM/IP.4/2](#)), bearing in mind the need for enhanced sectoral and stakeholder engagement, including in particular section VI, subsection D on enhanced sectoral and stakeholder engagement.

Detailed Mandate for the Science Policy Interface

Building on document SAICM/IP.4/4, develop a proposal that:

(i) Articulates the rationale or need for a science-policy interface for the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020;

(ii) Describes the potential functions of such an interface;

(iii) Recommends the approach to best achieve the science-policy interface functions, either within or outside the "beyond 2020 framework";

(iv) If within the "beyond 2020 framework", establish the science-policy interface; or, if necessary, create a process to establish it for consideration by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its sixth session.

Process Metrics

214 People registered in this VWG from all SAICM stakeholder groups, sectors and all UN regions

8 Virtual meetings held between October 2020 and February 2021 & 5 rounds of electronic feedback

62 Electronic submissions from SAICM stakeholders received and processed.

✓ The IP3 compilation document SAICM/IP.4/2 served as a basis for textual deliberations

✓ All relevant documents can be found on the SAICM website

Outcomes: The Co-facilitators' Final Report

Part I: Textual recommendations (Sections B, C, D, E, G, and H)

Part II: Recommendations for the establishment of a Science-Policy Interface

Part III: Recommendations for further consideration of issues in the "Parking Lot"

- Section B is related to National Implementation

- Section C is about the role of regions

- Section D is about enhanced sectoral and stakeholder engagement

- Section E is on subsidiary bodies and ad hoc expert groups

- Section G is about reporting and is entitled "Taking Stock of Progress"

- Section H provides a mechanism for updating or revising the framework

- **Process Highlights**

  ➢ Much of mandate was to facilitate progress in areas where text already existed
  ➢ Review of IP3, open discussion, written comments, co-facilitators text, stakeholder discussions (Section C, IOMC), return to issues, summaries
  ➢ Provide general understanding
  ➢ Work through issues
  ➢ Meld the views together
  ➢ Highlight areas for resolution versus areas of unresolvable policy differences
  ➢ Creation of the Parking Lot – good example of how we worked; let's talk about this first and then come back to the individual sections

- Consolidated and highlighted issues that need further discussion.

- Issues that the group or members of the group agreed it either did not want to overlook or would not be able to resolve until a later stage of the IP.

- Issues range from strongly held views of certain stakeholders to ideas that were suggested but not discussed.

Further dialogue to take place on issues listed in the "Parking Lot"

Progress:

- Good discussion and general agreement on:
  - ➤ what the role of the focal point should be (paragraph 1),
  - ➤ the importance of the stakeholders/sectors (paragraph 3),
  - ➤ the importance of tailoring national action plans (paragraph 4) and effective implementation (paragraph 5), and
  - ➤ the importance of reporting, but non-duplicative reporting (paragraph 4)
- Recognition of some bigger policy issues that this VWG did not need to resolve:
  - ➤ Scope
  - ➤ Waste

To be worked on:

- Designate a technical, political , or both national focus point
- Opportunity for consultations with sectors and stakeholders within the national process
- Who can do an action plan?
- What is being reported?
- Ensure vs. promote

Progress:

- No brackets in the text

- Strong role for regions to play, including together

To be worked on:

- Does international belong in the title?

- Section D: National Implementation

  - Good discussion and general agreement building on the work we had done in Bangkok

  - Recognition of the importance of engagement from the IOMC and others

  - Includes footnotes for "bracket" issues

  - Notes potential for duplication in Sections A and/or G

  - Raises the question of whether there is a role for UNGA

- Section E: Subsidiary Bodies

  - Discussion on lack of need for this Section

  - Highlights intersection of Section A and Rules 3 and 23

- Section G: Taking Stock of Progress (Reporting)
  - Made a lot of progress, perhaps the most of any section
  - General agreement on minimizing effort and duplication
  - Isolated the tasks that we want the Secretariat to do versus the stakeholders
  - Framed "mechanics" of reporting (content, timing, focus, independent review)
  - Highlighted, in the footnotes, potential clarifications needed
  - Raised the question of voluntary peer review; placed in the Parking Lot
  - Needed more time to consider the Japanese dashboard from its presentation

- Section H: Mechanisms for Updating and Revising the Framework
  - General agreement on the opportunity and process to review and update
  - Needed more time to consider the Japanese dashboard from its presentation

Part II: Recommendations on the Science-Policy Interface

- Confirmed points of agreement

- Identified areas for further work

- Began process of identifying possible characteristics and functions

- The questions of scope and placement of a SPI also remain outstanding

↪ **Further dialogue to take place on functions and characteristics of a SPI + on development of the potential options for its scope and placement.**

Next steps and recommendations from the co-facilitators

- Japanese proposal for Taking Stock of Progress (Section G) and Updating the Instrument (Section H)

- Overlap with related sections of SAICM/IP.4/2 (some noted below in green) for which this VWG was not mandated

- Footnotes contained in this VWG's Textual Recommendations (Part I) and any related in SAICM/IP.4/2 should be reviewed

- Possible other "governance" areas for future work, in addition to the Parking Lot:
  - Section A on the ICCM
  - Scope, Vision, Principles and Approaches
  - Section B on the Bureau
  - Section C on the Secretariat
  - Rules of Procedure