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VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE AND MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

Summary of the 2nd Virtual Meeting: Open Discussion on Mechanisms to Support Implementation – Sections G and H

1) Welcoming remarks

The two facilitators of the Virtual Working Group, Ms. Karissa Kovner and Ms. Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, welcomed all participants to the second Virtual Meeting and third step in the VWG process. They introduced the focus of the meeting as an open discussion on Mechanisms for Taking Stock of Progress (Section G) and Mechanisms for Updating the Framework (Section H, document SAICM/IP.4/2) and presented the proposed questions to guide participants through the discussion of each paragraph, to be found in the calendar as well as in the agenda for the meeting.

2) Open discussion on Mechanisms to Support Implementation

Section G: Mechanisms for Taking Stock of Progress. Consideration of concepts presented in SAICM/IP.4/2, pages 12–13, Section VI.G, paragraphs 1–14, under the following areas:

The co-facilitators reminded the VWG that the text in the compilation document (IP4/2) was not well-developed text. Rather, it represented some general ideas or views that had been touched on briefly by Thematic Group C at IP-3 and included in the compilation text by the Bureau as a starting point.

The VWG generally considered Section G as having two components: reporting and reviewing. To start, several stakeholders provided general comments on Section G, including the need for a mechanism for taking stock of progress to be inclusive, transparent, and impartial that serves to build trust among stakeholders. Consistency in language throughout the section would have to be ensured and overlaps in content with other sections should be avoided.

In terms of general views for paragraphs 1-11, a number of participants agreed on the proposal to split paragraph 1b. into two parts. Regarding the language, there was a request to change the heading to “Taking Stock of Progress”, and in paragraph 1a. to add “strategic” before “objectives.” Furthermore, a number of stakeholders considered indicators to be of central importance for taking stock of progress, asking the co-facilitators to focus the reporting section on objectives, targets, milestones and to assess progress against the vision of the beyond 2020 framework.
There were a number of concerns raised that additional reporting adds to the reporting burden already faced by stakeholders and therefore participants urged the development of a reporting tool which is purposeful, adds value, and does not take away resources for implementation. To reduce workload and avoid the duplication of information, reporting could be aligned with and leverage data from existing, complementary processes. One stakeholder also suggested that in addition to reporting on overall progress, the progress of individual stakeholders should also be assessed to identify areas of improvement and the need for enhanced resources/capacity building. One stakeholder proposed to include a concept of peer review to increase the learning process. Several stakeholders highlighted the importance of a multi-stakeholder approach implying that all stakeholders should report, not only countries. Lastly, there was agreement among the attendees that more consistency is needed on periodic reviews (paragraph 3 and 5) and language on objectives/vision (paragraph 1 and 4).

Paragraphs 11–12: What is the process and duration for reporting?

On paragraph 11, participants expressed that its meaning and implications is unclear and that periodic reviews for each country over a short duration of time could be too cumbersome. Similarly, it was noted that in paragraph 12, the definition of “key targets” was not clear and the frequency of reporting should be aligned with frequency of the future Conferences (e.g. every x years). One stakeholder proposed to delete item (i).

Paragraphs 13–14: What mechanisms are needed to review the effectiveness of the reporting?

With regards to these paragraphs, significant overlap with Section V. Institutional Arrangements (SAICM/IP.4/2) was identified by a number of stakeholders. It was proposed to delete this section and transfer relevant information from Section G to Section A. Secondly, on language, there was a request to write “in conjunction with” the 2030 Agenda instead of “at the same time.” Related to Section V, one stakeholder brought up the discussion from IP3 to establish a review body or panel (e.g. IOMC under a new mandate).

Paragraphs 2-3: What are the roles and responsibilities of the different bodies?

Participants noted the overlap of responsibilities with Section V. Institutional Arrangements. It was proposed to delete both paragraphs as the content is well covered in other parts of the compilation document.

3) Open discussion on Mechanisms to Support Implementation


Regarding the language, clarification was sought on the meaning of “the totality of the 2020 framework”, as well as on the implications of the “delegated authority.” Discomfort was also raised with the word “must”. Stakeholders highlighted that it was not clear how an update of the beyond 2020 framework would be triggered. The importance of developing a baseline against which to measure progress as well as clear indicators and objectives was flagged by several stakeholders, and one stakeholder suggested it would be important to ensure that the multi-sectoral process allows all stakeholders, not just governments, to propose amendments. With regards to consistency of this draft section of the new instrument, like Section G, the overlap with Section V. Institutional Arrangements – functions of ICCM was noted.

Finally, a question on how this Section relates to the rules or procedure adopted at ICCM2 was raised.