

**First virtual meeting of the Virtual Working Group on
Targets, Indicators and Milestones**

Tuesday, 07 December, from 13:00 – 16:00 CET

**VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON TARGETS, INDICATORS AND MILESTONES
Report of the 3rd Virtual Meeting on Targets, Indicators and Milestones**

1) Welcoming remarks and review of meeting agenda and meeting objectives

Welcome remarks were given by co-facilitator Mr. Wajira Palipane (Sri Lanka).

There were 93 participants on the call.

2) Co-facilitators proposal- facilitative table sample for SO B

Silvija explained the proposal of facilitative tables based on the request from meeting participants in the previous meeting. The tables are intended to show the different elements of the targets and to get an all-encompassing overview of what has been proposed in the stakeholder written submissions and in the VWG discussions. The tables are also intended to help identify current gaps and help sort through duplication. The table can be found [here](#).

General comments on proposal of facilitative tables

- There were concerns about the indicators section of the table as to how these indicators had been selected and decided upon. Silvija explained that these are indicators that come from stakeholder submissions and/or IP4/3, are for purposes of illustration only and are not to be considered as a formal document that is coming out of the group.
- Some stakeholders showed concerns that this facilitative table is a good way to organize information yet, there still needs to be further work done in order to fulfill part one of the group mandate: finalize the targets proposal currently set out in SAICM/IP.4/3, with a view to enable multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral commitment and action, where appropriate.
- Stakeholders found in general that the presentation of facilitative tables for each SO is useful for further deliberations. The co-facilitators should further continue with developing the same tables for all SOs. Stakeholders suggested that the tables should include the new proposed targets that have come through by this process. Some participants suggested to add an additional column that shows responsible actors under each target.

3) Discussion on inputs provided for targets under SO D

A total of 19 electronic submissions were received for targets under SO D and SO E. Silvija provided an overview of the targets under SO D and SO E and presented an overview of the general considerations received and “new proposed targets” on the electronic submissions.

General discussion under target D1

- Some stakeholders pointed out the importance of including “safety and production” as an element of this target.
- There was general agreement by stakeholders to include sustainable chemistry as an overarching concept. There was general support for text proposals from Norway and US.
- Concerns were raised questioning the measurability of this target as it is currently written.
- One stakeholder group raised the importance of clarifying the definition of sustainable alternatives and also a need to reference a definition for sustainable and green chemistry. The co-facilitator proposed to place this concern as a placeholder as it needs to be discussed in the broader document (not only under the targets work) in order to have a common understanding across the new SAICM instrument.

General discussion under target D2

- The co-facilitator explained that among the submissions, there had been comments on the necessity to delete the qualifiers of geographic scope. There needs to be further discussion on D2 and its Alt to the reference in using natural products and non-cleaner production processes and facilitating the recycling and reuse of products. She explained that there seems to be convergence on broadening the scope and include a broader scope for responsible actors.
- Stakeholders agreed that the objective of the target is not fully reflected in its current wording.
- Some consensus that Norway’s proposal can be used as a basis to re-word this target and make it SMART.
- Some stakeholders raised concerns about using the term circular economy considering there is not an agreed upon definition of such term.
- Stakeholders raised that it is important for this target to emphasize and support research and development as well as approaches in green chemistry and sustainable procurement.
- There was a suggestion to include a reference to the life cycle management of chemicals instead of the reference to products.
- In response to addressing the concern on indicators under the current working of this target, the OECD mentioned that they are currently tracking policies that encourage production using sustainable and safe alternatives through economic tools like fees and taxes. This shows that there are linkages with existing indicators that could be leveraged should the target as it is in its alternative version.

General discussion under target D3, D4, D5

- Some stakeholders agreed that the responsible actors for target D1 and D3 should be private sector while target D2 should be broaden to all stakeholders.
- General agreement that target D4 should be deleted as it is considered a subset of other targets.
- Consensus that targets should be more impact oriented and that outcome indicators.
- One stakeholder mentioned that they did not support the inclusion of consumer products under D5 because it’s broader than the scope from the beyond 2020 instrument.
- General comments concerning the broadening of the scope of responsible actors to include more than industry associations.

General discussion on proposed “new targets”

- Two new targets were proposed under SO D.
- General support for the Norwegian target on research and innovation: *In research and innovation programs priority is given to sustainable solutions and safer alternatives to harmful substances in products and mixtures, including in consumer products.*

Discussion on inputs provided for targets under SO E

General discussion under target E1

- Target on the recognition on the beyond 2020 instrument. Need to keep measurability in mind. Further work needed to develop measurable indicators.
- For this target it is important to recognize chemicals possibly not at the highest levels might not be possible.

- Stakeholders mentioned that as the indicator framework is further developed, this target may become redundant as other targets with more actionable items and indicators may be introduced.

General discussion under target E2

- Policy coherence is an important issue to demonstrate the efficacy of the instrument.
- Some stakeholders highlighted the importance of mentioning mainstreaming under this target.
- Convergence on defining the target’s geographic levels.
- Target should have a reference to sustainable financing and should be a timebound target.

General discussion under target E3

- As the indicator framework is further developed, this target needs revision to be more specific and measurable.
- Consider the “smartness” of this target. Suggestion to revise the target wording without changing its intention.
- One stakeholder highlighted the importance of establishing identified agreed international language under this target as well as possibly associated indicators (such as SDG target 17.6).

General discussion under target E4

- As the deliberations in VWG4 on Financial Considerations progress, reference to integrated approach to financing and the three components should be included. Further discussion on the formulation of this target needs to take into account results from discussions in VWG4.
- Consensus to include “implementation of integrated approach to financing” in the target
- With regards to the implication and outcomes of such target when talking about mobilization of resources, some participants suggested to reevaluate the target expectations as well as responsible actors.
- One stakeholder suggested to include a reference to “polluter pay principle” and internalization of costs by industry stakeholders.

General discussion under target E5

- Difficulty to define this target and relevant indicators to fix baselines and thus measure progress.
- Stakeholders mentioned the challenges in determining and measuring ‘gaps’ as well as to clearly reference positive ways in narrowing gaps.
- Stakeholders highlighted that issues should be discussed and resolved in further development of indicator framework.

General discussion on proposed “new targets”

- Two new targets were proposed under SO E.
- General support for the target regarding internalization of costs/cost recovery mechanisms (EU proposal).
- General support of the Canadian proposal to link targets to other priority issues and agendas.

4) Discussion on targets under SO C

Co-facilitator Wajira proceeded to present targets under SO C.

General comments on targets under SO C

- Stakeholder consensus on in-depth discussion on target formulations under SOC needs to be conducted after results of VWG deliberations on IOCs have completed.
- Most stakeholders favoured a less process-oriented formulation, flexible enough to encompass future decisions made on IOCs by the Conference.
- Some stakeholders agreed that the process-oriented side of IOCs (work plans, legislation) may be better suited to other SOs.
- The secretariat mention that targets should be discussed in this group and that the discussions under these

both groups should be connected.

5) Co-facilitators proposal of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones

- The co-facilitator proceeded to explain the Proposal of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones. The proposal can be found [here](#).
- There was general consensus to support the outline process recommended by the co-facilitators in establishing a technical working group that looks into pending issues. There was also general support to add further details about custodians, measurability and baseline data sets.
- Consider limiting the number of indicators in further work on targets, indicators and milestones.
- The co-facilitator reiterated that this proposal will not finalize agreed text on target proposals. She clarified that the deliberations of this discussion will go through the Bureau which will make the final decision on how to move forward on the work done for targets, indicators and milestones.
- Some stakeholders stated the importance that there should be further work to develop milestones. One stakeholder shared her concerns with the development of milestones at this point in the discussions taking into consideration it is a political and not a technical decision.
- The UK and the IOMC reiterated their support to facilitate the indicators work in going forward.

6) Next Steps

- Third request for electronic input on “co-facilitators proposal of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones” and targets under SO C. This document is to be posted online by 08 December in the SAICM website and open for written comments by 22 December. The request for electronic feedback can be found [here](#).
 - The compilation of electronic inputs for SO C and co-facilitators proposal of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones” and will serve as the basis for discussion for the meeting scheduled on 12 January 2021 from 13:00-16:00 CET.
-