**First virtual meeting of the Virtual Working Group on
Targets, Indicators and Milestones**
Tuesday, 12 January, from 13:00 – 16:00 CET

VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON TARGETS, INDICATORS AND MILESTONES
Report of the 4th 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 98 participants on the call.

2) Discussion on inputs provided for targets under SO C

A total of 12 electronic submissions were received for targets under SO C. Both co-facilitators provided an overview of the targets under SO C and presented an overview of the general considerations received on the electronic submissions.

Silvija reiterated that the work done by the Virtual Working Group on Issues of Concern will have a direct impact on target formulation under SO C. She then proceeded to invite one of the co-facilitators from the Virtual Group on Issues of Concern (VWG3) Sverre Thomas Jahre (Norway), to provide a status update of the developments for VWG3 and their relevance to the work on targets, indicators and milestones.

Brief overview of status of IOC group:
- The connection between issues of concern and objective C is important in moving forward.
- The co-facilitators proposal for the process for issues of concern was released to all stakeholders 11 January 2021 for a round of electronic feedback due 22 January 2021.
- Next meeting is on Monday 12 January 2021. Based on the discussions on Monday, the co-facilitators will hand over the outcome document of the group to the co-chairs of the intersessional process.t
- The group is working on a proposed process for the existing emerging policy issues as well. It seems that our VWG would like to see a decision on next steps for each of the existing emerging policy issues at ICCM5. There will be a need to reflect on targets and indicators for the existing emerging policy issues that become part of the new instrument.

Interventions of meeting participants on targets under SO C and new targets proposed in stakeholder submissions

- Participants reiterated that both virtual groups need to feed information, support and complement each other's work.

- There was general agreement that the current targets are process oriented.

- There was disagreement among the stakeholders as to whether the targets under this objective should measure the progress on individual issues of concern or rather focus on process. There was no general agreement to the preference for the current proposed targets (C1, C2 or alt C1, alt C2).

- Participants expressed convergent views on retaining a Strategic Objective related to Issues of Concern versus views on having no need for SO C. Some stakeholders did not see added value by both of the proposals for target under SO as the content is already captured either by other targets under SO B and SO D or in the modalities for the Issues of Concern group.

- Many of the participants expressed support to include specific targets related to the Issues of Concern. Many stakeholders favored to adopt Canada's proposal where targets and indicators for each issue of concern are incorporated by reference under Strategic Objective C once adopted by the Conference.

- Regarding the new proposed targets under SO C, stakeholders expressed their concern on the difficulty of measuring some of them. It was indicated that there should be an iterative process where indicators are developed alongside the targets to make sure that the wording is in fact what is required to measure. Some stakeholders noted that some of these new proposed targets are broader than the beyond 2020 instrument.

3) Discussion on decision tree proposal by co-facilitators

The co-facilitator explained that this agenda item is intended for the group to make decisions to develop part (ii) of the groups mandate: *Develop a set of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets.* She further explained that the co-facilitators had looked through the submissions and created a discussion diagram meant to group the different ideas and similarities in the submissions and map how a possible outcome of the group might look like in moving forward. This recommendation will be submitted to the Bureau for their consideration as per the group mandate. The discussion diagram with the recommendation proposals can be found in the following link.

Interventions of meeting participants on decision tree by co-facilitators

- There was general agreement that there was considerable progress in meeting the mandate of the VWG1. However, additional work is needed before decisions on targets, indicators and milestones can be made.
- Regarding the indicators process, UNEP and UNECE have expressed willingness to support the development of an inventory on indicators.
- Participants agreed that participation and call for written submissions should be open to any SAICM stakeholder interested in participating, including experts with experience in statistics, data, indicator framework development, knowledge of data coverage and availability. The group should have regional, multistakeholder, multisectoral balanced representation.
- Some stakeholders remained hesitant with regards to establish another group for additional discussion about indicators in this time before IP4 and ICCM5. This is mainly due to the concerns that some stakeholders have with technology difficulties in taking part in virtual work and thus being limited in their ability to partake in discussions and decisions made in the group.

- A number of stakeholders, including IOMC organizations support the concept of undertaking technical work on indicators and then feeding that into the policy group on targets.

UK hybrid proposal based on decision tree presented by co-facilitators

The UK representative made an intervention presenting a proposal for a hybrid option of the scenarios proposed in the decision tree presented by the co-facilitators. The proposal can be found in the following link. The UK proposes the development of two groups: i) a policy expert group (work extended from VWG1 and VWG2) that will focus on draft targets and target formulation under strategic objectives and work iteratively with the technical expert subgroup ii) a subgroup to continue with the work on targets, indicators and milestones. The process should remain iterative between both groups, where the subgroup work would feed into the policy expert group discussions.

The results of this process should allow to more clearly define and understand recommendations on target relevant indicator options taking into account the input from the expert subgroup and have a small number of

headline indicators that can be measured from day one of the adoption of the new framework at ICCM5.

There was general support by the group for the UK hybrid proposal. In moving forward, the co-facilitator proposed to prepare a document laying out a set of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets to be considered by the Bureau. This document will take into consideration the discussions of today's meeting and the hybrid proposal from the UK. This document is to be posted online by 18 January in the SAICM website and open for written comments by 25 January. The request for electronic feedback can be found here.

4) Discussion on facilitative tables for SOA-B, D-E proposal by co-facilitators

The co-facilitator explained that the first part of the group's mandate was to finalize the target's proposal currently set out in document IP4/3 with a view to enable multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral commitment and action where appropriate. She explained that the co-facilitators had created a set of facilitative tables for SO A-E, taking into consideration the groups request on the previous VWG meeting. She further explained that the tables are not a comprehensive list of indicators nor do they contain all the written submissions provided by stakeholders. The tables are meant to facilitate the discussions and are not intended to be part of the outcome document. For all variants of proposals on the targets of SOA-E, participants were invited to turn to the >50 submissions to be accessed here. She opened the floor for comments on how to move forward with this section of the group' mandate.

General considerations from the floor thanked the development of the facilitative tables but indicated that the co-facilitators and the secretariat should provide an advance version of the targets and target wording by capturing the different modifications (noting that there was necessarily full agreement). The advance version should include a section of "considerations" to include areas of convergence.

The cofacilitators agreed with the suggestions to develop such document. The co-facilitator reiterated that targets under SO C and selection of targets under SO E may not advance further until the work of the groups on Issues of Concern and Integrated Approach to Financing is finalized. The draft targets document will be uploaded on the SAICM website by 26 January 2021 and are intended to serve as the basis for discussion for the virtual meeting scheduled on 01 February 2021.

5) Next steps

- Fourth request for electronic input on "set of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets". This document is to be posted online by 18 January in the SAICM website and open for written comments by 25 January. The request for electronic feedback can be found here.

- The draft targets document prepared by co-facilitators for stakeholders' considerations to be uploaded on the SAICM website by 26 January 2021. Draft targets are intended to serve as the basis for discussion for the meeting scheduled on 01 February 2021 from 13:00-16:00 CET.

———————————————————