

VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON GOVERNANCE AND MECHANISMS TO SUPPORT IMPLEMENTATION

REQUEST FOR ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

TOPIC: SUBSIDIARY AND AD HOC BODIES

Co-facilitators: Karissa Kovner, USA and Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, Thailand

Mandate: Make proposals that progress work in lead-up to IP4.

DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS: MONDAY, 30 NOVEMBER 2020

Note: Please submit your responses/feedback to the questions below to the SAICM Secretariat at saicm.chemicals@un.org, with a copy to jose.demesa@un.org and marijana.todorovic@un.org on or before **Monday, 30 November 2020**. You may use this word document to submit your inputs. Indicate your name and organization.

Using the compilation text of recommendations from the outcome of IP3 regarding SAICM (SAICM/IP.4/2), which can be found in the documents section of the website related to this Virtual Working Group at <http://www.saicm.org/Beyond2020/IntersessionalProcess/VirtualWorkingGroups/tabid/8563/language/en-US/Default.aspx>, the co-facilitators request electronic input on Section (E): Subsidiary and Ad Hoc Expert Bodies (please see page 11) with the following instructions:

*Please provide your general views, **not to exceed 1 page**, on the discussion presented in SAICM/IP.4/2, page 11, Section VI.E, paragraphs 1 –2. Please note that the co-facilitators are not requesting redline changes to the current compilation text, but rather seeking views on what issues this section should or could address. Based on the input received, further consideration of this section will take place at the 5th virtual meeting scheduled for 17 December 2020 meeting.*

In your submission, please consider addressing:

- *Whether there is a need for subsidiary and ad hoc expert bodies*
- *How such bodies would be established and by whom*
- *Who would participate in such bodies*
- *What role would such bodies play*
- *What responsibilities would such bodies have and to whom*

- *Other relevant issues raised in SAICM/IP.4/2, Section VI.E, paragraphs 1 –2*

As agreed by the Bureau, relevant documents for this Virtual Working Group may include:

[SAICM/IP.4/2](#) 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/INF/4](#) Promoting multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral participation – Summary of known obstacles and possible incentives

[SAICM/IP.4/INF/5](#) Stakeholder input on contributions to achieve enhanced sectoral and stakeholder engagement for beyond 2020

[SAICM/IP.4/INF/6/Rev.1](#) Stakeholder workshop on strengthening governance for the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020: Summary Document

[SAICM/IP.3/5/Corr.1](#) Other mechanism to support implementation prepared by the co-chairs of the intersessional process – corrigendum

[SAICM/IP.3/INF/4](#) Submission from the German Environment Agency – Enhancing the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

Submission from the following organizations and stakeholders:

Health and Environment Justice Support (HEJSupport)

Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNC)

Pesticide Action Network (PAN International)

groundWork South Africa

Women Engage for a Common Future (WECF)

Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE)

Toxisphera

Commonweal

BUND/Friends of the Earth, Germany

Whether there is a need for subsidiary and ad hoc expert bodies

We see that an independent Science Policy Interface (SPI) (see also our submission on this topic coming soon) should be the main source of input in technical issues to the ICCM. However, *ad hoc* expert bodies could assist in interpreting advice from the SPI into relevant policy advice for the post 2020 instrument. See additional input for Section VI.E., §§ 1-2.

How such bodies would be established and by whom

Any stakeholder should be able to propose the need to establish such bodies and provide the rationale for them, suggested scope of work, and desired outputs in written form to the Secretariat. ICCM should decide on the need to establish such ad hoc expert bodies, The Secretariat should post the proposal on the SAICM web page no later than 2 months prior to an ICCM meeting. Depending upon the interval between the ICCM meetings and how far away from the next ICCM meeting a proposal is submitted, it may be necessary to consider if there is another body that could be mandated to take the decision on the proposal. The Open-ended Working Group is one fora that could be considered.

Who would participate in such bodies

Independent experts presenting all relevant perspectives, including indigenous knowledge and gender. Transparent rules of procedure and terms of references must be in place to ensure that the experts are geographically and gender balanced, credible, and strict conflict of interest policies in place and implemented.

What role would such bodies play

The role is partly captured by chapter VI. E.§2. We suggest to delete ~~and incorporate strict standards of rigor, including peer review, to be approved by the international conference.~~ We highlight the promotion of a two-way dialogue between disciplines and between science and policy, in particular to assist the ICCM to interpret advice from the independent SPI into concrete policy actions.

What responsibilities would such bodies have and to whom

Remove the brackets of a. and remove the word “international”.

All *ad hoc* bodies answer, according to their respective terms of references established by the ICCM, to the requests from the ICCM or other mandated bodies.

Other responsibilities should be added, so that they fit to all types of potential subsidiary bodies, e.g. on finance. At the moment, it looks like the responsibilities from a – e are being made for the SPI only.

Other relevant issues raised in SAICM/IP.4/2, Section VI.E, paragraphs 1–2

The bracket in §1 around “covered by” should be removed and the bracketed text “[addressed in the framework of]” deleted, as ICCM should be able to create subsidiary *ad hoc* bodies for addressing technical or policy issues not covered by other fora, in a flexible way.

In §2, we want all brackets in the chapeau removed, i.e. the text now in brackets should stay.

In §2 a, we want all brackets removed, and suggest the addition of “and periodically reviewing the implementation”, in line with the added suggestion in our Submission to the SAICM Secretariat May 12th 2020.

The full text would read:

{Identifying, prioritizing, and providing recommendations to address chemicals and waste issues of {international} concern, and periodically [reviewing the implementation.](#)}