

# Minutes of 78th UK Chemical Stakeholder Forum meeting, 15th January 2020, BEIS Conference Centre, London

## 1. Welcome by Chair (Camilla Alexander-White)

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting (see Annex A for attendance & apologies).

### 1.1. Approval of agenda

The draft agenda was approved.

### 1.2. Approval of draft minutes of the 77th UKCSF meeting (UKCSF/25/09)

The draft minutes of the September meeting, were approved, subject to the following amendments:

- Page 9: Session 1 discussion is missing a point on the need to map out what's in place now and identify the gaps for the chemicals strategy.
- Page 2: Ambiguity in the minutes around the use of the word "domestic".

### 1.3. Update on CSF

Camilla Alexander-White reminded the group that the Chair of the meeting was drawn from the Steering group on a rotating basis with member of the steering group chairing one or two meetings. She highlighted that a colleague of hers was attending to represent RSC's interests, whilst she chaired. She also reminded the group that the meeting was to be held under Chatham House rule.

**Organisational profiles** - This was a request for UKCSF members (and other attendees) to provide some basic information about their organisation and their interest in the Forum. We have now received profiles from 30 organisations and circulated these ahead of the meeting. One of the questions related to how those present at the CSF in turn engage their members and how we might support that. The Chair thanked those present for their comments which Defra and the steering group would reflect on.

## 2. Update on the Chemicals strategy

Chloe Meacher, Joint Head (with Susie Willows) of Chemicals and Pesticides (part of the broader Chemicals, Pesticides and Hazardous waste team) at Defra, gave a verbal update on the Chemicals Strategy.

Chloe reported that Rebecca Pow is now the Minister with responsibility for chemicals policy and that Defra had finished the initial phase of stakeholder engagement. A call for evidence would be published at the end of spring 2020, inviting the submission of evidence, not views, that government should consider in developing the strategy. Defra was also procuring evidence to complement the forthcoming call for evidence. She said that Defra would be moving to the policy development phase, looking at short and long term policy needs. There would be a consultation on a draft strategy before publication of the final version in 2022. Chloe thanked the RSC's for its thought leadership and hosting of an event on the strategy. She also thanked everyone for their contributions at the last CSF and asked that everyone continue to feed in their comments.

## 3. Chemistry Council proposed sector deal

David Bott, of the Society of Chemical Industry, outlined the Chemistry Council's proposed sector deal, highlighting the need to drive sustainability and health outcomes. See Annex B.

### 3.1. Q&A on Chemistry Council proposed sector deal

One attendee asked David whether he had understated the scale of the shift required to deliver on environmental objectives e.g. battery technology. David responded that the industry did indeed need to move fast, having put off change for too long but that it could only do what it could afford to. He reported that 10 years ago, there was a roadmap to the future mapped out and the government didn't do enough to support it, so not much of it had been delivered.

The same attendee then asked whether we should be looking to restrict our use of chemicals, rather than instead taking a holistic approach and carefully managing the risks. David agreed in principle with the questioner that the latter was preferable.

Another attendee asked about the economic argument for recycling plastics, saying that technology isn't the issue but whether it could be made economically viable. David acknowledged the issue of the cost of recycled plastics versus virgin materials. He responded that if the composition of waste was known then the value could be pushed up and the material put back into the supply chain.

A third attendee asked how to get everyone moving in the same direction and what the government could do to effect change. David responded drawing on his previous experience as Director of Innovate UK which involved giving out grants alongside advice. He noted, it wasn't just about money and that business wanted certainty. Using the

automotive sector as an example, he noted the power of government as a convener of actors up and down the supply chain and the benefits that could bring.

#### **4. Chemistry for a circular economy**

Professor James Clark of the University of York, presented on “Green Chemistry: Chemistry for Circularity”. See Annex C.

#### **5. Sustainable chemistry**

Doctor Nick Bennett of the University of Nottingham, presented on “Sustainable Chemistry @ Nottingham”. See Annex D.

##### **5.1. Q&A on Chemistry for a circular economy and Sustainable Chemistry**

An attendee asked Nick about work being done at Nottingham on bio-based plastics. They asked whether the impact of these new plastics on current recycling practices had been looked at. Nick acknowledged the issue and noted that there was active research in this area.

Another attendee asked James about how to use ‘big data’ to address the current problem of knowing what is being dealt with in the circular economy. James responded that this could be useful in tracking future products and their components. He recognised a need to understand what is being recycled, to avoid creating problems downstream. David Bott added that the idea of putting micro-chips in plastics was no longer up for discussion and infrared was now used to identify chemical composition. James continued that there is also a need for a more holistic approach when it comes to green chemistry.

A third attendee asked James about some of the headlines on integrating chemistry into the circular economy in his presentation and whether he had mapped those principles. James responded that there had been some work on this published last year in *Nature*, but also that he had mapped these separately and this information would be released in a *Science* article the following week.

The last question, to both James and Nick, enquired about working with engineers that don’t have much experience with chemistry and how to get chemists and chemical engineers to work better together. James responded that he found it to be more the other way round i.e. chemists with little engineering experience, and commented that it is really difficult to change university curricula. He cited programs in Germany and the USA, where teaching doesn’t start with the specific science, but with sustainability instead. Nick responded that in Nottingham’s programs, the students work in teams coming from different disciplines, including engineers. He also noted a previous initiative called DICE – ‘Driving Innovation in Chemistry & Engineering’, which Nottingham was part of, aimed at bringing chemists and engineers together.

## **6. Green Finance Strategy**

Colin Mackie of the Defra green finance team, presented on the “Green Finance Strategy”. See Annex E.

### **6.1. Sustainable chemistry and Green finance group discussions**

Attendees discussed questions around the three presentations given on sustainable chemistry and green finance. See Annex F for a summary of the discussion.

## **7. 60 Second Pitches**

There were three 60 second pitches:

- Sam Saunders introduced PETA UK. Sam reported that PETA UK is a member of the PETA International Science Consortium. They are actively involved in chemicals regulation, as an ECHA accredited stakeholder observer and with Brexit discussions on chemicals regulation. PETA is eager to bring its experience and knowledge to the CSF.
- Emma Grange introduced Cruelty Free International (CFI). Emma reported that CFI want full replacement of testing on animals and commitment from the UK. They are also concerned about Brexit and want the UK to have access to ECHA’s data.
- Julius Kreißig introduced Wood plc. Julius reported on their recent work, including a contract to support ECHA in developing the Substance of Concern in Products (SCIP) database, a key component of the chemicals / product / waste interface and the circular economy strategy at EU level.

## **8. Report on chemical-product-waste CSF sub-group**

Tom Nickson of the EA, gave a verbal update on the chemical-product-waste CSF sub-group.

Tom reported that the group had met once since the last CSF meeting in September 2019. He explained that the group had discussed work that Defra is taking forward to map the legislation that affects the chemicals/waste interface and possible work to support traceability through the supply chain by gaining a better understanding of the information needs of reprocessing facilities. Tom said that the group is keen to have new members, particularly from the textiles and construction industries, but also from other groups. Tom noted that the work this group was doing was pertinent to draft target C2 in the Post 2020 framework (the next agenda item).

## **9. Post-2020 Framework on chemicals and waste Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)**

The policy lead from Defra, presented on “Post-2020 Framework for the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste”. The main points were as follows:

A brief background was provided on the existing framework (SAICM), a voluntary multi-stakeholder/ multi-sectoral framework which was adopted in 2005 and complements the multilateral environmental agreements for chemicals and waste. This voluntary framework aims to improve chemicals and waste management globally. The post 2020 framework is unique as it includes multi-sectoral stakeholders, NGOs, academia, etc.

The new framework, post 2020, will include international targets and objectives which were discussed in detail at the last intersessional meeting in Bangkok (IP3), in October 2019. The intersessional was attended by 73 governments, including the UK, plus many stakeholders met to look at improving stakeholder engagement, policy development and finance. A set of principles for target development were agreed at IP3; these needed to be SMART, results focused and easy to communicate. Following UNEA4, in March 2019, a resolution on chemicals and waste was agreed UNEP was tasked to review existing science-policy. The UN report on Science-Policy-Interface was expected in February 2020.

These objectives and targets are not only relevant to government but also to stakeholders. This meeting was an opportunity for the CSF to contribute to the development of these targets and to consider how to help implement the framework. Defra has asked the CSF to consult their members after the meeting and provide written feedback on the SAICM objectives and targets by January 31<sup>st</sup> 2020.

### **9.1. Post-2020 SAICM target objectives group discussions**

Attendees discussed questions around the Post-2020 SAICM draft targets and objectives. See Annex G for the Post-2020 SAICM target and objectives, and see Annex H for a summary of the discussion.

## **10. Policy and regulation update**

There were no questions on the policy update paper (UKCSF/20/01).

### **10.1. REACH**

Stavros Georgiou of HSE, provided a verbal update on REACH.

Stavros explained that the format of the written update had changed, making it shorter with links to key information and an e-bulletin was available online. He reported that UK government officials would no longer be participating in the ECHA scientific committees, following the UK's departure from the EU on 31st January 2020, but that UK stakeholders would be able to continue to submit comments to ECHA public consultations in the usual manner.

Stavros also noted that the RAC approval on restricting siloxanes (D4, D5, and D6) had been completed and that a consultation is taking place on the SEAC draft opinion, lasting until mid-February 2020. The RAC opinion and SEAC draft Opinion on the restriction of micro-plastics had been delayed to March 2020, partly because of the large volume of public consultation comments.

An attendee asked whether a UK REACH system was up and running. Stavros responded that UK REACH has been planned for and would be up and running as necessary following the transition period.

### **10.2. EU Exit**

Simon Johnson of Defra, provided a verbal update and answered questions on EU Exit.

This would happen on 31 January with the transition period (formerly called the implementation period) starting on 1 February. In view of this Simon strongly advised that stakeholders look again at the existing guidance published on the HSE's website on what this means for the sector. In summary, during this period UK manufacturers and exporters will continue to have access to the EU27 market and UK businesses will go on filing REACH registrations through ECHA. However, because the UK would no longer be a member of the EU it would lose its say in an official capacity on the decisions taken on authorisations and restrictions.

On the question of the UK's future relationship the official said that would be determined in negotiations with the EU which would begin once the UK had left the EU on 31 January.

A key question for stakeholders following the UK's exit would be how to continue have a say on the future decisions taken by the EU. Citing the example of how the CIA and CEFIC have worked together to call on both the UK and EU to look for a pragmatic solution on access to data, Defra suggested that trade associations could build on their strengthened relationships with their European counterparts to make their voice heard on issues of common interest.

Simon concluded his update by reassuring the Forum that Defra would continue to listen to the views of stakeholders and keep our guidance (including in relation to Northern Ireland) for businesses under review and updated as necessary over the course of this year.

## **11. AOB**

An attendee raised a comment about mobilising resources in the CSF, not financially but in a practical sense. They suggested having a more focused discussion to see whether the group can use their expertise to address some of the big problems.

Another attendee raised a comment on information they said they received, which implies that high temperature incinerator capability in the UK, is inadequate to dispose of persistent organic pollutants in furnishings with fire retardants. They asked if there was someone present at the meeting that could answer this enquiry.

### **11.1. Next meeting**

The Chair thanked everyone for attending. The next meeting would be held on 24 June 2020, hosted by the Society of Chemical Industry, Belgrave Square, LONDON.

## **Annexes**

Annex A: Attendance and apologies

Annex B: Presentation - Chemistry Council proposed sector deal

Annex C: Presentation - Chemistry for a circular economy

Annex D: Presentation - Sustainable chemistry

Annex E: Presentation - Green finance strategy

Annex F: Summary of discussion on Sustainable chemistry and Green finance

Annex G: Post-2020 SAICM Draft Objectives and Targets

Annex H: Summary of discussion on Post-2020 SAICM Draft Objectives and Targets

For accessibility reasons, Annexes B, C, D and E will not be made available on the UKCSF website. Copies can be obtained by contacting the secretariat at [Chemicals@defra.gov.uk](mailto:Chemicals@defra.gov.uk).

## Annex A: Attendance and apologies

### Attendees

Camilla Alexander-White	Royal Society of Chemistry
Brigitte Amoruso	Make UK
Ian Axford	LGC Group
Richard Ayton	Dow
Susanne Baker	techUK
Nick Bennett	University of Nottingham
Francesca Bevan	Marine Conservation Society
Tony Bingham	AGB Chemical Compliance
David Bolton	British Retail Consortium
David Bott	Society of Chemical Industry (SCI)
Kit Bowerin	Breast Cancer UK
Sue Bullock	Ramboll Environ
James Clark	University of York
Michael Cooper	Chemical Business Association
Imogen Cripps	Green Alliance
Matteo Dalle Valle	Chevron Oronite
Tracey Donaldson	Institute of Chemical Engineers
Mohamed Elkhalfa	British Plastics Federation
Natasha Gerard	ADS (UK Aerospace, Defence, Security and Space industries)
Emma Grange	Cruelty Free International
Lisa Hipgrave	International Fragrance Association UK
Mike Holland	Independent
Bud Hudspith	Trades Union Congress
Pat Jennings	Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (CIWM)
Khurram Jowiya	Cruelty Free International
Helen Kean	Anthesis Group
Joshua Kelly	BIFFA



Julius Kreißig	Wood plc
Jo Lloyd	ERM
Kate Lowe	Chemical Watch
Philip Malpass	UK Cleaning Products Industry Association
Crea O'Hanlon	EUK Consulting
Clelia Oziel	Chemical Watch
David Park	British Coatings Federation
Libby Peake	Green Alliance
Piat Piatkiewicz	Non-Ferrous Alliance
Roger Pullin	Chemical Industries Association
Caroline Rainsford	CTPA (Cosmetic, toiletries and perfumery association)
John Reid	British Association for Chemical Specialities
Clara Ritch	3M
Joanna Sachs	CLEAPSS
David Santillo	Greenpeace
Samantha Saunders	PETA
Gareth Simkins	ENDS
Wayne Smith	British Coatings Federation
Karen Stroobants	Royal Society of Chemistry
Wayne Smith	British Coatings Federation
Gene Wilson	Environmental Services Association
William Wilson	Wyeside Consulting Ltd

## Government officials

Naa Acquah	Defra	Gin Masiulyte	Defra
Ruth Coward	Defra	Chloe Meacher	Defra
Katie Dick	Defra	Ruth Michael	Defra
Claire Dixon	Defra	Jane Morrill	Defra
Alison Elliott	Defra	Tom Nickson	EA
Max Folkett	Defra	Eloise Procter	Welsh Government
Stavros Georgiou	HSE	Elliott Smith	Defra
Chris Greene	Defra	Elen Strale	Defra
Lorraine Hutt	EA	Julia Sussams	Defra
Simon Johnson	Defra	Connor Taylor	Defra
Ieuan Jones	Defra	Lee Vousden	BEIS
Robbie Jones	Defra	Alun Williams	Defra
Hannah Kunicki	BEIS	Susie Willows	Defra
Colin Mackie	Defra	Holly Yates	Defra

## Member Apologies

Steve Fletcher      Knowledge Transfer Network

## The following members were substituted by colleagues

Steve George      ADS (UK Aerospace, Defence, Security and Space industries)  
Philip Law      British Plastics Federation

## Annex F: Summary of discussion on Sustainable chemistry and Green finance

- 1. What does sustainable chemistry mean in your sector? Where is it being used? Please give examples** – perhaps very specific bespoke examples as well as broader more holistic examples addressing sustainability throughout the supply chain?

Sustainable chemistry is seen differently in every sector and at each point in the supply chain. Historically, “sustainable” meant product efficiency rather than sustainability throughout the lifecycle.

Classifications of waste do not align with classifications of chemicals. A common framework for lifecycle analysis is needed, as everyone is doing this differently.

Good examples: IKEA removing brominated flame retardants from products; Apple initiative to recycle phones; CTPA initiative partnering experts with those less experienced.

- 2. What would you want to do to reduce complexity? How might you begin to do this? How might you start discussion in your organisation?**

Need to understand why complexity is necessary. Hard to put numbers together, but these are wanted now.

Sector specific innovation can be an issue. Often existing functionality is simply adjusted rather than considering reformulating. As cheap and simple as possible seems to be more profitable but there is not much evidence to back this up.

Complexity can be driven by restrictions. Regulation is often viewed as the enemy of innovation, but it doesn't need to be viewed this way. The gates can't all be closed, meaning that it can't be ensured that all new products are sustainable.

Challenges of product safety standards and customer pressure, lead to a demand for big investments in sustainable chemical processes in product development. Consumer demand is important but, they are influenced by price.

Recycling may introduce its own complexity, e.g., unknown substances, unidentifiable products mixed in ways that can't be separated; more complex polymers are harder to recycle. Waste management needs to be designed in right from the beginning at product development stage. Companies need to be incentivised to do this, otherwise we are creating problems for the future.

**3. How could the uptake of sustainable chemistry be increased?** Could include discussion of:

- Are there other sectors that you could work with to further sustainable chemistry? E.g. water, waste, biomass, chemical producers, retailers, other CSF representatives etc.
- What could Government do to support?

In the cases of fuels and lubricants there is a high demand in the market place for sustainability. The public are looking for more information but, the main barrier is that products we make have to match strict performance requirements. Can take 7-10 years, to replace chemicals with new product because of requirements and investment, especially in larger quantities.

Performance is dictating what gets done with respect to sustainable chemistry and cost is the driver. Need to manage consumer expectation and for the government to see it as a priority with more global awareness. The US industry is driving sustainability because, they can see the benefits but Europe is not doing this.

Educational awareness for the public is vital, need to change how society works, but there isn't much information available on what sustainable chemistry means, e.g., managing expectations for reducing plastics use, explaining that getting rid of all plastics isn't the answer. Take the topics of how energy is produced and recycling to the public's doorstep, frame it without chemistry and bring it into the current hot topics.

The government's role should include: banning harmful chemicals, controlling how substances are used and allowing safer alternatives, e.g., the BPA to BPS move. Legislation and regulation should put a ban on chemicals with a potential impact, currently waiting for regulations to catch up. Important to take a holistic approach in looking for solutions.

Classification of waste is an issue in recycling plants. Efficiency of plants depends on knowing what is in waste. Chemists and engineers need to work together, to consider the lifecycle and incentivise products that are easy to recycle and not fossil fuel based.

Coherent discussion and plan is necessary, on direction and ensuring commercial viability. Not enough to just flag issues and there is a perceived need for government to lead. The Chemicals Strategy should start by identifying what doesn't work with the current approach.

**4. What should be our next steps to develop potential policy options for the chemical strategy?**

Starting point is definitions and metrics. Greater harmonisation needed between countries on driving sustainability and deciding criteria on use of materials based on restrictions. In the US, industry is driving sustainability, but there is a role for the government.

Need a better understanding of what chemicals are in products (legacy content) and why chemicals are being used. Then speed up restrictions and ensure enforcement.

Projects need to map out what we're doing and target where we need to work, e.g., changing chemistry and making the transition, whilst ensuring commercial viability. We could make better use of our data, i.e. pool it for better outcomes.

**Post-Green Finance presentation (there was limited time for discussion of these questions):**

5. To what extent are the financial risks arising from climate and environmental change factored into investment planning in your sector?

- Risks to infrastructure and supply chains
- Transition risks

Need to map and understand the flow of all materials through the UK economy to make changes in sustainability. It is difficult to gauge metrics of success without this, e.g., when the price of energy went up, it destroyed the UK's aluminium market. There needs to be established data in order to make decisions.

Need to understand the cost of doing nothing. There is a cost to sustainability and it will take time. Need to ensure there are incentives, e.g., providing a tax relief to businesses for doing the right thing will bring industry to the UK, but penalising moves the work abroad.

6. What are the key barriers to mobilising investment in sustainable chemistry and what actions would help to clarify investment signals?

Path dependency is one of the main barriers and decisions on infrastructure investments. e.g., landfill / resources recycling have tied us into this form of waste disposal.

Capacity to identify data is poor, this is linked to a need for metrics and consistency of data. Other countries are better at identifying ways to see where waste comes from and goes to. Should run data through Office for National Statistics, as robustness of the data is needed in order to make a return on investment from loans.

Complexity of chemistry is now another barrier and commercial confidentiality, i.e., how to break that down to IMDS (International Material Data System) type level and how to ensure that data flows down through the supply chain. Can use consumer pressures, as this could drive decisions on financial investments.

Government needs to provide regulatory stability and predictability when it comes to sustainability. This gives companies something to actually invest in. Need more cross-government consensus, particularly on monitoring and bringing investment back to the UK.

SMEs (Small and Medium-sized Enterprises) don't have the same expertise as bigger companies and they need information on how to access funds. Need to support SMEs that want to do the right thing. This would also support a level playing field which is important.

Find a way to get UK consumers to accept the need for change, rather than just being told. Consumers abroad are more educated on sustainability. Some retailers try to take the high road, but others make their sustainable products more expensive and consumers won't buy them e.g., Marks and Spencer Plan A.

## Annex G: Post-2020 SAICM Draft Objectives and Targets

**Strategic objective A: Measures are identified, implemented and enforced in order to prevent or, where not feasible, minimize harm from chemicals throughout their life cycle and waste;**

Target A.1: Countries adopt, implement and enforce legal frameworks that address risk prevention and the reduction of adverse impacts from chemicals throughout their life cycle and waste.

Target A.2: Countries have sufficient capacity to address chemicals and waste issues nationally, including appropriate inter-agency coordination and stakeholder participation mechanisms, such as national action plans.

Target A.3: Countries are implementing the chemicals and waste-related multilateral environmental agreements, as well as health, labour and other relevant conventions, and voluntary mechanisms such as the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals.

Target A.4: Stakeholders have incorporated the sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycle and waste into their planning, policies and practices, thereby supporting the development and implementation of chemicals management systems and other sector-appropriate mechanisms.

Target A.5: Governments and industry ensure that workers are protected from the risks associated with chemicals and waste and that workers have the means to protect themselves.

**Strategic objective B: Comprehensive and sufficient knowledge, data and information are generated, available and accessible to all to enable informed decisions and actions;**

Target B.1: Comprehensive data and information for chemicals on the market are available and accessible, including information and data on properties, health and environmental effects, uses, hazard- and risk-assessment results and risk- management measures, monitoring results and regulatory status throughout their life cycle.

Target B.2: All stakeholders, in particular industries and regulators, have and are using the most appropriate and standardized tools, guidelines and best practices for assessments and sound management, as well as for the prevention of harm, risk reduction, monitoring and enforcement.

Target B.3: Information and standardized methods are available and used to understand the impacts of chemicals and waste for improved burden-of-disease and cost-of-inaction estimates, to inform the advancement of chemical safety measures and to measure progress towards reducing those impacts.

Target B.4: Educational, training and public awareness programmes on chemical safety and sustainability have been developed and implemented, including for vulnerable populations, along with worker safety curricula and programmes at all levels.

Target B.5: Countries and stakeholders are implementing training on environmentally sound and safer alternatives, as well as on substitutions and the use of safer alternatives, such as agroecology.

**Strategic objective C: Issues of concern that warrant global and joint action are identified, prioritized and addressed;**

Target C.1: Programmes of work including timelines are established, adopted and implemented for identified issues of concern.

Target C.2: Information on the properties and risk management of chemicals across the supply chain and the chemical contents of products is available to all to enable informed decisions.

**Strategic objective D: Benefits to human health and the environment are maximized and risks are prevented or, where not feasible, minimized through safer alternatives, innovative and sustainable solutions and forward thinking;**

Target D.1: Companies adopt corporate policies and practices that promote resource efficiency and that incorporate the development, production and use of sustainable and safer alternatives, including new technologies and non-chemical alternatives.

Target D.2: Governments implement policies that promote innovation to facilitate the recycling and re-use of products, the adoption of sustainable and safe alternatives, including new technologies and non-chemical alternatives (e.g., the prioritized licensing of reduced-risk alternatives, assessment frameworks, labelling schemes and purchasing policies).

Target D.3: Companies, including from the investment sector, incorporate strategies and policies to support the sound management of chemicals and waste in their investment approaches and business models and apply internationally-recognized reporting standards where relevant.

Target D.4: Companies apply sustainable production principles and life-cycle management in the design of chemicals, materials and products, taking reduced-risk, design-for-recycling and non-chemical solutions and processes into account.

Target D.5: Industry associations promote change towards sustainability and the safe management of waste and of chemicals and consumer products throughout their life cycles, including in sharing information and building the capacity of small and medium-sized enterprises to reduce risks.

**Strategic objective E: The importance of the sound management of chemicals and waste as an essential element to achieving sustainable development is recognized by all; adequate financial and non-financial resources are identified and mobilized; actions are accelerated; and necessary transparent and accountable partnerships are established to foster cooperation among stakeholders.**

Target E.1: The highest levels of stakeholder organizations, including government, industry, civil society and international organizations in all relevant sectors, formally recognize the importance of and commit to action on the sound management of chemicals and waste, and recognize its relevance to sustainable development.

Target E.2: Policies and processes for the management of chemicals and waste are integrated into national and regional development strategies.

Target E.3: Inter- and intra-sectoral partnerships, networks and collaborative mechanisms are established to mobilize resources, to share information, experiences and lessons learned, and to promote coordinated action at the regional and international levels.

Target E4: Identify and mobilize the financial and non-financial resources needed to promote the sound management of chemicals and waste in all sectors, by and for all stakeholders.

Target E5: Gaps between developed and developing countries are narrowed in terms of the implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste.



## Annex H: Summary of discussion on Post-2020 SAICM Draft Objectives and Targets

This agenda item involved attendees discussing the following questions with respect to the draft objectives and targets (groups B-E, as outlined in Annex G):

1. How might this target be improved and be made SMART?
  - Specific
  - Measurable
  - Achievable
  - Relevant
  - Time-bound
2. What contributions i.e. actions could you see your sector making?
3. What challenges might this target present to you as an organisation?

Defra noted that the discussion provided helpful input which will be fed into the preparations for the 4<sup>th</sup> Intersessional Process (IP4) taking place in Bucharest in March 2020. This framework will be agreed in October 2020.

The forum held detailed discussions on the draft targets proposed for the post-2020 framework on chemicals and waste which involves stakeholders as well as governments. The below provides a summary of those discussions and some reflections offered by attendees after the meeting.

- **Links to other areas and frameworks:** Making links to the broader international frameworks and targets is important including links to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the circular economy and climate change. Improving the traceability of chemicals throughout the supply chain for chemicals, safe by design, and designing for dismantling could be useful and there may be others which could be relevant.
- **Current drafting:** The wording is complex and sometimes challenging to understand. Targets need to be clearly drafted in plain language, focused on outcomes and terms should be defined e.g. what is meant by 'comprehensive' or 'addressed'. Clearly identifying which actor is responsible for delivering under different objectives and what they are expected to deliver is needed. Some alternative wording was also provided for a number of targets and a few areas of duplication were identified (e.g. C2/B1). If the targets have timescales imposed this will support increased action from industry particularly if they are shorter.

- **Data and information:** The issue of data sharing is important but it may need to be targeted for particular sectors? What is required? Would the open data concept be supported or could SAICM play a role within this? Mutual acceptance of data is very important and test guidelines shouldn't be different in order to ensure tests do not need to be repeated. However, confidentiality can be an issue and where there are agreements data should be shared but it is not currently being done. There may be a role for government to push companies to share data. Could it be useful to push for an international agreement on information requirements? GHS is global - does waste management need to be included in this?
- **Standards & harmonisation:** Improving the regulation of chemicals and waste internationally could be useful given the increasing complexity of international supply chains. SAICM has an important role to play in improving the management of chemicals and waste internationally and ensuring that perverse incentives are not created which leads to the movement of production to countries who are not engaged with SAICM objectives. There could be a role for 'total lifecycle approaches' both on carbon accounting and more widely accounting for all negative externalities of a given activity. Some ISO standards, such as ISO14040 & ISO14043, already provides a starting point for this. Though there are challenges around how tools and methods would or could be standardised – via bodies such as BSI, CEN and ISO, at global or regional levels? Who sets the baseline for appropriate standards and how would these be define? What if any are the internationally recognised reporting standards? It may be useful to influence the sustainability criteria used by industry.
- **Training & Education:** An improved understanding of the concepts by consumers would help them to better understand and judge what they read in the media. If consumers have access to more information they need to understand the information being made available.
- **Improving regulation:** It might be helpful to consider a tiered structure from 'Expert level countries – tier 1' to 'Basic level of operating countries tier 5' and everything in-between to classify nations of the world, in terms of how knowledgeable they are about chemicals and sustainability. This might provide a framework for action.