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Thank you Co-chairs,

As indicated in previous declarations, including the previous agenda point, our shared vision for the sound chemicals management (SMC) beyond 2020 is already well articulated in current SAICM core documents, UNEA resolution and WHO declaration.

Similarly, the high value of the multi-stakeholder process has been highlighted and should not only be upheld, but deepened where possible, including by re-emphasizing the critical role of the health sector; and reaching out to:

- human rights communities,
- development and north-south collaboration communities,
- children and education organizations and communities,
- indigenous and women groups,
- and a more diverse industry representation beyond the chemical manufacturers, to actively include manufacturers of safer alternatives, organic agriculture, bio-pesticides etc..
The non-legally binding nature of SAICM has also been largely commented mainly to rightly highlight that it has allowed SAICM to address new and emerging issues and develop new and innovative legal, policy and grassroots approaches to address ongoing challenges for the sound management of chemicals and waste.

In parallel, however, the lack of legally binding commitments has also been identified as a weakness of the process by limiting the raising of political priority for the issue of SMC and preventing the commitment of adequate financing. And, as a result, limiting the effectiveness of SAICM implementation on the ground and subsequent reduction of harms as exemplified by the stories told yesterday in the opening statements of my colleagues from IPEN and PAN.

While these two approaches seem irreconcilable, a number of very valuable proposals have been advanced in the past years in relation to possible governance for the SMC, most notably the paper proposed by the Nordic Council presented yesterday during the 1st informal dialogue.

We of course acknowledge that this process will not lead to a legally binding framework convention on SMC in the coming three years, but we also recognize that the SMC will not be a time-limited process and will remain a topic requiring our attention in a non-time-limited manner. We therefore would like to reiterate our call for the secretariat to prepare a governance option document considering all options, including binding, non binding, and mixed arrangements to guide our discussions for the next three years.