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Thank you Madam Chairman.

SAICM is underfinanced. GEF-7 allocations have increased funding to the chemicals and waste focal areas, but SAICM funding remains the same at $13 million USD for four years – 1.4% of the chemicals and waste budget and 0.2% of the GEF-7 replenishment.

We welcome the UNEP Evaluation of the Integrated Approach. UNEP should implement the recommendation in the UNEP evaluation of the integrated approach to, “make a formal request to donors to make an overt signal that chemicals and waste are a fundable component of development plans.”

Echoing Canada, a SAICM clearing house mechanism should publicly track development aid for sound chemicals management.

Private sector financing is poorly implemented in the integrated approach. The UNEP evaluation notes that, “the use of the integrated approach to trigger new financial and in-kind participation of industry is not strongly evidenced.”

Adequate, predictable and sustainable financing that includes internalization of costs of chemical producing industries at the global level. A 0.1% levy on the chemical industry would produce $5.8 billion USD per year for implementation of chemical safety measures and be consistent with Rio Principle 16.

We believe UNEP should implement the evaluation 2 recommendation to, “commission studies on market-based instruments for cost internalisation and incentives for sustainable consumption and production, particularly for green chemistry investments.”

The UNEP evaluation notes that, “Civil society has lost out from the closure of the QSP to which civil society could apply for funding. The Special Programme does not consider CSOs as an institution for implementation and this has generated concerns among civil society organizations.”

Civil Society can be the most cost effective actors in making change on the ground to protect communities and the environment from chemicals and waste.
In line with the evaluation, UNEP should, “propose solutions to address civil society financing,” including, “changing Special Programme grants to include the possibility of sub-grants to CSOs.”

A specific fund for SAICM implementation should be established that provides funding for smaller grants than GEF categories and is designed using lessons learned from the SAICM QSP program.

Thank you Madame President.