

United Kingdom

Further your request for more information on the Chemicals strategy in addition to my email of 27 March 2013.

- 1) In general, we can and should support from a policy viewpoint the direction of travel of the Chemicals strategy, as it manages to mention all the relevant chemicals and wastes agreement including those for which the GEF is not the financial mechanism.
- 2) However, there are some areas which could be strengthened, in particular on mercury.
- 3) We welcome the increase focus on SIDS and LDCS.
- 4) We can agree to the three strategic objectives but need to consider whether the programmes, topics for priority funding in GEF 6 and the indicators fully align with the Conventions and frameworks. For example, the topics for funding taken from could refer more to mercury (text in black below taken from p. 117 of the pre-programming doc; my suggestions in RED)

a. Elimination of stockpiles of PCB, DDT and obsolete pesticides and stockpiles of new POPs *OK*

b. Management and phase out of PCB oils and POPs pesticides as stipulated in the Stockholm Convention *OK*

c. Reduction of emissions of unintentional POPs (UPOPs) *OK*

d. Introduction of alternatives to DDT for vector control *including approaches to improve their safe and rational use for public health (DfID request)*

e. Early action on mercury to enable ratification of the Mercury Convention *to include:*

- *Rapid assessments*
- *Detailed inventories*
- *Development of specific legislation, storage facilities etc.*
- *ASGM*
- *Capital investment (moving away from manufacture or mercury-added products or processes using mercury)*
- *Capacity building workshops*

f. Action on new POPs particularly in the context of e-waste and chemicals in products

g. Complete phase out of ODS in CEITs and introduction of low GWP, zero ozone depleting potential (ODP) alternatives *OK – checked with Montreal colleagues*

h. Projects that manage harmful chemicals and waste on a sectoral basis such as health care waste management, and harmful waste management *Basel colleagues believe that the health sector is NOT a priority – They have suggested the following: “Projects that take a life cycle approach to the management of chemicals and wastes, to both minimise harmful wastes and to understand better the best overall environmental option for the management of the waste.”*

i. Innovative financial instruments that engage the private sector - *(comment - is this correct language?)*

- 5) The EU will also be asking for consideration of the following in the Stockholm COP next week with a-c in priority order but d-f of equal importance

“Further requests the entities entrusted with the financial mechanism of the Convention to consider the following additional guidance:

- a. identification of alternatives for endosulfan and PFOS
- b. identification, sound management and disposal of waste related to polyBDEs
- c. identification, sound management and disposal of obsolete stocks for lindane
- d. measures to support effectiveness evaluation

e. institutional capacity, particularly with development of plans, strategies and resource mobilisation in LDCs and SIDS

f. facilitation of compliance, provided that a functioning mechanism is agreed and operational ;”