

Statement on Scope 29 January

Congratulations to the Chair,

Thanks to Thailand

Thank the Secretariat for bringing us a message from the Head of WHO. His references to the health impacts of pollution were timely and set out the case for a broad scope. Forgive me, if age means I misheard, but in the same section of the meeting I thought I heard UNEP's representative describe the institution we all want to establish, as a Panel on Chemicals. This does not accord with my recollection of the broad discussion we had in negotiating 5.8 and the careful balancing of chemicals and wastes and broader types of pollution that appear throughout the final text.

Thank the Secretariat for Document 1/4. Always difficult to produce the first paper and too easy to see what you don't like in it.

Like to draw attention to the Annex of 1/4 which suggest 2 approaches are possible Chemicals Up (value chains) or Pollution Down. Choosing between them is a very valid question. As the Global Alliance on Health and Pollution no one will be surprised we prefer pollution down and are disappointed the questions posed in the rest of the paper and the proposed way forward do not encourage a comparison of the two.

Like others we do not support a value chain approach. Would like to suggest 3 further reasons for not going down this path.

Overlap with International Resources Panel. A good webinar organised by the Secretariat last year explained its work.

Unlikely to get another opportunity for a Science Policy Panel for many years so needs to look at whole of 3rd Planetary crisis that UNEP has identified ie pollution.

However, like Brazil, not sure a value chain approach speaks sufficiently to needs of developing countries, especially since they do not usually control those chains. Our developing country members tell us that air pollution, heavy metals, in particular lead, and highly hazardous pesticides are more immediate priorities than chemicals in products for their governments. The natural science of these pollutants may sometimes be known but lead for example has remained a problem at least since Roman times. We need social science input find policies that will help us take effective policy action.

Again, like others we welcome an integrative approach but do not see the proposed objective as a suitable organising principle for this. The objective given seems more of a function. We would see impacts on both human health and ecosystems as a better basis for integration and warmly welcome the remarks made by the distinguished representative of the World Bank during the deep dive at lunch time on the importance of using these impacts as a means of setting priorities.

Jill.hanna@cantab.net +44 7342 388 159