

Statement on the Agenda item 4
Ajay K Jha, CECOEDECON, India

I am speaking on behalf of the Farmers, Women, Indigenous Peoples and Science and Technology Major Groups without prejudice to their right to speak. Our comments are as followed;

1. Scope, objectives and functions

The scope needs to be broad, expansive and inclusive as the panel will be required to deal with thousands of chemicals including the highly hazardous pesticides resulting into 220,00 deaths every year and 95% of the accidental poisoning are in the global south.¹ Less than 4% of all pesticides used globally are regulated by binding international conventions² and less than 35% developing countries have regulations in place.³

From the INF/10 it's not clear whether the research undertaken by the SPP is based on the primary data or the peer reviewed research as in the IPCC.

2. In capacity building, it's not clear who are we talking about as recipient of the capacity building, also it looks like capacity building is envisioned as a linear one way exercise. We suggest that the panel also needs to understand the challenges and issues faced by the farmers, IPs, women, grassroots communities and scientific and technology communities and their perspective on the solutions.
3. In operating principles, we would suggest to add "integrity" to scientific independence.

We are also concerned not to see "polluter pays principle" among the critical principles listed. Similarly, we have concern on "informed participation" and wonder whether there is a need to qualify participation with "informed."

4. In the plenary, we see that participation of the non governmental organizations, IPLCs is "qualified in the matters covered by the Panel" this is not explained and open to different interpretations?

It is proposed to respect and recognize other knowledge systems such as those of indigenous peoples, local communities, farmers etc. under the principles of generating a true 'inter-scientific dialogue'.

In the functions we see ensuring the active and efficient participation of the "civil society as observers" and we would suggest the inclusion of the major groups recognized in the

¹ Pesticide Atlas 2022, Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung & others, as cited by the IISD at https://sdg.iisd.org/commentary/policy-briefs/food-systems-and-chemicals-addressing-highly-hazardous-pesticides/also_cited_at_the_saicmknowledge.org

² Highly Hazardous pesticide in Kenya, Heinrich Boll Stiftung, Sept. 2023 as cited at https://ke.boell.org/sites/default/files/2023-09/data-and-facts_highly-hazardous-pesticides-in-kenya-1.pdf

³ IISD, Nov. 2023 as cited at <https://sdg.iisd.org/commentary/policy-briefs/food-systems-and-chemicals-addressing-highly-hazardous-pesticides/>

Agenda 21 besides civil society. We think not recognizing “nine Major Groups” will be a travesty of 40 years history, struggle and the contributions of the major groups.

Thanks