**23rd Chemical Dialogue (“CD23”): FINAL REPORT**

*August 25, 2019*

*Room Calbuco, Enjoy Hotel*

*Puerto Varas, Chile*

 The Twenty-Third Meeting of the Chemical Dialogue (“CD” or “Dialogue”) (“CD23”) was convened on August 25, 2019 in Room Calbuco of the Enjoy Hotel in Puerto Varas, Chile and attended by representatives from 14 APEC economies: Australia (Government & Industry); Canada (Industry (Virtual)); Chile (Government & Industry); Indonesia (Government); Japan (Government & Industry); Korea (Industry); Malaysia (Government & Industry); Mexico (Industry); Peru (Government); Philippines (Government & Industry); Russia (Government & Industry); Singapore (Government & Industry (latter Virtual)); Chinese Taipei (Government & Industry); and the United States (Government & Industry). CD23 also welcomed invited guests from the Argentinian Government and Industry as well as Brazilian Industry. CD23 was co-chaired by Mr. Kent Shigetomi as the Government Co-Chair and Dr. Shinoi Sakata as the Industry Co-Chair. CD23 was preceded by a Latin American Regulatory Cooperation Forum held on August 23, 2019, a special session of the Regulators’ Forum on risk assessments and also of the Regulators’ Forum on August 24, 2019, and an Industry Pre-Meeting (“IPM”) held on August 24, 2019 in the same location.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **09:00 – 09:40** | **AGENDA ITEM 1** | **SETTING THE SCENE** |

1. **Welcome from Government Co-Chair** **Government Co-Chair**

The Government Co-Chair opened CD23 by welcoming the 14 APEC economies and two guests, Argentina and Brazil. The Government Co-Chair thanked Chile for its excellent hospitality and for welcoming us to the beautiful shores in Puerto Varas. The Co-Chair congratulated delegates on a successful series of meetings over the previous few days, including the Latin American Regulatory Cooperation Workshop on Friday (23rd), the risk assessment workshop, the Regulators Forum, and the Industry Pre-Meeting on Saturday (24th), and then this plenary session.

The Co-Chair called on delegates to build on those discussions and to actively participate in the discussions throughout the CD plenary. In particular, he encouraged participants to leverage the unique ideas that were put forward during the previous meetings and to propose specific projects or next steps that the CD could undertake to help meet the priorities of the Committee on Trade & Investment (“CTI”) and of Chile for their 2019 host year.

1. **Welcome from Industry Co-Chair** **Industry Co-Chair**

On behalf of the Asia-Pacific Chemical Industry Coalition (“APCIC”), the Industry Co-Chair welcomed delegates to CD23 and provided a brief summary of the discussions at the IPM held during the afternoon of August 24, 2019. The Industry Co-Chair first thanked Mr. Sergio Barrientos, the General Manager of ASIQUIM, Chile’s Chemical Industry Association, who joined her as Honorary Co-Chair for the IPM.

The IPM noted that its priorities continued to align closely with the items on the CD’s agenda, including a focus on regulatory cooperation, addressing divergences in GHS implementation, addressing the challenges of marine debris or marine litter; promoting the chemical industry as a solutions provider; and information sharing on regulatory developments.

Industry noted its support for the outcomes from the two workshops that had been held, including: (1) promoting regulatory cooperation around (i) the prioritization of chemicals for risk assessment and evaluation and (ii) GHS implementation and convergence; (2) developing a regulatory cooperation toolkit for chemical regulators that incorporates both APEC’s general regulatory cooperation experience and the experiences shared during the workshop; and (3) hosting a 2020 event on the same topics with regulators from Southeast Asia in 2020. Industry also identified two potential new workstreams for the CD’s consideration in 2020, including: (1) chemistry as a critical element in promoting a circular economy; and (2) chemical specific rules of origin in recent free trade agreements. Industry looked forward to carrying these discussions forward during the CD plenary.

1. **Welcome from Chile** **Chile Representative**

A representative of the Government of Chile welcomed CD delegates to Puerto Varas. He reiterated Chile’s four main themes for the year: (1) Digital Society; (2) Integration 4.0; (3) Women, SMEs, and Inclusive Growth; and (4) Sustainable Growth.

Chile noted that the CD has consistently contributed to accomplishing the CTI’s objectives, including for example through: (1) disseminating best practices on GHS that have been important in helping Chile build capacity amongst its regulators and industry; (2) good regulatory practices; and (3) marine debris, a particular priority for Chile as it looks to lead the development of an APEC Roadmap on Marine Debris. Chile expressed its appreciation to the CD for its self-funding of the Latin American Regulatory Cooperation workshop and the Risk Assessment workshop over the previous two days.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **09:40 – 10:00** | **AGENDA ITEM 2** | **STRATEGY AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE DIALOGUE** |

1. **Review of Alignment with CTI Priorities Moderated by Co-Chairs**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/002 – Draft Consolidated 2016-2019 Boracay Action Agenda Stocktake (as of Aug. 8, 2019)

Action Items: The CD:

* Noted that the CD’s agenda remained aligned with the Committee on Trade and Investment’s priorities and encouraged economies to consider specific projects the CD could undertake to further contribute to those priorities; and
* Called on economies to identify contributions that the CD has made and could make over the next year toward implementation of the Boracay Action Agenda prior to its final evaluation in 2020. Deadline for comments to CD Program Director is on 20 September 2019, COB.

 The Government Co-Chair reminded delegates that since 2014, the CTI has requested its sub-fora to include time on their agendas during their second meeting every year to confirm that they have helped to meet the CTI’s four objectives: (1) support for the multilateral trading system; (2) deepening regional economic integration, including through implementation of the Lima Declaration on the Free Trade Area of the Asia-Pacific (“FTAAP”); (3) strengthening trade facilitation and connectivity, including through regulatory cooperation and convergence; and (4) promoting innovative and inclusive responses to APEC-wide issues, including through engagement with the private sector.

 The Philippines introduced the consolidated 2016-2019 Boracay Action Agenda (“BAA”) Stocktake for micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (“MSMEs”). The Philippines noted four particular CD contributions, including (1) capacity building on regulatory cooperation, (2) potential new work on rules of origin for chemical products, (3) implementation of GHS, and (4) information sharing on customs rules and regulations. The Philippines noted that the BAA concludes it 2020 and that it will likely commission a study to assess its contribution over the five-year horizon. The Philippines challenged CD members to identify additional contributions in 2020 that would continue to promote trade facilitation in chemical products for MSMEs.

1. **APEC Secretariat Update** **APEC Secretariat**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/017 – APEC Secretariat General Information and Update for 2019 and Project Update

Action Items: The CD

* Requested that delegates review the Chemical Dialogue webpage, including, in particular, the description of ongoing workstreams, and provide any updates to the Secretariat; and
* Encouraged delegates to identify concrete proposals for potential CD projects and submit them to the CD for comment prior to CD24 in Malaysia’s host year.

The Secretariat presented Document Number 017. He started by discussing several administrative matters. With respect to quorum, the CD did not make quorum at either meeting in Papua New Guinea, but it did successfully make quorum during both meetings in Chile. The Secretariat then reiterated its call for CD delegates to continue to highlight the importance of the CD to their economies, providing four suggestions of potential ways to do this including: (1) joining the CD meeting itself to demonstrate participation, (2) applying for and receiving APEC funds, (3) demonstrating alignment of work to APEC parent fora priorities, and (3) updating the CD webpage. In reply to a question regarding how the CD could better convey its value to the CTI, the Secretariat recommended that the workstreams and their importance be included in the CTI Convenors report.

The Secretariat reviewed the 2019 project cycle results. The CD was unsuccessful in its one submitted proposal for Project Cycle 1 (the risk assessment workshop now being self-funded on the margins of the CD Regulators’ Forum). Overall 52 percent (52 of 100) of the projects submitted in the first funding cycle were approved for funding and 54 percent for the second funding cycle. We do not yet know the exact deadlines for the 2020 funding cycles, but we expect (a) the funding cycle one timeline to be established in October to November 2019, (b) to call for concept notes by February 2020, and (c) to require concept notes to be finalized before March 10. The Secretariat called for additional projects to be put forward for potential funding in 2020 and several economies noted that would support putting forward the risk assessment proposal again in 2020.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **10:00-10:15** | **AGENDA ITEM 3** | **SHARED GOAL 1: TO FACILITATE TRADE BY EXPANDING AND SUPPORTING REGULATORY COOPERATION AND MUTUAL RECOGNITION IN THE REGION** |

1. **Regulators’ Forum Temporary RF Chair**

Action Items: The CD:

* Encouraged economies to nominate a chair for the Regulators’ Forum as soon as possible; and
* Instructed the Regulators’ Forum to finalize a 2020-2021 workplan as soon as it endorses a new chair.

The Government Co-Chair, as temporary representative of the Regulators’ Forum, briefly summarized the previous day’s discussions. He reiterated the potential ideas for a 2020-2021 work plan that had been discussion during the Regulators Forum, including:

* Information sharing;
* CD integration, particularly related to integrating the RF's work with that of the CD by integrating the RF into future workshops that build on the Good Regulatory Practice workshops, and by broadening the number of regulators participating in the virtual working groups;
* Capacity building, particularly with respect to (a) implementing commitments that economies have made related to international chemical conventions (e.g., Stockholm), (b) the importation of chemical products, (c) GHS implementation, and (d) address the challenges posted in implementing risk assessment & management frameworks; and finally
* A set of additional ideas, including a repository of translations of APEC chemical regulations, a presentation at the next RF on what APEC has done with respect to GRP generally, developing a list of dual-purpose chemicals, and developing an interactive guide with economy-specific regulations and a checklist of what is needed to export chemicals to a particular economy.

The Government Co-Chair reiterated the call for an economy to step forward to serve as Chair, noting that the commitment was only for one meeting a year (during SOM3) and the administrative difficulties are not too challenging. Several economies reiterated the request to the room for economies to consult with their colleagues and identify anyone willing to consider the role.

1. **Latin America Regulatory Cooperation Forum Temporary RF Chair**

Action Items: The CD:

* Agreed to undertake further work to implement the action items identified by the Latin American Regulatory Cooperation Forum:
	+ Industry to identify a nominee to participate on the Latin American Regulator Network;
	+ Include a standing agenda item on the CD plenary agenda to report out on activities undertaken by CD member economies to promote regulatory cooperation related to chemicals, including inside and outside APEC;
	+ Organize a similar event in 2020 in Malaysia’s host year to focus on regional regulatory cooperation efforts in chemicals within Asia, particular Southeast Asia;
	+ Draft a report on the range of regulatory cooperation mechanisms available in the chemical sector, from information sharing, through memorandums of understanding, to seconded officials, and FTA text, with examples of where each has been implemented;
	+ Develop a toolkit that builds on the report above that can be used by regulators seeking to promote regulatory cooperation efforts, regardless of their stage of development; and
	+ Begin discussions on a CD endorsed template for a sectoral annex to promote regulatory cooperation in chemicals, potentially modeled after the chemical annex agreed to as part of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (“USMCA”)

U.S. Industry, as Project Overseer for the self-funded workshop, presented a summary of the Latin America Regulatory Cooperation Workshop that had been held on August 23, 2019. The workshop produced a robust discussion of chemical specific regulatory cooperation initiatives taking place throughout Latin America and benefited greatly from the participation of Argentina and Brazil as invited guests. Discussions were centered around six roundtables held on a range of regulatory cooperation topics: (1) international chemical management; (2) SAICM; (3) obstacles to regulatory cooperation; (4) regulation cooperation in trade agreements and through bilateral mechanisms; (5) progress on regulatory cooperation in Latin America; and (6) a conclusion session.

CD delegates welcomed the report on the workshop and the discussions that had been held. Argentina thanked the CD for the opportunity to participate and invited industry from APEC Latin American economies to identify a representative to participate in the Latin American Chemical Regulator Network. Australian Government stated that it would be willing to contribute to a draft report on the range of regulatory cooperation mechanisms available to economies and to contribute its own experience in establishing regulatory cooperation by helping build trust between regulators across economies. The Philippines thanked the organizers and noted that Southeast Asian economies have organized a chemical industry regulatory cooperation meeting annually, but that the meeting would substantially benefit from the input received during the workshop.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10:30-11:00** | **FAMILY PHOTO AND COFFEE BREAK** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **11:00-12:30** | **AGENDA ITEM 3, CONTINUED** | **SHARED GOAL 1: TO FACILITATE TRADE BY EXPANDING AND SUPPORTING REGULATORY COOPERATION AND MUTUAL RECOGNITION IN THE REGION** |

1. **Risk Assessment Workshop Workshop Convener**

Action Items: The CD:

* Agreed to carry forward the recommendations generated by the risk assessment tabletop exercise, including related to:
	+ Work towards a commitment by economies to use risk assessments on chemical substances by other competent authorities in other economies, taking into account of exposure scenarios in their own jurisdictions;
	+ Develop APEC best practices on risk assessments for chemical substances and recommendations for capacity building to help economies apply those best practices;
	+ Recommend that economies, particularly Australia, present a case study on their risk assessment approaches at CD25 (SOM3);
	+ Develop an APEC CD report on past work on risk assessments for potential use by APEC economies, drawing from existing work by the OECD or other sources; and
	+ Prioritize an APEC concept note for a second risk assessment workshop at CD 25 (SOM3) in 2020 in Malaysia.

U.S. Industry as conveners of the Risk Assessment workshop presented a summary of the results. First, they noted how this served as a different model for a workshop. Instead of focusing on the presentation of information, it focused on a hands-on “tabletop” exercise in which participants had the opportunity to try and actually conduct a risk assessment using real-life scenarios. The convener’s circulated a survey immediately afterwards and received the following results:

* 15/15 found the workshop helpful in understanding risk assessment;
* 11/15 found the workshop “definitely” helpful, and 4/15 found it “mostly” helpful in understanding how risk assessment decisions were made; and
* 14/15 respondents would recommend sending a colleague to a repeat event.

CD delegates thanked the organizers for the opportunity to participate in the workshop. Australia noted that one of the ground rules of the workshop was that teams could not share data and suggested that future iterations of the event could allow for data sharing as a way of showing the value of regulatory cooperation. Australia further noted the workshop highlighted the value of choosing tests and data carefully with limited budgets and the corresponding need for regulators to understand that they will need to be able to communicate uncertainty to the public. Australian Government volunteered to present a case study at CD25 on how it has sought to address these challenges within its new regulatory framework (summarized in Section 6 below). Several other economies expressed their appreciation for the event and their willingness to join a similar event if held on the margins of a future CD meeting.

1. **Virtual Working Group on Regulatory Cooperation and Convergence**
2. **VWGRCC Work Plan VWGRCC Co-Chairs (U.S. Industry; Government Co-Chair [TBD])**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/003 – Rules of Origin for Chemicals in APEC Free Trade Agreements

Action Items: The CD:

* Sought nominations for economies willing to serve as the Government Co-Chair of the Virtual Working Group on Regulatory Convergence and Cooperation (“VWGRCC”) by September 31, 2019
* Welcomed the work undertaken by the United States related to analyzing developments on utilizing chemical reaction rules of origin (“ROO”) for chemical products in recent APEC free-trade agreements (FTAs) and regional trade agreements (RTAs); and
* Recommended that further work be undertaken on chemical reaction ROOs to determine if the CD could develop a set of recommendations for APEC economies to consider for chemical ROOs when negotiating new, or revising existing, FTAs and RTAs.
* Agreed that the Government Co-Chair would coordinate this work with the Market Access Group (MAG) and the Subcommittee on Customs Procedures.

 The Industry Co-Chair of the Virtual Working Group on Regulatory Cooperation and Convergence (“VWGRCC”) presented an update on the VWGRCC’s work since SOM1. The Co-Chair noted that the VWGRCC had taken an active role in supporting the two workshops that had been already discussed. Additionally, the good regulatory practices (“GRP”) and customs workstreams of the group are discussed below.

 The VWGRCC therefore focused this agenda item on a follow-up discussion of rules of origin (“ROOs”) for chemical products that had been first proposed at SOM1 2019 (Doc. No. 2019/SOM3/CD/003). Historically, chemical ROOs had required either a tariff shift or a regional value content (“RVC”) requirement. Newer FTAs and RTAs have, however, started to shift to newer rules, including chemical reaction rules and, occasionally, purification, mixture/blend, and isomer separation rules. Based on a survey of APEC economies, all but two are already party to an FTA or RTA that contains a chemical reaction rule. The VWGRCC therefore asked delegates whether the CD should consider some form of workstream that aimed to understand and then promote these newer approaches.

 CD economies welcomed the proposal. Chile noted that it was chair of the Subcommittee on Customs Procedures (“SCCP”) and would be happy to share information with that group. Mexico agreed with the idea of potential work on new rules and also suggested that the work focus on both verification and certification in the FTA context which, while horizontal issues, can often pose unique challenges to ensuring chemicals qualify as originating. The Government Co-Chair noted that if the CD wanted to apply for APEC funding, then a broader proposal would be better as it would better show support for regional economic integration. That proposal could potentially include development of a CD set of recommendations on 21st century FTAs for chemical products. The APEC Secretariat welcomed this project and commented that it would be easy to show the linkage between this and the CTI’s work program, but suggested that the CD also ensure that it coordinated any work with the Market Access Group (“MAG”).

1. **Sharing Best Practices in Chemical Regulation Self-Funded Project: Update The Philippines & VWG Co-Chairs**

Action Items: The CD:

* Encouraged economies to nominate speakers for the next webinar as soon as possible; and
* Encouraged economies to volunteer to organize the remaining three webinars.

The VWGRCC Co-Chair renewed the call for economies willing to lead the three remaining webinars that follow from the CD19 project on “Sharing Best Practices in Chemical Regulation” relating to: (1) evaluating comments received during public consultations; (2) principles-based regulation; and (3) tools for collecting exposure information. U.S. industry offered to host the webinars and the CD recommended delegates consider expressing interest in organizing the discussions intersessionally.

1. **Customs Practices for Industrial Chemicals** **U.S. Industry**

Action Items: The CD:

* Encouraged additional economies to provide information sharing presentations on their approaches to import requirements for industrial chemicals at future CD meetings; and
* Noted the intention of the VWGRCC to utilize those presentations to consider drafting principles related to best practices for the import of industrial chemicals for ultimate consideration by the CD at future meetings.

The VWG Co-Chair noted that at CD21 and CD22 the CD had included an agenda item to encourage economies to present best practices in import procedures for chemical products. Chile had provided a thorough presentation at CD22 and other economies were encouraged to offer to do the same at future meetings. Several CD delegates noted that it was difficult for them to get their customs officers to the CD meetings and therefore recommended that to the extent the CD and SCCP meeting schedules were aligned at future SOMs, it may be easier to secure a presenter on these topics.

1. **Proposed Self-Funded & APEC Funded Proposals U.S. Industry**

Following on the two workshop proposals discussed above, U.S. Industry noted its intention to submit a revised concept note for APEC funding of a risk assessment workshop to be held during the Malaysia host year. Australia noted its willingness to again cosponsor this project. The United States also expressed willingness to partner with other economies in the drafting of a proposal related to the ROO/FTA issues discussed above. The Government Co-Chair encouraged economies to develop project proposal ideas for 2020 to continue to reinforce the CD’s relevance to more senior APEC fora.

1. **Economic Importance of the Chemical Industry in APEC Economies U.S. Industry**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/004 – Letter: Chemical Industry Calls for Free and Open Trade in Chemicals

Action Item: The CD:

* Noted the intention of the CD industry associations to negotiate and agree to consensus language as a letter to Senior Officials and APEC Ministers that reiterates, at a minimum, the economic importance of the chemical industry to APEC supply chains and economies.

 The VWGRCC Co-Chair introduced Document Number 2019/SOM3/CD/004 that resulted from the action item at CD20 and CD21 in which the CD agreed to draft a letter to CTI and SOM that leveraged the two economic importance reports the CD had endorsed, that was intended “to reinforce the value and importance of the Chemical Dialogue and the importance of its work to meeting APEC objectives.” U.S. Industry introduced the draft as a working draft for discussion and revision, noting that the intention was to develop industry consensus from all APEC economies and then to potentially submit it to ABAC as a business initiative.

 A number of industry associations expressed their support for the idea of the letter, but noted they had amendments to offer to the title and text before they could agree to endorse the document. The CD therefore agreed that delegates would work intersessionally to see if consensus could be reached amongst industry associations on the text of the letter that, at a minimum, reiterated the economic importance of the chemical industry to APEC supply chains and economies to senior APEC fora, potentially via ABAC.

1. **Virtual Working Group on GHS**
2. **Implementation of VWG Workplan**

 **VWG Co-Chairs (U.S. Industry & Singapore Government)**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/005 – Virtual Working Group Globally Harmonized System for the Classification and Labeling of Chemicals: Progress Report

Action Items: The CD:

* Notes the VWGGHS’s Progress Report and agrees to post to G.R.E.A.T. website
* Encourages member economies to complete the 2020 GHS Implementation Convergence Questionnaire;
* Requests economies to provide a status information update on their economy’s plans for implementation of the 7th edition of the UNSCEGHS’s Purple Book to the VWGGHS; and
* Encourages the VWGGHS to continue brainstorming potential next steps, including principles or best practices, to begin closing the GHS implementation gaps identified in the VWGGHS’s ongoing work.
* Requests a Government Co-Chair nomination

The Industry Co-Chair of the VWG on the Globally Harmonized System for the Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (“GHS”) (“VWGGHS”) provided an update on work progress since CD22 (summarized in Document Number 2019/SOM3/CD/005), which includes:

* Finalizing comments on its Terms of Reference (2019/SOM1/CD/002a) and secured their endorsement;
* Completing and submitting the Annual GHS Implementation Report (2019/MRT/006) (discussed in agenda item below);
* Endorsing the updated “Comparison of Implementing GHS Regulations Amongst the APEC Economies” (2019/SOM1/CD/002);
* Beginning collaboration with the VWG on Data Exchange on GHS capacity building (discussed in agenda item two below), and
* Debating potential next steps to promote GHS implementation, such as development of a set of principles/best practices that could then be adopted by economies, potentially on a pathfinder basis.

The VWG Co-Chair called for comments on these items as well as reports from CD member economies on GHS implementation status. Finally, the Co-Chair renewed the call for a Government Co-Chair nomination.

1. **Annual GHS Implementation Report Australian Industry**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/006: Annual GHS Implementation Report
* 2019/SOM3/CD/006a: Annual GHS Implementation Report Survey

Action Items: The CD:

* Noted the Annual GHS Implementation Report (2019/SOM3/CD/006) from Australia;
* Sought comments on the 2020 GHS Implementation Questionnaire (2019/SOM3/CD/006a) by September 15, 2019 and, if no adverse comments received, approval by that date; and
* Encouraged CD economies to complete the GHS Implementation Convergence Questionnaire prior to December 15, 2019 to ensure the annual report can be prepared in sufficient time to enable comment and then submission to the MRT.

 Australian Industry reviewed the successful submission of the Annual GHS Report to Ministers Responsible for Trade on the margins of SOM2 (2019/MRT/006). Australian Industry noted that the report was picked up, and well summarized, by Chemical Watch.[[1]](#footnote-1)

 Looking ahead to the 2020 report, Australian Industry noted that they would focus on lower hazard GHS categories that have been implemented by some economies but not by others (*e.g.*, Flammable Liquid Category 4, Acute Toxicity Category 5). To complete the questionnaire on time, Australian Industry proposed the following timeline: (1) CD Members agree to the 2020 Questionnaire at SOM3; (2) CD Members provide replies to the 2020 Questionnaire by December 15, 2019; (3) Australian Industry to circulate a draft report to the VWGGHS for comment by February 1, 2020; (4) The CD to approve the final report to the MRT at SOM1 2020; and (5) CD to submit the report to CTI and up to MRT intersessionally pre-MRT. The CD agreed to the proposed timeline and encouraged economies to begin completing the survey.

1. **Extensions and Status of the G.R.E.A.T. Project Chinese Taipei**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/007 – Updated on the Globally Harmonized System Reference Exchange and Tool (“G.R.E.A.T.”) Project

Action Items: The CD:

* Thanked Chinese Taipei for its continued support of the GHS Reference Exchange and Tool (“G.R.E.A.T.”) website;
* Welcomed the proposal for a new feature comparing lists of priority management chemicals across APEC economies and encouraged Chinese Taipei to refine the proposal intersessionally after consideration of comments from the CD meeting; and
* Encouraged economies to provide relevant updates to Chinese Taipei to maximize the utility of the site.

Chinese Taipei provided an update on developments related to the GHS Reference Exchange and Tool (“G.R.E.A.T.”) project that it hosts (Document Number 007).[[2]](#footnote-2) Since the website was founded, there have been 180,000 visits to the site, which includes a steady flow of new visits (12,000 between February and July 2019). After summarizing the existing features, Chinese Taipei offered to continue to host the site as its contribution towards Shared Goal 1 and then introduced a new proposal to expand its functionality that compares lists of prioritized chemicals across CD member economies. To do this, Chinese Taipei requested economies to provide their lists of prioritized chemicals and the G.R.E.A.T. website will then be upgraded to enable display and comparison of these lists. This tool is intended to promote information flow, but will not be intended to question actual classification decisions as Chinese Taipei continues to support the principal of self-classification.

A number of economies thanked Chinese Taipei for its leadership on this initiative, noting that industry in those economies had commented to them about its utility to develop safety data sheets (“SDSs”) in local languages where they were trading. Several economies expressed concern about consolidating a list of chemicals that were still “pre-assessment” in that economy out of fear of creating a functional “blacklist” prior to a risk assessment having been concluded. Chinese Taipei agreed to discuss the issue with these economies intersessionally and to provide an updated proposal to the CD intersessionally or at CD24.

1. **Virtual Working Group on Data Exchange Russian Federation & Singapore**
2. **Implementation of the VWG Workplan Co-Chairs**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/008 – The APEC CD Virtual Working Group on Data Exchange
* 2019/SOM3/CD/008a – The APEC CD Virtual Working Group on Data Exchange: Presentation

Action Items: The CD:

* Welcomed the proposal for GHS capacity building webinars and encouraged the VWGDE to collaborate closely with the VWGGHS to ensure the webinars contribute to ongoing capacity building work being undertaken by the VWGGHS.
* Agreed that economies interested in participating in the UNSCEGHS global list project should note that interest through their UNSCEGHS representatives.

The Co-Chair of the VWG on Data Exchange (“VWGDE”) provided a progress report for CD23 describing its activities along its three main work streams: (1) Information Sharing, which relates to the development of an interactive guide summarized in the next agenda item, (2) Voluntary Initiatives, where the VWGDE is continuing to develop a proposal for future work and will revisit it in 2020, and (3) Cooperation with International Fora, where it is focusing on (a) capacity building on GHS and (b) cooperation with the UNSCEGHS.

With respect to the GHS, the VWGDE provided an additional update regarding the GHS capacity building proposal for four webinars on GHS: (1) an introduction on GHS implementation, (2) implementation lessons learned, (3) industries perspective on challenges, and (4) outcomes and next steps. We recommend that the CD continue to encourage close collaboration with the VWGGHS on any GHS capacity building activity.

With respect to the UNSCEGHS, the VWGDE summarizes the ongoing work related to the potential development of a global list for the classification of chemicals. The VWGDE has submitted a supplemental background document (2019/SOM3/CD/008) with a few more details on the UNSCEGHS’s work and that calls on CD economies to take note of these developments and investigate the potential to contribute to that project.

The CD welcomed the proposal and encouraged the VWGDE to collaborate closely with the VWGGHS and agreed that economies interested in participating in the UNSCEGHS global list project should express their interest to their economy’s UNSCEGHS representative.

1. **Interactive Guide Co-Chairs**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/008b – VWGDE Interactive Guideline Presentation

Action Items: The CD:

* Welcomed the developments on a user interface for a potential interactive guide on chemicals and noted the intention of the Virtual Working Group on Data Exchange to further refine the interface intersessionally.
* Encouraged the collaboration between the VWGDE and the Latin American Regulator Network to potentially leverage the experience of the VWGDE in developing a similar regional tool for the Latin American network.

The Co-Chair provided an update on the Interactive Guideline that has been under development. By way of background, this project aims to build on Russia’s self-funded project in which it collected more than 600 pages of information from 17 APEC economies on their chemical regulatory systems. The VWGDE had therefore proposed to develop an “Interactive Guide” to make that information accessible to CD members. The workstream was endorsed at CD21, and at CD22 the VWGDE had demonstrated a potential model for the interface.

Going forward, the VWGDE intends to develop a webpage for the interactive guide by the end of November 2019 and fill out a pilot form from November-December 2019 for 1-2 economies. The webpage will include numerous data elements, including: Emergency; Chemicals; Key procedures; SDS & Label; Databases; CBI; Multilateral Environmental Agreements; Transport; and Non-regulatory Mechanisms. Currently, the plan is to host the guide on the VWGDE platform as an interim solution, but a long-term home has not been identified. In response to a question, the VWGDE noted that this differed from the OECD eChem portal insofar as the eChem portal covers hazards, but not regulations. Two Latin American economies welcomed the initiative and recommended that it could be something that the Latin American Regulator Network could consider using/expanding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **12:30-14:00** | **LUNCH** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **14:00-15:30** | **AGENDA ITEM 4** | **SHARED GOAL 2: TO PROMOTE UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHEMICAL INDUSTRY’S ROLE AS A PROVIDER OF INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT** |

* 1. **APEC Sustainable Plastics Eco System** **Chinese Taipei**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/009 – APEC Sustainable Plastics Eco System – Best Practice Sharing on Business Model Innovation and Technologies Implementation

Action Item: The CD:

* Welcomed the proposal from Chinese Taipei to the PPSTI “APEC Sustainable Plastics Eco System – Best Practice Sharing on Business Model Innovation and Technologies Implementation” and requested that the agenda and any meeting specifics be circulated to CD delegates.

Chinese Taipei’s representative to the Policy Partnership on Science, Technology and Innovation (“PPSTI”) joined the CD to present about a relevant concept note on “APEC Sustainable Plastics Eco System – Best Practice Sharing on Business Model Innovation and Technologies Implementation” (Document Number 009), which is being submitted through (PPSTI). The PPSTI representative welcomed the opportunity to present to the CD for the first time.

The concept note aims to use a model that Chinese Taipei had pioneered that turned waterway waste plastics into fountain pens in an effort to preserve the habitat for the endangered Black-faced Spoonbills in Chinese Taipei. Building on that experience, the concept note has three objectives: (1) sharing information from local business model innovation, existing technologies and equipment for further collaboration in APEC; (2) connecting people by providing more capacity building and generic process sharing to foster a healthy eco-system for a cleaner and greener APEC; and (3) promoting the circular economy using waterway waste plastics as a solution to plastic pollution to achieve a sustainable society.

The project’s work plan involves six stages: (1) November 2019, there will be a waterway cleaning event with a goal of collecting a certain amount of plastic (self-funded); (2) processing of collected materials in December 2019; (3) proof of concept for the regeneration of recycled plastic materials in February 2020; (4) manufacturing of recycled plastics in April 2020; (5) an APEC seminar (if funding is secured) in July 2020 to promote a technical exchange regarding the lessons learned; and (6) submitting a final report to APEC in September 2020. The outcomes will yield an educational event, dissemination of best practices on innovative knowledge of plastic waste solutions, and a draft set of policy recommendations to promote those solutions.

The Secretariat requested that the meeting agenda and details be circulated to the CD intersessionally.

* 1. **VWG on Marine Debris** **Representative of the Marine Debris VWG**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/010 – VWG on Marine Debris Update

Action Items: The CD:

* Welcomed the presentation from the VWG on Marine Debris; and
* Encouraged economies to disseminate interest on the various marine debris related initiatives within their economies and to promote active participation in the numerous workstreams.
* Welcomed the inclusion of additional information from the VWG on Marine Debris on the APEC website.

A representative from the VWG on Marine Debris (“VWGMD”), a joint working group between the CD and the Ocean’s and Fisheries Working Group (“OFWG”), presented an update on the work undertaken since CD22 (Document Number 010). After presenting a brief background on the founding and historic successes of the VWGMD, the VWG discussed ongoing new or planned projects including:

1. A new CTI project to build capacity on domestic policies that promote waste management and recycling infrastructure, address barriers to trade, and increase markets for sustainable materials. The project will focus on four key policy areas, including (a) supporting environmental regulation and the identification of sound environmental practices; (b) enabling legal definitions of waste and recyclable materials; (c) materials quality and health and safety standards; and (d) enabling policies for recycling infrastructure investments (*e.g.*, investment rules for public-private partnerships). The work builds on the CTI’s previous APEC Regulatory Cooperation Advancement Mechanism (“ARCAM”) project that sought to align definitions related to sustainable materials management and will include a workshop/roundtable in 2020.
2. An ABAC conference on Building the Infrastructure for the Circular Economy in APEC focused on creating the enabling environment for infrastructure public-private partnerships, with an initial focus on waste management. This will include a September 9, 2019 conference hosted by Hong Kong, China.
3. Seeking to help coordinate numerous other parallel workstreams in APEC, including:
	1. A Clean City and Ocean Project from the United States and Chile in the OFWG;
	2. Best Practices on Circular Economy from Mexico in the CTI;
	3. A proposal from Japan for a peer review to evaluate the current status of resource recycling in Asia-Pacific cities;
	4. A Malaysian proposal for a APEC New Plastic Economy conference;
	5. Ongoing work by the United States to update the 2009 APEC Report on Economic Costs of Marine Debris to APEC Economies; and
	6. Chile and the Policy Support Unit developing a compendium of preventive measures and policies that APEC economies are taking to reduce land-based marine debris.

The VWGMD’s next steps include: (1) expanding the VWG Network; (2) Continuing to connect work from other APEC groups; (3) promoting the circular economy infrastructure development conference in Hong Kong, China; (4) engaging bilaterally with interested economies on infrastructure funding; and (5) updating the information regarding the VWGMD on the website.

* 1. **Approach for Marine Plastic Litter** **Japan**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/011 – Japanese Industries’ Initiative for Marine Plastic Issues – Featuring Japan Initiative for Marine Environment’s (JaIME’s) Initiative
* 2019/SOM3/CD/011a – Issues and Actions Concerning Marine Plastic Litters

Action Item: The CD:

* Welcomed the substantial efforts being undertaken by Japanese Government and Industry to promote solutions to the challenges of marine debris and encouraged further collaboration by other economies with that work.

The Japanese Government provided an update regarding efforts relating to marine plastic litter since its presentation on the topic at CD22 (Document Number 011a). Specifically, since SOM1:

1. The G20 Summit was held on June 28-29 in Osaka, Japan and shared the “Osaka Blue Ocean Vision” that aims to reduce additional pollution by marine plastic litter to zero by 2050. It also endorsed the “G20 Implementation Framework for Actions on Marine Plastic Litter”.
2. Japan has launched the “MAnagement of Wastes, Recovery of Marine Litter, INnovation, and Empowerment” (“MARINE”) Initiative to help achieve the Osaka Blue Ocean Vision. This includes efforts to (1) promote international cooperation including bilateral ODA and assistance (*e.g.*, training for 10,000 officials in waste management by 2025), (2) promoting international partnerships by Japanese companies, NGOs, and local governments to facilitate the export of infrastructure and innovation, and (3) disseminating best practices to combat marine plastic litter.
3. Japan has also undertaken a range of additional efforts, including developing an Action Plan to Counter Marine Plastic Litter (that helped build the foundation for the G20 Declaration), revising its basic policy on the promotion of measures against articles that drift ashore, and promoting the Clean Ocean Material Alliance (“CLOMA”).

Japanese Industry then provided a complimentary presentation on industry’s “Japan Initiative for Marine Environment (“JaIME”) (Document Number 011). JaIME was established on September 7, 2018 and is operated by joint secretariats of five chemical industry associations: Japan Chemical Industry Association, Japan Plastics Industry Federation, The Plastic Waste Management Institute, The Japan Petrochemical Industry Association, and The Vinyl Environmental Council. The members of JaIME are comprised of chemical companies, petrochemical companies, plastic companies, etc. JaIME’s objective is to prevent plastic waste from flowing into the sea, and it has developed an action plan that includes the following steps:

1. collecting and analyzing information and promoting information sharing;
2. taking appropriate and timely actions to policy makers, etc.;
3. engaging in outreach in Asia to support improvement of plastic waste management;

In the Project of Human Resource Development for Improvement of Waste Plastic Management, JaIME is planning to conduct a one week training session in Tokyo in February 2020 for policy makers from Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, the Philippines, Viet Nam, and Myanmar. The goal of the training session is for trainee to understand concept of plastic material flow analysis.

1. promoting capacity building for scientific knowledge and evidence;

JaIME supported a research work to assess the effectiveness of energy recovery scientifically in terms of circular utilization of resources. LCA (Life Cycle Assessment) method on the reduction effect of environmental burden (CO2 emissions) was applied for evaluating effectiveness of energy recovery compared with that of mechanical recycling and feedstock recycling. The study was completed in March 2019 and presented to the 10th International Symposium on Feedstock Recycling of Polymeric Materials (2019 May 26-29, Hungary).[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **15:30-16:00** | **COFFEE BREAK** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16:00-16:30** | **AGENDA ITEM 5** | **SHARED GOAL 3: TO ENABLE EFFECTIVE COOPERATION BETWEEN INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENTS TO IMPROVE CHEMICAL PRODUCT STEWARDSHIP AND SAFE USE** |

* 1. **Challenges to Risk-Based Chemical Management Systems U.S. Industry**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/012 – Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) Update

Action Item: The CD:

* Encouraged delegates to provide additional case studies of economy’s approaches to overcoming challenges to the implementation of a risk-based approach to chemical management.

 In response to an action item from CD22 in which the United States committed to submitting an update on the implementation of the new TSCA, U.S. Industry presented Document 012. Since TSCA was passed in 2016, all of the major statutory deadlines have been met and the U.S. EPA has put in place all three framework regulations related to a reset of the chemical inventory, prioritization, and risk evaluations. The chemical inventory “reset” is now complete; of the 86,000 chemicals on the inventory, roughly 40,000 were identified as being in active commerce.

 The U.S. EPA has also begun the first ten risk evaluations provided for in the legislation. These were identified by statute for “fast track” risk evaluations and four of the draft risk evaluations have been published.[[4]](#footnote-4) The next six evaluations (of Carbon Tetrachloride, Methylene Chloride, NMP, Perc, TCE, and Asbestos) are due by the end of December 2019, but a six month extension is possible. EPA has also begun the process of identifying the next 20 high priority and low priority chemicals for risk evaluation and two manufacturer initiated requests have been submitted to the agency for review. The legislation requires that the fee for these assessments (~$1.3 million) will be paid by manufacturers and importers of the chemical, though not by processors.

 CD delegates engaged in a discussion about the risk assessment process provided in the legislation. The initial chemicals for prioritization were statutorily required, but the next set will be identified through a prioritization process designed by U.S. EPA. In response to a question, U.S. Industry noted that while industry does not provide its own risk assessment to regulators, the new TSCA does allow industry to request a risk assessment of a chemical, as well as to provide exposure data required for the risk assessment process. Several delegates asked whether U.S. EPA has begun conducting international outreach on its new approach and U.S. industry noted that the agency’s focus thus far has been on meeting its statutory deadlines, but that based on recent discussions, the agency is intending to expand its outreach in 2020.

* 1. **SAICM Singapore & U.S. Industry**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/013 - Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Beyond 2020

Action Items: The CD:

* Agreed to engage in further intersessional discussions regarding a potential CD submission to the ICCM-5 process regarding the CD’s contribution to meeting the SAICM 2020 objectives and the CD’s recommendations for the post-2020 SAICM process intersessionally for consideration at the next CD meeting;
* Encouraged APEC delegates, both industry and government, to actively participate in upcoming SAICM post-2020 discussions, including in the 3rd and 4th Intersessional Process meetings and ICCM-5.

U.S. Industry provided an informational update on the SAICM Beyond 2020 process. The 3rd SAICM Intersessional Process (“IP”) Meeting will be held October 1-4 in Bangkok, Thailand, while IP-4 will be held March 23-27 in Bucharest, Romania, as part of the preparation process for the Fifth International Conference on Chemicals Management (“ICCM5”) to be held October 5-9 2020 in Bonn, Germany. U.S. Industry noted that there are several visions being debated for SAICM 2020, including a continuation of the current model, adopting a more formal model, and various models in between. U.S. industry therefore posed three questions to CD delegates: (1) how should SAICM 2.0 balance the needs of developed and developing economies; (2) how do proposals for a broader framework complement the development and financing of SAICM 2.0; and (3) how can CD participants elevate support for chemicals and waste management within their government/organizations.

Peru noted that a number of economies, including several CD members, had proposed an approach to the financing issues, including through establishment of an international fund. Other economies noted that the challenge is that the chemical industry cannot finance the entire process.

Argentina, who participated actively in the IP-2 meeting held in Montevideo, Uruguay, called on CD delegates to participate actively in the SAICM discussion process, noting that SAICM appeared to lack representation not only from the right government ministries (Environment and Health ministries were represented, but others, including Commerce, Trade, and Foreign Affairs were not present) but also from industry. The net result was that SAICM appeared to lack the same common understanding between governments and industry that appears in the CD and Argentina suggested that delegates consider ways to bring the APEC dynamic into SAICM. Chile and other APEC economies agreed with the comments.

* 1. **Capacity Building for International Commitments U.S. Industry**

Action Item: The CD:

* Agreed to circulate a request to CD delegates to identify specific challenges they have had in implementing international commitments to help frame future work on this agenda item.

At CD21, CD delegates identified a need for additional information sharing regarding, and capacity building to meet, the requirements imposed by various international conventions to which CD delegates are party, including, for example, those made at the United Nations Environment Assembly ("UNEA"), in the Basel Convention, and in the Stockholm Convention. At CD22, the CD encouraged economies to propose specific capacity building projects the CD could undertake to facilitate implementation of CD members' international commitments. U.S. Industry will moderate a discussion to identify potential ways that the CD could address ongoing challenges faced by APEC member economies, such as through capacity building, technical assistance, and other cooperative efforts for CD consideration that may assist economies in meeting their international obligations.

The United States opened the floor for economies to identify any international commitments with which they were struggling, and to identify a potential next step or action related to such commitments. One economy noted that the concern was less about a particular treaty or commitment, and related more to how regulators could help build awareness and capacity amongst industry with respect to these commitments as economies seek to implement them.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **16:30-17:30** | **AGENDA ITEM 6** | **INFORMATION EXCHANGE ON REGIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL ECONOMY REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS** |

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/014 – Update by Australia: Australian Regulation of Industrial Chemicals: Australian Industrial Chemicals Introduction Scheme Implementation Update and Alignment against APEC Chemical Dialogue Best Practice Principles
* 2019/SOM3/CD/015 – The Chemical Management Scheme and the Update in Chinese Taipei
* 2019/SOM3/CD/016 – Chemical Management Regulation in Korea

Several economies provided informational updates on regulatory developments in their economies as follows:

* Australia: Australia provided a summary of the new Australian Industrial Chemicals Introduction Scheme (AICIS) that will replace the National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS). The enabling legislation, the Industrial Chemicals Act (ICA), became law in March 2019, and will commence on 1 July 2020. Whilst the ICA sets the major obligations and powers under AICIS, secondary legislation is currently being developed to provide the details. This secondary legislation is expected to be approved by the Australian Minister for Health by the end of calendar 2019. The scope of the new scheme remains the same: the assessment of the risks to human health, safety and the environment from the introduction of industrial chemicals. The main changes to the scheme involve: an Australian Inventory of Industrial Chemical Substances, to which only the industrial chemicals on the current Australian Inventory of Chemical Substances will be transferred; greater transparency, whereby, in accordance with overseas practice, protection of the chemical name will be achieved by masking of the name rather than by exemption from publication; a rebalancing of regulatory impost with expected risk, whereby industry will categorize the expected risk of unlisted chemical introductions into very low risk, and low risk, when no premarket intervention by AICIS is required, but industry must report their introductions to facilitate any required compliance follow-up, and medium-high risk, when AICIS will assess the expected risk of the chemical premarket; more flexible evaluation powers to assess the risk of previously unassessed chemicals and reassess the risk of previously assessed chemicals in light of changed circumstances of introduction; modernized compliance powers and tools; limiting the use of animal test data for chemicals used in cosmetics; the conditional acceptance of international risk assessments undertaken by trusted overseas regulators; and expanded control powers as a regulator of last resort.
* Chinese Taipei: Chinese Taipei presented Document Number 015 on updates to its regulatory framework. With respect to GHS, the Ministry of Labor (“MOL”) announced several regulatory changes in November 2018, including (a) that SDS text should be in Chinese characters, (b) requiring CAS numbers for mixtures to be noted in SDS section 3 by January 1, 2020, and (c) clarifying certain rules around confidential business information (“CBI”). With respect to chemical regulation, Chinese Taipei’s EPA announced an amendment of its Registration Regulation on March 11, 2019 that (a) designated 106 chemicals for prioritized review beginning on January 1, 2020, (b) harmonizing the information requirements between EPA and MOL, (c) ensuring consistency of CBI treatment, and (d) requiring an annual report of new and existing chemical substances. Chinese Taipei’s update then summarized a number of additional regulatory requirements and provided links to the primary resources.
* Republic of Korea: The Republic of Korea presented Document Number 016. The legal framework of chemical management in the Republic of Korea is governed by three acts: the Act on Registration and Evaluation of Chemical Substances (“ARECs”), the Chemical Control Act (“CCA”), and the Consumer Chemical Products and Biocides Safety Act (“K-BPR”). The Republic of Korea provided a summary of each of these pieces of legislation, with a particular focus on phase-in requirements for chemical notification and registration under ARECs that ranges from 2021 through 2030 depending on the chemical and volume. The Republic of Korea additionally noted for CD delegates that the International Conference on Chemical Policy (“ICCP”) would be held in October 2020 in Seoul and will include 180 participants from more than 10 economies.
* Chile: Chile provided a verbal update noting that over the last decade Chile had placed its focus on storage, importation, and labeling of chemicals. In 2016, Chile updated its Chemical National Storage Regulation in a joint public-private development process, which provides the requirements for the storage of certain chemicals and a biannual mandatory declaration requirement for facilities that store those chemicals. Chile has currently recorded more than 1,800 chemical storage premises through this process. Additionally, since 2012, Chile has maintained a GHS National Coordinating Committee that is comprised of representatives from the private and public sectors and has been developing a GHS implementation strategy. Finally, Chile noted that it has ratified all chemical-related international conventions, having ratified the Minamata Convention in October 2018.

Several other economies provided verbal updates from the floor.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **17:30-18:00** | **AGENDA ITEM 7** | **RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS** |

1. **Summary of the Day and Action Items** **APCIC**

Action Item: The CD:

* Agreed that the Government and Industry Co-Chairs would circulate (1) a draft of the CD action items as soon as possible after the meeting for comment and (2) a draft report from the meeting for comment and endorsement in the weeks following the meeting.

A representative from the APCIC summarized the day’s discussions, including a review of the agreed action items. The CD agreed that these action items would be circulated as soon after the meeting as possible and that a more fulsome summary report would be issued at a future date.

1. **APEC Ministerial Meeting ("AMM") Statement** **Government Co-Chair**

The CD’s work was recognized by APEC Ministers several times in 2018*[[5]](#footnote-5)* and its annual GHS report was tabled at the 2019 Trade Ministers meeting. The CD will discuss its progress on the items identified by the AMM in 2018 and discuss items that the Government Co-Chair could consider submitting to Senior Officials for possible inclusion in the AMM Statement to be issued at the conclusion of the 2019 APEC year.

The Government Co-Chair noted that in his communications with the CTI, SOM, and Ministers, he would highlight the (a) the CD’s workshop on regulatory cooperation in Latin America, (b) the tabletop capacity building exercise on risk assessments, and (c) the CD’s ongoing efforts to support APEC’s multi-fora efforts to address marine debris.

1. **Document Classification List** **APEC Secretariat**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/000 – Document Classification List (APEC Secretariat)

Action Item: The CD:

* Endorsed the Document Classification List (2019/SOM3/CD/000) as revised by the Secretariat.

The Secretariat reviewed the Document Classification List (2019/SOM3/CD/000) and delegates agreed that Documents 006, 008, and 016 could be converted to public, but Document Number 021 would remain restricted. On that basis, delegates endorsed the revised list.

1. **2020 Preparations** **Malaysia**

Meeting Documents

* 2019/SOM3/CD/021 – Malaysia : Host of MyAPEC2020 (Malaysia)

Action Item: The CD:

* Thanked Chile for its efforts in hosting CD23 and encouraged delegates to attend the CD’s next meeting at SOM1 in February 2020 in Putrajaya, Malaysia.

Malaysia provided a presentation to introduce CD delegates to its upcoming host year. Malaysia identified several priority areas including: Regional Economic Integration, focusing on improving the narrative of trade & investment; inclusivity and digital economy, focusing on INCLUSIVE economic growth through digital economy & technology; and innovation & sustainability, focusing on driving INNOVATIVE sustainability. Malaysia provided an early calendar of potential dates for the SOM meetings, but noted these were subject to change. It did, however, identify a proposed CD itinerary for SOM1, which would include a field trip from the SOM location in Putrajaya to the Petronas Refinery & Petrochemical Integrated Development Area.

The CD concluded with Chile thanking delegates for their contribution to the successful year and their appreciation for the opportunity to have hosted.

\* \* \*

1. *See* <https://chemicalwatch.com/register?o=78653&productID=1&layout=main>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The site is available at <http://great.osha.gov.tw/ENG/index.aspx>. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Report ~~Draft~~ available at <https://www.nikkakyo.org/sites/default/files/JaIME_LCA.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The four chemicals are: (1) pigment violet (colorant) identified as having no unreasonable risk; (2) HBCD identified as having no unreasonable risk; (3) 1,4-dioxane identified as having no unreasonable risk in consumer products, but a potential risk to workers; and (4) 1-Bromopropane identified as having mixed risk depending on application. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. *See e.g.*, <https://www.apec.org/Meeting-Papers/Annual-Ministerial-Meetings/2018/2018_amm>, at Para. 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)