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**Draft Report**

1. **Introduction**

The fifth meeting of the IMG took place online on 05 October 2017, chaired by Mr. Hossein Fadaei of the EMG Secretariat. The meeting discussed the two work streams of the IMG, which include the undertaking of further e-waste analysis and the systematic sharing of knowledge in relation to data, information and expertise etc., on e-waste. For both these work streams, their possible form and contents were deliberated, along with the recruitment of lead agencies.

The former refers to an expected analysis which will build on mapping undertaken for the “United Nations and E-waste” report. With this report having observed e-waste projects and initiatives, the further analysis is expected to look into more in-depth programmatic and mandate gaps in UN entities’ e-waste decisions. There may also be scope to match this with the needs of countries, on particular e-waste issues that they are struggling to address and where there is limited efficiency and coherence in support by the UN.

The latter refers to the expected identification of a suitable existing, or new, online platform/website/portal for sharing information, data, or/and expertise and knowledge on e-waste. It is suggested that what is made available on this platform either contributes to, or comprises, information and data on countries’ e-waste situation, flows, inventories and legislatory environment etc.; or expertise and knowledge designed for UN agencies and staff who are developing and later implementing country e-waste projects. These two possibilities may influence the audience of the platform.

The list of meeting participants is provided in Annex I.

1. **Opening remarks and adoption of the agenda**

There were no comments on the agenda, which was subsequently adopted.

After adoption of the agenda, the Chair provided an overview of the idea behind the analysis of programmes and mandates, and its relation to the development of a subsequent proposal, strategy or plan for collaboration among UN entities after this analysis. Emphasis was placed on collaboration closely involving the interests of countries. The Chair noted that this analysis, leading into such a proposal, strategy or plan, would help identify how collaboration could perhaps be carried on after the IMG has concluded its work.

Following this, the Chair provided an overview of work stream 2, with some background information on the options to house e-waste related knowledge, including existing knowledge and resources that might be required.

To finish introductions, the Chair then highlighted that the third proposed work area – on UN internal e-waste management – will be focussed on towards the end of this year, in coordination with the IMG on Environmental Sustainability Management.

The Chair then opened the floor for discussion on the contents of Work Stream One and the involvement of lead agencies.

1. **Work Stream One – further e-waste analysis**

Ms. Terekhova from the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions (BRS) began by indicating that they are interested in participating in this work. From a practical viewpoint, BRS would like to know what the work will involve; for example, will it lead to a report or another type of outcome.

The Chair replied, noting that the intention is not so much to develop a report or to produce something normative, but rather to put together a matrix (or short document), with the intention to support a proposal, strategy or plan for collaboration in the short-term future.

Ms. Marit Nilses from the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), intervened by asking whether a “needs analysis” will be included in Work Stream One.

The Chair highlighted that the analysis could look into the country level, ideally addressing the full life-cycle of electrical and electronic equipment. He noted that this analysis should identify the needs of the country in terms of particular e-waste issues which they are struggling to resolve, and that are not addressed efficiently or coherently by UN entities. However, other foci for the analyses may also be considered.

UNESCAP suggested that a matrix of what we do, will not necessarily show what we need to do. It was highlighted that the needs of UN agencies, and especially, the needs of countries must be understood.

Mr. Nelson Manda from the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) agreed that we must capture the actual needs of the countries which the UN serves, believing that the capacities of the UN should be matched to the needs of the countries. For example, in Asia, there may be a need for more guidance, whilst in Africa there may be a need for more financing.

UNITAR recommended that the needs of the countries, cross-mapped with the programmatic/decisions of UN agencies, would be a good approach. UNITAR confirmed their interest in being involved in Work Stream One.

Ms. Bianca Perina from the International Labour Organization (ILO) noted, that they see drastically different needs from the countries, calling for a stronger focus at the country level. ILO understands that this work may be resource-intensive and for this reason they cannot lead; however, in the future ILO will be pleased to join programmes and collaborate on the outcomes. ILO remains available for contributions to gathering information etc., for both work streams.

Mr. Mario Castro from the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) pointed out that they are also interested in contributing to both work streams. At the moment, however, they are undertaking some reshuffling to locate a new focal point for the IMG on Tackling E-waste.

Mr. Muhammed Omotola from the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) Secretariat and the Pollution and Health Unit of UN Environment, noted that it is important to look into our agencies to see how we can work together– and to then go to countries and look into their needs.

UNESCAP enquired about the scope of this analysis and its follow-up proposal, strategy or plan. Is it in the interest of this IMG to look into engagement with the private sector and government? A big-brand coalition was then suggested, to also help bring in resources to support this process.

Upon these suggestions, the Chair requested that IMG Members help in bringing in their connections and processes from government and private sector in different countries.

UNITAR noted that one of the questions we should ask is –how can countries make adjustments to their current legislative boundaries (e.g. barriers to entry for the private sector)? This might help encourage investment in tackling e-waste management.

BRS noted their support for UNITAR’s points, by highlighting that the IMG’s recent report on The United Nations and E-waste makes a pertinent reference to extended producer responsibility (EPR). It was also highlighted that this not only requires input from the private sector but also legislation from the government, suggesting there are new approaches required, thinking out of the box, to get involved with the private sector and their finances.

UNITAR indicated that there are several country level initiatives already in place, and we could either analyse these or collaborate with them.

Whilst noting that they work with the Global e-Sustainability Initiative (GeSI), ITU concurred with UNITAR and BRS that the platforms out there – which can include the private sector – can be very helpful to collaborate with the IMG.

UNITAR raised a point that it is important, however, to look at what is attractive – a hook – for the private sector.

**Conclusion:**

* BRS and UNITAR confirmed their interest in taking a lead on Work Stream One, with support of the EMG Secretariat, and possible external consultant.
* Based on discussions during agenda item 3. (a), the terms of reference could consider the needs of one case-country(ies), through a needs assessment in tandem with the proposed programmatic analysis of UN entities.
* The terms of reference for Work Stream One, might also look into bringing in connections/a coalition with government and private sector from the case-country(ies).
* ITU are in the process of identifying a new focal point for the IMG on Tackling E-waste.

**Next Steps:**

* BRS and UNITAR to work alongside EMG Secretariat in establishing a draft Terms of Reference for Work Stream One, to be distributed for comments by the wider IMG in November 2017.
1. **Work Stream Two – the systematic sharing of knowledge**

Mr. Muhammed Omotola noted that from a knowledge management perspective, Work Stream Two could look into not so much a clearing house, but more a platform – through the entire life-cycle – that can be available for people to see what the UN is doing.

Ms. Haddy Guisse from UN Environment mentioned InforMEA, noting that it is a good platform upon which to contribute the systematic sharing of knowledge.

Mr. Muhammed Omotola noted interest, on behalf of the SAICM Secretariat and the Pollution and Health Unit of UN Environment, in joining Work Stream 2.

UNITAR made an intervention questioning where countries go with respect to finding guidance on e-waste.. There are many agencies whom they can turn to but no one-stop shop. How do we make a platform that has a bearing on chemicals management and that is consolidated on e-waste?

BRS reminded the group that the sustainability of this platform should be taken note of, and that there are several other platforms that already may have staffing time behind them.

UNESCAP highlighted the Global Partnership on Waste Management and their knowledge sharing platform.

The Chair made reference to previous discussions with colleagues at the International Environmental Technology Centre (IETC) in Osaka, noting that their platform is not currently being maintained or updated. IETC have, however, expressed interest in transferring the information set aside for this platform, to the platform of choice, of the IMG under Work Stream Two.

**Conclusion:**

* The formation of a new platform that provides e-waste information at each life-cycle stage.
* InforMEA as a possible avenue for contributing knowledge.
* Making sure that the platform is long-lasting (sustainable).

**Next Steps:**

* The recruitment of a second lead entity to support Work Stream Two.
* The establishment of a draft Terms of Reference for Work Stream Two, to be distributed for comments by the wider IMG in November/December 2017.
* Investigate the potential for transferring information from the Global Partnership on Waste Management knowledge platform, as proposed by IETC previously.
1. **Brief overview of a possible Work Plan for 2017/18 (to be later finalised and agreed by email)**

The Chair provided an overview of the work plan, giving the floor an option to comment. No further comments were made and it was agreed that this tentative work plan would evolve as the respective terms of reference a developed for both work streams.

**Next Steps:**

* The possible Work Plan for 2017/18 will be further shared - by email - for finalisation with IMG Members, whilst the scope of the two terms of reference is being deliberated
1. **Other matters**
2. **Closure of the meeting**

The Chair closed the meeting at 17:00 GVA time.
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