

**15TH CHEMICAL DIALOGUE (“CD15”)
THIRD SENIOR OFFICIALS MEETING (“SOM3”)
AUGUST 27, 2015, CEBU CITY PHILIPPINES**

SUMMARY REPORT

The Fifteenth Meeting of the Chemical Dialogue (“CD” or “Dialogue”) was held on August 27, 2015 in Cebu, City, Philippines as part of a series of meetings from August 25 through August 29. The CD was attended by representatives from 17 economies: Australia (Government and Industry); Canada (Government and Industry); Chile (Government); China (Government); Indonesia (Government and Industry); Japan (Government and Industry); Republic of Korea (Government); Malaysia (Government and Industry); Mexico (Industry); Peru (Government); Philippines (Government and Industry); Russia (Government and Industry); Singapore (Government and Industry); Chinese Taipei (Government); Thailand (Government); United States (Government and Industry); and Viet Nam (Government). The Dialogue was also attended by a representative of the Chair of the Regulators’ Forum as well as approved guests from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (“OECD”), the International Council of Mining and Metals (“ICCM”), and several companies from non-APEC economies.

09:00 – 09:20	AGENDA ITEM 1	SETTING THE SCENE
----------------------	----------------------	--------------------------

1.A. Welcome from Government Co-Chair

Government Co-Chair

Dr. Ryan MacFarlane, Principal APEC Coordinator for the U.S. Department of State, and the CD’s Government Co-Chair, provided a welcome to the CD’s 15th meeting (“CD15”) in Cebu City, Philippines. The Government Co-Chair thanked the Philippines for its hospitality and seamless arrangements throughout the year. Since SOM1, the CD’s work has received high-level recognition, including by the Committee on Trade and Investment (“CTI”), Senior Officials (“SOM”), and in the Ministers Responsible for Trade (“MRT”) outcome statement. The MRT welcomed the CD’s interim report on implementation of the Globally Harmonized System of the Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (“GHS”) and called for a final report to the APEC Ministers Meeting (“AMM”) with recommendations for addressing the variance. The MRT also welcomed the CD’s ongoing cooperation with the Oceans and Fisheries Working Group (“OFWG”) to promote innovative solutions to marine debris as well as the CD’s ongoing cooperation to promote APEC’s work on regulatory cooperation.

The Government Co-Chair noted the alignment of the CD’s workstreams with the CTI’s priorities: enhancing regional economic integration (through the work on regulatory cooperation as well as the new work on free trade agreements (“FTAs”) and regional trade agreements (“RTAs”)); building sustainable and resilient communities (through work on promoting solutions to marine debris and on emergency preparedness); and promoting the participation of micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises (“MSMEs”) in regional and global value chains (through work to promote alignment of GHS implementation and on regulatory cooperation).

The Government Co-Chair commended the CD’s robust workstream since SOM1 including: the half-day seminar on good regulatory practices (“GRP”) held on August 26 and the implementation of agreed work plans of the Virtual Working Groups (“VWGs”) on regulatory cooperation, GHS, data exchange, and marine debris. The Government Co-Chair called for delegates to use CD15 as an opportunity to make progress on these workstreams and to aim to finalize outcomes to the extent possible by the Concluding Senior Officials Meeting (“CSOM”) in November 2015.

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

Dr. Fumiaki Shono, the Executive Director of the Japanese Chemical Industry Association (“JCIA”), and the Industry Co-Chair, provided a welcome on behalf of the Asia-Pacific Chemical Industry Coalition (“APCIC”). The Industry Co-Chair thanked the Philippines for its gracious hospitality, in particular for hosting the dinner for CD delegates the night before. The Industry Co-Chair also thanked Mr. Joey Marcalain, President of the Chemical Industry Council of the Philippines, for serving as an Honorary Co-Chair of the Industry Pre-Meeting (“IPM”).

The Industry Co-Chair summarized the previous day’s meetings. From the perspective of industry, the day began with an excellent Seminar on GRP. The contribution from APEC’s Economic Committee (“EC”) and its Subcommittee on Standards and Conformance (“SCSC”) were particularly valuable, and industry looks forward to identifying concrete ways to carry that work forward.

During the afternoon, the IPM focused on key issues affecting the chemical industry throughout the region, which continue to be regulatory in nature. As a result, the two major priorities for industry included: (1) regulatory cooperation to ensure that regulations work together as effectively as possible to protect human health and the environment without imposing unnecessary trade barriers or compliance costs through duplicative and/or differentiating regulatory variations; and (2) more global and more harmonized implementation of the GHS. Industry talked for the first time about the need for human resource capacity building to ensure that the next generation of regulators, and their industry counterparts, are receiving the education they need to maintain and further the chemical safety management infrastructure.

Industry discussed priorities on the CD agenda which included: (1) the ongoing work of the VWG on regulatory cooperation (implementation of its work plan, contributing to work on FTAs/RTAs, and proposals from the Philippines and Malaysia on capacity building); (2) the VWG on GHS (including the draft comparison that had been commissioned, the GHS report to MRT and AMM, and a proposal from Mexico on GHS capacity building); (3) the VWG on marine debris (including agreement to a work plan, hosting of an awareness raising session, and consideration of a pilot project); (4) the VWG on GHS Data Exchange (including contributions to the UN Subcommittee of Experts on GHS (“UNSCGHS”)); and (5) a submission from the CD to the Fourth International Conference on Chemicals Management (“ICCM-4”) from September 28 to October 2 in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Industry Co-Chair concluded by thanking the APEC Secretariat and the National Organizing Committee for their excellent organization and by calling for a productive series of discussions.

9:20 – 9:45	AGENDA ITEM 2	STRATEGY AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE DIALOGUE
--------------------	----------------------	--

2.A. Review of Alignment with CTI Priorities**Moderated by Co-Chairs****Meeting Documents**

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/021 – APEC Implementation Plan for the Boracay Action Agenda to Globalize MSMEs

Action Items

- The CD sought comments on Document Number 021 (*APEC Implementation Plan for the Boracay Action Agenda To Globalize MSMEs*) by September 2, 2015 and noted the inclusion of a reference to the CD on page 9.
- The CD noted its intention to review the Shared Goals and their application to the changing nature of chemicals trade and technology development as part of its efforts to renew its Strategic Framework in 2016

The Government Co-Chair noted that pursuant to its review in 2014, the CTI had asked each sub-fora to implement an annual review process. At the first meeting of the year, the sub-fora are to review their agenda to ensure it remains aligned with CTI objectives and is commercially relevant. At the second meeting, the sub-fora are to conduct a “look back” to ensure these objectives are being met.

The Government Co-Chair outlined the CTI’s five main priorities: (a) support the Multilateral Trading System and the World Trade Organization, (b) enhance Regional Economic Integration, (c) strengthen Connectivity, (d) promote Regulatory Cooperation, and (e) contribute to APEC’s cross-cutting mandates. The CD agreed to continue to review to ensure alignment with these objectives.

The Government Co-Chair also noted the discussion at SOM1 about the possibility of combining Shared Goals 2 and 3. The CD discussed the potential merits of combining them and noted that there are some overlaps so it might make sense to combine them and identify a new third Shared Goal. Delegates noted that the CD’s Strategic Framework runs from 2014 through 2016. Therefore, in 2016 the CD will need to begin developing a successor document. The CD agreed to consider its three shared goals and whether any revisions to them were necessary during that review.

Delegates discussed the Boracay Action Agenda to Globalize MSMEs (Doc. No. 021). The Boracay Action Agenda had been agreed at SOM2. The tabled document is designed to help promote its implementation and comment was sought by Senior Officials from each of the sub-fora. Delegates noted that one area in which the CD could better highlight its work was the promotion of MSMEs and agreed to provide any related comments by September 2, 2015.

9:45 – 12:30	AGENDA ITEM 3	SHARED GOAL 1: EXPAND AND SUPPORT COOPERATION AND MUTUAL RECOGNITION AMONG CHEMICAL REGULATORS IN THE REGION TO FACILITATE TRADE
--------------	---------------	---

3.A. Regulatory Cooperation**3.A.ii.a. Regulator’s Forum****RF Chair****Action Items:**

- The CD noted that the VWG on GHS will coordinate with the Regulators’ Forum on GHS-related items and will ensure developments are reported to both forums.
- The CD noted that the RF will be developing a 2016-2017 Action Plan, including a proposal on Lead in Paint by the Philippines, and plans to provide an initial draft of that Action Plan to the CD for consideration in October.
- The CD looks forward to the outcome report from the Metals Risk Assessment workshop to be held on August 28 and 29 and to consideration of that report and its proposed next steps intersessionally.

A representative of the Chair of the Regulators' Forum ("RF") reviewed the RF's discussions during its annual meeting. The RF had a robust discussion across a range of elements. During the morning, the RF received updates from a number of individual economies on regulatory changes. During the afternoon, the RF discussed updates to its 2014-2015 Action Plan to begin the process of developing a 2016-2017 Action Plan. The RF noted at least one new proposed activity related to Lead in Paint and discussed several other possibilities. The RF set an internal deadline for comment and to develop a draft action plan before submitting to the CD for intersessional approval.

The OECD noted the continued coordination of the RF and the OECD's Clearinghouse on New Chemicals ("Clearinghouse"), including the open invitation for the CD and RF to participate in the Clearinghouse's activities. This Clearinghouse's next meeting will be October 7-8 in Vancouver, Canada, preceded by a workshop on the use of analogues for new chemicals on October 6. The Australian Government then provided an introduction to the Workshop on the Risk Assessment of Metals, scheduled for August 28-29 in Cebu. Because the workshop was being held after the CD's meeting, the workshop will provide an outcome report to the CD for intersessional review. The report will include proposed next steps, including the possibility of webinars to be hosted in October, November, and December, on which CD agreement will be sought.

Delegates discussed how to ensure that the CD and RF remained coordinated on items that were included on both agendas, including in particular on GHS implementation. The CD agreed on the importance of coordination and agreed that the CD and RF should share information and seek input from the other forum on items which crossed over their agendas.

10:15 – 10:45	FAMILY PHOTO AND COFFEE BREAK	
10:45 – 12:30	AGENDA ITEM 3 CONTINUED	SHARED GOAL 1: EXPAND AND SUPPORT COOPERATION AND MUTUAL RECOGNITION AMONG CHEMICAL REGULATORS IN THE REGION TO FACILITATE TRADE

3.A.ii. Regulatory Cooperation Virtual Working Group

3.A.ii.a. VWG Work Plan

VWG Co-Chairs

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/008 – Progress Report on Advancing Regulatory Cooperation and Convergence for Chemicals Management

Action Items

- The CD noted the Document Number 008 (*Progress Report on Advancing Regulatory Cooperation and Convergence for Chemicals Management*) and endorsed the proposed next steps for the VWG that it includes, namely that the VWG will:
 - Evaluate the Philippine and Malaysian proposals under the VWG umbrella to help inform further actions to promote chemical regulatory cooperation in the region, including with respect to capacity building;
 - Coordinate with the VWG on GHS on any future proposals or work items that could be pursued jointly;

- Undertake additional research on tools for sharing regulatory information in operation in the broader international arena;
- Approach the Malaysian, Singapore and Thai economies to share their Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) participation experiences, with a view to promoting broader understanding of the MAD program;
- Update the VWG RCC work plan post Cebu; and
- Formally invite the Regulators Forum Chair to future VWG RCC meetings to provide for closer alignment of future work plans.

Australia, as the Government Co-Chair of the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation, introduced the VWG's progress report since SOM1. Since SOM1, the VWG has held two teleconferences, agreed to its work plan, contributed to the ½ day seminar on GRP (Agenda Item 3.A.ii.b), provided comments on proposals from Malaysia and the Philippines (Agenda Item 3.A.ii.c), and assisted in the translation of a Russian Federation text on international comparative chemical management (Agenda Item 3.A.ii.d). The VWG will update its work plans after the CD15 meeting to incorporate developments from the meeting and the GRP Seminar. The VWG noted its intention to better coordinate its work with the RF and its invitation to the Chair of the RF to participate in its teleconferences.

U.S. industry, as the Industry Co-Chair of the VWG, noted that one of the lessons learned from the 2014 workshop and the 2015 GRP seminar is that regulatory cooperation is a long journey but that it can begin with small steps. The two new proposals from the Philippines and Malaysia could represent two such steps. The CD agreed to note the report and endorse the next steps contained therein.

3.A.ii.b. Good Regulatory Practices in Chemicals: ½ Day Workshop VWG Rep.

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/024 – Chemical Dialogue: Seminar on Good Regulatory Practice in Chemicals Regulation – Summary Report

Action Items

- The CD asked the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation to develop an initial draft of a potential checklist to promote implementation of the CD's Best Practice Principles by September 25, 2015
- The CD asked the Government Co-Chair to initiate outreach to the Economic Committee for further cooperation, including through proposing a potential chemical-specific panel during the 9th Conference on Good Regulatory Practices at SOM3 2016.
- The CD took note of the additional potential actions included in Document Number 024 (*Chemical Dialogue: Seminar on Good Regulatory Practice in Chemicals Regulation – Summary Report*).
- The CD sought comments on Document Number 024 by September 25

APCIC, as one of the coordinators of the Seminar, reviewed the discussions at the Seminar and the proposed next steps as outlined in Document Number 024. The Seminar represented a follow-up from the 2014 workshop on Regulatory Cooperation because of the close linkage between GRP and regulatory cooperation; the implementation of GRP, including the receipt of stakeholder comment and the consideration of alternative regulatory approaches, helps promote regulatory cooperation internationally.

The Seminar was organized around two panel discussions. The first featured presentations from the Chair of the EC and a representative of the SCSC, discussing APEC's ongoing work on GRP across APEC's numerous fora. A CD representative introduced the CD's Best Practice Principles and noted the linkage to the ongoing GRP work. The second panel focused on three case studies on GRP implementation from the United States, Chinese Taipei, and then from the perspective of industry's experience with best practices across the region. The dynamic and constructive question and answer sessions identified several challenges to the implementation of GRP including: (1) initial resources required from governments (even if the implementation of GRP could produce long-term savings) and (2) developing the skills necessary for regulators to implement the identified GRPs.

Several potential follow-up actions were identified including: (1) development of an implementation "check-list" for the Best Practice Principles; (2) contributing to the EC's GRP workshop in 2016; (3) the need for continuous training to build the necessary capacity; and (4) the potential for outreach to non-APEC Latin American economies as observers in any GRP work undertaken in 2016.

The Government Co-Chair welcomed the CD's initiative to collaborate with the EC and SCSC. There were more than a half dozen GRP-related events, demonstrating the importance of the topic and the need for sustained training on the issues across sectors. Australia highlighted the importance of leveraging existing tools as part of this process, including the OECD's Mutual Acceptance of Data ("MAD") program. The representative from the Regulators' Forum noted how the promotion of more complete alignment of regulatory developments had also been a key theme of its discussions at the RF. The OECD noted that there are a number of ongoing activities at the OECD of potential relevance, including the development of integrated approaches for testing and assessment including analogues and read-across. In response to a question, the OECD noted that there are no current plans for a workshop on these tools, but if there was interest then joint APEC-OECD members could potentially propose one.

3.A.ii.c. Discussion Paper: Sharing Best Practices in Chem. Regulation **The Philippines and Malaysia**

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/020 – Update on the Philippine Proposal for Capacity Building on Best Practices in Chemical Regulations
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/022 – Concept Note of the Philippines: Sharing Best Practices in Chemical Regulation
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/023 – Sharing Best Practices in Chemicals Regulation – Discussion Paper by the Philippines
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/028 – Establishment of Action Plans to Promote Chemical Regulatory Cooperation and Convergence Within APEC Economies Via Logical Framework Approach (LFA)

Action Items

- The CD requested that the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation hold a teleconference by October 16, 2015 to discuss how to combine the Philippines (Document Number 022) and Malaysia proposals related to capacity building for regulators and regulatory cooperation.
- The CD sought a revised draft proposal from the VWG for consideration by the end of November.

- The CD agreed to put forward the revised proposal, once endorsed, for funding during the second funding cycle of 2016

The Philippines introduced its proposal (Document Number 024). The proposal for a multi-year capacity building program for regulators to implement the CD's Best Practice Principles was first introduced at SOM1 2015. The program would potentially include a follow-up workshop to the 2014 Regulatory Cooperation workshop, a seminar on case studies actually implementing the Best Practice Principles, a study visit to an actual case study, and then a series of practical workshops on how to transform existing regulations (including cost-benefit analysis). Since SOM1, the proposal was circulated to the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation and to the Regulators' Forum for comment. The VWG agreed that the proposal had significant merit and noted its potential linkage with the Malaysian proposal (described below). Because APEC's multi-year funding has been put on hold, the proposal would need to be revised to seek funding for only a one-year period.

Malaysia then provided a presentation on its proposal entitled "Establishment of Action Plans To Promote Chemical Regulatory Cooperation and Convergence Within APEC Economies Via Logical Framework Approach." The proposal is to organize a workshop that would seek to identify and analyze potential challenges to chemical trade among APEC economies and to develop action plans to facilitate that trade. The proposed timeline would be: identifying the venue in February 2016, inviting speakers and participants during March-May 2016, confirming participation and logistics in June-July 2016, and hosting the workshop in August 2016. Malaysia is seeking \$120,000 from APEC for the workshop. Malaysia sought comment from economies on how to fine tune the proposal and to collaborate to increase the effectiveness of any potential workshop.

During the comment period, there was widespread support for the intent of both proposals to promote capacity building on regulatory cooperation and the best practice principles. Several economies noted how the two proposals could be potentially combined to form an integrated program. It was suggested that the VWG on regulatory cooperation host a teleconference focused solely on the two proposals and to develop a coordinated proposal that would fit within the funding requirements. It was also noted that the Regulators' Forum should participate in that discussion because of the focus on regulator capacity building. The Government Co-Chair noted the overwhelming support for continuing work in this area and indicated that a combined proposal, with broad co-sponsorship, would be more likely to get funding from APEC's increasingly limited budgets. The CD agreed to seek to revise and combine the proposals and to seek intersessional endorsement before submitting the proposal during the second funding cycle of 2016 to ensure it does not compete with the proposal on GHS capacity building being put forward during the first session (see Agenda Item 3.A.iii.a).

3.A.ii.d. Chemicals and FTA/RTA Issues

Australia and U.S. Industry

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/009 – Chemicals and FTA/RTA Issues
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/014 – Chemical Industry Priorities for the Negotiation of Regional and Bilateral FTAs

Action Items

- The CD noted the recommendations contained in Document Number 009 (*Chemicals and FTA / RTA Issues*), namely noting:

- The above update on FTAAP progress and in particular, that participation in this work is through the CTI representative for each member economy;
- That the CD may have valuable input to provide to this process on lessons learned in the implementation of existing FTAs and RTAs, and priorities for the chemical sector in the FTAAP.
- The CD requested comment on Document Number 014 (*Chemical Industry Priorities for the Negotiation of Regional and Bilateral FTAs*) by September 25 and noted that the document is not being put forward by the CD for endorsement, but could be maintained as a resource for individual CD member economies to consult in the future.

Australian industry introduced Document Number 009 as a follow-up to the Scoping Study on Potential Benefits to the Chemical Industry from Participating in Negotiations on Free Trade Agreements introduced at SOM1. The new document summarizes APEC discussions on FTAs/RTAs since SOM1. Those discussions will be continuing at the Senior Official level and it was therefore recommended that the CD could provide input to this process through each economy's CTI representative.

U.S. industry then introduced Document Number 014. At SOM1, there was a discussion about the elements of FTAs/RTAs that could be of value to the chemical industry, including general (or "horizontal") areas. As a follow-up, the U.S. industry had drafted an industry paper that sought to identify certain key priority areas. Because the context of each negotiation is different, the paper seeks to identify general principles for negotiation, rather than specific textual proposals. The U.S. industry noted that the document was intended to be an "industry" document and that it was not being put forward for endorsement. Instead, comments were sought intersessionally with a goal of potentially being able to make it available as a resource document for economies to consider going forward.

During the comment session, economies noted the value of potentially sharing the draft principles document with other APEC groups that have substantive expertise on these types of issues (e.g., the Sub-Committee on Customs Procedures ("SCCP")). Several economies agreed that the document would be most valuable as an industry paper. The CD agreed to seek comments to develop as much consensus as possible with an aim of considering the document as a resource for negotiators to reference to ensure they knew the priority areas for the chemical industry.

3.A.ii.e. Update of Russian Document – "The safety of chemical products – National and International Issues"

Australia and the Russian Federation

Action Items

- The CD noted the intention of Russia and Australia to submit a draft document related to national and international issues involving the safety of chemical products to the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation by the end of December 2015 and to hearing more about the document at SOM1 2016

The Russian Federation and Australia provided a summary of their recent efforts to develop an English translation of a Russian document on national and international issues relating the safety of chemical products. Australia thanked Russia for its significant work in the development of the document and noted their collaborative efforts to ensure it was translated and finalized quickly. Russia indicated its intention to finish a draft of the document by the end of December 2015 and to share a draft with the

VWG before then circulating it to the CD if there is interest. The CD noted this timeline and its interest in reviewing the document in 2016.

3.A.ii.f. Follow-up to 2014 Regulatory Cooperation Workshop U.S. Industry

Action Items

- The CD noted the standing invitation from the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation to invite sharing of experiences, in particular related to experience implementing MAD, including potential input from the OECD.

U.S. industry provided an update on follow-up to the 2014 Regulatory Cooperation Workshop noting that interim and final reports from the workshop had been circulated and approved by the CD at SOM3 2014 and intersessionally respectively. Those reports contemplated a number of follow-up actions, including the Seminar of GRP that was held on August 26 and other items discussed at that seminar.

One of the topics arising from the workshop that had not been discussed during the seminar was a potential CD project on the OECD's Mutual Acceptance of Data ("MAD") program. U.S. industry noted, on behalf of the VWG, the standing invitation from the VWG for economies that have implemented MAD to share experiences and lessons learned with the VWG and potentially with the CD at SOM1. A guest from the OECD noted that it had undertaken surveys of members' experiences with the MAD program and that it may be willing to share the results of those surveys with the CD if that would be of interest. The CD agreed to continue to share information related to MAD implementation.

3.A.iii. Virtual Working Group on GHS

3.A.iii.a. Implementation of the Work Plan

VWG Co-Chairs

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/002 – Progress Report on the Implementation of Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) in APEC Economies
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/010 – Comparison of Implementing Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Regulations Amongst the APEC Economies
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/011 – Summary of Comparison of Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Implementation Efforts and Proposed Next Steps

Action Items

- The CD requested that the VWG on GHS circulate a survey regarding input on the GHS Smart Form by October 16
- The CD requested that the VWG revise and finalize Document Number 002 (*Progress Report on the Implementation of Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) in APEC Economies*) and submit it to the CD in time for it to be submitted to the CTI for consideration by October 16, 2015 and ultimately transmitted to APEC Ministers
- The CD sought comments on Document Number 010 (*Comparison of Implementing Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Regulations Amongst the APEC Economies*) and Document Number 011 (*Summary of*

Comparison of Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Implementation Efforts and Proposed Next Steps by September 15, 2015

- The CD endorsed the transmission of Document Numbers 002, 010, 011, as revised to reflect comments received, and potentially in a consolidated format, to CTI for transmission to APEC Ministers as part of its GHS Report.

The U.S., as Industry Co-Chair of the VWG on GHS, noted the substantial progress the VWG had made since SOM1 and called delegates attention to Document Numbers 002, 010, 011, 015, and 016 which were introduced in turn. First, U.S. industry introduced Document Numbers 010 and 011. For several years, the CD has discussed the growing divergence in GHS implementation across the region. The 2015 MRT noted this increasing divergence and called for the CD to undertake work to address the variance. As a first step in doing so, the VWG commissioned a study to provide evidence of the variance it had previously discussed. A draft of that comparison is provided in Document 010 which seeks to identify variation across several topics including: (a) the physical, health, and environmental hazard categories implemented by APEC economies against GHS Revision 5; (b) the GHS revision number currently implemented in each economy; (c) the GHS implementation schedules in each economy; (d) a list of the economies that have implemented a list of GHS chemical classifications; and (e) an identification of mixture cut-off values. Comments were sought on the living document to ensure it remains current with regulatory developments.

To meet MRT instructions, a list of potential next steps to address some of the variances identified was circulated in Document No. 011. To implement these recommendations, the VWG recommended that the CD agree to transmit the comparison document to APEC Ministers in November as a follow-up to the MRT instruction, seek an instruction from AMM to address the identified variances, and build capacity to avoid variance potentially through a workshop in 2016. The CD welcomed the study and acknowledged the significant effort that was undertaken in the report. The CD sought comments on both documents by September 15 and endorsed the transmission of the comparison and recommendations, as revised to reflect any comments received, to CTI with a recommendation that it be transmitted to Ministers.

Australia introduced the progress report on the VWG on GHS's work (Document Number 002). Australia noted that the VWG had developed a "Smart Form" to facilitate increased submissions on the annual GHS reporting. The Smart Form did not however increase the response rate, so Australia agreed to circulate a short survey to economies to seek comment on why the reporting rate was low. Several comments were provided at the meeting, including some technical challenges identified with submitting long answers using the Smart Form. The CD agreed to seek completion of the survey once circulated.

Mexico introduced its proposal to host a GHS capacity building workshop in 2016 (Document Number 016). The proposal would be for a 2.5 day workshop in Mexico City to identify challenges with, and promote solutions to, consistent GHS implementation. Mexico noted its intention to work with the VWG on GHS to refine the proposal and to seek cosponsors. The proposal was welcomed by several economies who noted the need to promote capacity building. The CD agreed to provide comments, and potential cosponsors, by October 1, 2015 and for the VWG to revise the proposal for potential endorsement by the CD for submission during the first funding cycle of 2016.

Russia then introduced a proposal to strengthen cooperation between the APEC CD and the UNSCEGHS. Since 2008, the CD has been providing its annual report to the MRT on GHS implementation and publishing it on the G.R.E.A.T. website. Russia proposed sharing that report with the UNSCEGHS to

raise awareness of the CD's work. This could be done unofficially by sharing the finalized CD report with the UNSCEGHS by email. To submit the document formally, the document would need to be revised to conform to the UNSCEGHS's document submission requirements. Russia sought comments from the CD on the proposal and then requested that the VWG further consider the comments and revise the proposal. The CD agreed to submit comments on the proposal by October 15, 2015.

3.A.iii.b. Extensions and Status of the G.R.E.A.T. Project

Chinese Taipei

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/012 – Update on Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Reference Exchange and Tool (G.R.E.A.T.) Project
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/013 – The Chemical Management Scheme and the Current Update on the System in Chinese Taipei

Action Items

- The CD thanked Chinese Taipei for its continued efforts to host the G.R.E.A.T. website and invited economies to continue to provide updates to Chinese Taipei for inclusion on the website.

Chinese Taipei introduced its updated report on the implementation of the GHS Reference Exchange and Tool ("G.R.E.A.T.") (Document Number 012). The website has now received more than 90,000 hits and includes GHS elements in 37 languages from 11 member economies and has been updated to reflect GHS revision 4. Chinese Taipei offered to continue to host and maintain the website to support the CD's efforts to meet the Ministers Responsible for Trade 2015 instructions to continue promoting GHS implementation across the region.

The Government Co-Chair thanked Chinese Taipei for its continued efforts to host the website and encouraged economies to think about ways to expand G.R.E.A.T. and to provide timely and regular information updates.

3.A.iv. Virtual Working Group on GHS Data Exchange

The Russian Federation

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/015 – Proposal to Strengthen Cooperation Between APEC Chemical Dialogue and UN Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Sub-Committee (UN SCE GHS)
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/017 – UN Sub-Committee of Experts on Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Project: Global List of Chemicals Classified According to the GHS

Action Items

- The CD invited comments on Document Number 015 (*Proposal to Strengthen Cooperation Between APEC Chemical Dialogue and UN Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Sub-Committee (UN SCE GHS)*) by September 18, 2015.
- The CD noted Document Number 017 (*UN Sub-Committee of Experts (SCE) on Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Project: Global List*

of Chemicals, Classified According to the GHS) and the proposed next steps it contains, namely that CD member economies can:

- Review the draft assessments of pilot chemicals submitted to OECD Clear Space platform by lead economies;
- Send comments (if any) to the protected site on OECD Clear Space platform by mid-October; and
- Participate in teleconferences / face-to-face meeting (if any) to evaluate the possibility of reaching an agreed hazard classification of pilot chemicals

Russia, as the Chair of the VWG on Data Exchange, provided a summary of the UNSCEGHS's ongoing pilot project related to a global list. Since SOM1, the UNSCEGHS has undertaken several teleconferences on its work and held an in-person meeting from June 29 through July 1, 2015. Russia proposed the following next steps for CD economies to consider:

1. Review the draft assessments of pilot chemicals submitted to the OECD Clear Space platform by lead economies;
2. Send comments (if any) to the protected site on the OECD Clear Space platform by mid-October; and
3. Participate in at teleconferences / face-to-face meeting (if any) to evaluate the possibility of reaching an agreed hazard classification of pilot chemicals

The OECD noted that the UNSCEGHS's work is intended as a feasibility study to investigate the amount of time and resources needed to prepare a global classification report. A global list would reduce variance and create value for both industry and regulators. The pilot therefore aims to determine whether agreement is possible, and if not, why not. In response to a question, the OECD noted that the format for submission of information was the same CLP template and reporting format it has always used. The CD agreed to note the next steps proposed by the VWG.

3.B. New Concept Note: GHS Capacity Building Workshop

Mexico

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/016 – Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Capacity Building Workshop

Action Items

- The CD sought comments and potential cosponsors on Document Number 016 (*Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) Capacity Building Workshop*) by October 1, 2015
- The CD noted its intention to submit Document Number 016, once endorsed by the CD, in the first funding cycle of 2016 in Peru's host year.
- The CD noted the desire to reach out to other Latin American economies in this work as observers in any potential workshop

This item was discussed as part of the discussion under the VWG on GHS above (Agenda Item 3.A.iii.a).

12:30 – 14:30	LUNCH
----------------------	--------------

14:30 – 15:00	AGENDA ITEM 4	SHARED GOAL 2: Enhance Understanding of the Chemical Industry's Role as an Innovative Solutions Provider
----------------------	----------------------	---

4.A. VWG on Marine Debris**Philippines Industry and U.S. Government (Co-Chairs)****Meeting Documents**

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/019 – Virtual Working Group on Marine Debris – 2015 Work Plan
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/025 – Virtual Working Group on Marine Debris – Project Proposal: Addressing Marine Debris Through Pilot Projects To Design Economically Sustainable Waste Management Infrastructure
- ❖ 2015/SOM/CD/026 – Virtual Working Group on Marine Debris – Presentation

Action Items

- The CD indicated that immediate comments Document Number 025 (*Virtual Working Group on Marine Debris – Project Proposal: Addressing Marine Debris Through Pilot Projects To Design Economically Sustainable Waste Management Infrastructure*) before the VWG's next teleconference on September 14
- The CD noted the intention of the VWG to submit the proposal to the CD and OFWG for endorsement once revised and endorsed by the VWG.
- The CD noted the VWG's invitation for additional participation from governments and industry in the VWG's activities.

The Industry Co-Chair of the VWG introduced the work of the VWG since SOM1 (Document Number 026). The VWG developed a work plan which was endorsed by the OFWG at its SOM2 meeting and then endorsed by the CD intersessionally; the agreed version was tabled as Document No. 019. The VWG also agreed on its co-chairs: Ms. Nancy Wallace from the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") as the Government Co-Chair and Mr. Crispian Lao from the Philippines Plastics Association as the Industry Co-Chair.

The agreed work plan contemplates five activities and the presentation summarized progress on each: (1) drafting a baseline report; (2) hosting an awareness raising session; (3) promoting a pilot-project of innovative technologies; (4) developing principles and definitions; and (5) contributing to the SOM Friends of the Chair ("FotC") on Urbanization. In particular, attention was called to the VWG's contributions to a panel discussion on creating value from waste at the FoTC on Urbanization "Mayors' Forum" to be held on September 3-4 in Cebu which would serve to contribute to the FotC, build awareness, and begin developing a needs assessment. Additionally, the VWG has begun discussions on a self-funded pilot project to promote implementation of comprehensive solid waste management systems at two beta-sites within the region (Document Number 025). The VWG will discuss the proposal on a call in early September and seek to circulate an agreed version to the CD for endorsement thereafter. The VWG welcomed immediate comment on the proposal.

U.S. industry noted its support for the VWG's ongoing work and, in particular, the example it sets of the value of partnering across fora within APEC. The Government Co-Chair reiterated the value of this approach and the leadership role the CD could take on the basis of this collaboration within the numerous other international fora (e.g., G7, OECD, etc.) addressing this issue.

15:00 – 15:30	AGENDA ITEM 5	SHARED GOAL 3: Encourage Chemical Product Stewardship, Safe Use and Sustainability
----------------------	----------------------	---

5.A. Regional capacity building (e.g. JAMP/SCRUM)**Led by Japanese Industry****Meeting Documents**

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/004 – Management of Chemicals in Products Practice of Information Communication Across the Supply Chain
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/005 – Chemical Risk Management in Japan

Japanese Industry presented an update on its Joint Article Management Promotion consortium (“JAMP”) (Document Number 004). The presentation highlighted several updates to the JAMP program since SOM1 including: (1) a revision to the JAMP Declarable Substances List based on updates in the regulatory and substance lists used by industry; (2) release of two new English guidance documents for “Mechanical Processing” and “Print Circuit Board Assembly Process”; and (3) the development of a new common communication scheme to promote responsible information communication amongst the Japanese industry (upstream, midstream, and downstream) for chemicals in product management (known as chemSHERPA). Japanese Industry also provided an update on the Project of Supply chain Chemical Risk management and Useful Mechanism discussion (“SCRUM”). Since SOM1, the SCRUM Project has updated its guidelines (April 1, 2015), by exchanging opinions with relevant authorities, industry associations, conducting case studies of risk assessment, and beginning to conduct trial risk assessment for products.

Japanese Industry then provided an update on an IT Tool for Risk Assessment it has developed (Document Number 005) known as the JCIA Base of Information Gathering, sharing & Disseminating for Risk management of chemical products (“JCIA BIGDr”). The goal of the project is to create an IT portal system to support JCIA members implementing chemical risk management and risk assessments. The presentation summarized the five primary functions of the BIGDr system, how the system can be used, and the plans for further expanding it in the future.

Indonesia intervened to congratulate JCIA for its efforts and to thank it for its support, particularly in the ASEAN context. The CD thanked JCIA for its update.

5.B. Contribution to ICCM-4**APCIC****Meeting Documents**

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/018rev1 – CD Contribution to ICCM-4

Action Items

- The CD agreed to Document Number 018rev1 intersessionally.

APCIC discussed the Dialogue’s potential contribution to the Strategic Approach to International Chemical’s Management’s (“SAICM”) fourth International Conference on Chemicals Management (“ICCM-4”) to be held from September 28 to October 2, 2015 in Geneva. At SOM1, 2015, the Dialogue agreed to provide a contribution to ICCM-4 similar to its previous “regional contributions” to ICCM-2 in 2009 and ICCM-3 in 2012.

A draft contribution was introduced in Document Number 018. The contribution parallels the approach undertaken in 2012 in which the CD's completed actions since the previous ICCM meeting were listed as contributions to meeting SAICM's five core objectives. APCIC noted that SAICM submissions were due by the end of July, but the CD had been given an extension until after its meeting, and therefore sought comment as soon as possible. The Philippines noted that in principle it would be willing to present an agreed contribution to the ICCM-4 meeting, provided an appropriate representative would be attending. The CD agreed to provide comments as quickly as possible and to seek approval from the CTI and Senior Officials for the submission, and presentation, of that document to ICCM-4. The CTI and SOM approved the CD's transmission of a consensus document to ICCM-4 and the CD agreed to Document Number 018rev1 intersessionally.

5.C. Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals

China and United States

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/007 – 2015 EU Regulations Updating

Action Items

- The CD Agreed to keep this item on the agenda and to seek additional information at SOM1 2016

The Industry Co-Chair noted that Endocrine Disrupting Chemicals ("EDCs") represented an emerging issue under SAICM and that the CD had agreed to continue sharing information regarding EDCs at SOM1. The Industry Co-Chair began this item by calling attention to the first few slides in Document No. 007 relating to the European Union's approach to the regulation of EDCs. On May 12, 2015, the European Commission held a roundtable on the ongoing impact assessment on EDCs. The Commission indicated its intention to publish the results of its impact assessment for more than 700 substances by late 2016. The Commission conducted a public consultation on EDC regulation including four options on criteria to identify EDCs and then three approaches to regulatory decision-making. The Commission is currently preparing its report summarizing the more than 27,087 responses, 93% of which were from two non-governmental organization campaigns.

The United States government provided a summary of its Endocrine Disrupter Screening Program ("EDSP"). The EDSP was mandated by legislation in 1996 and was formally established in 1998 using a two-tiered approach. Tier 1 ("screening tier") is to identify substances that have potential biological activity along several pathways using a battery of assessments. Tier 2 ("testing tier") is to identify and establish a dose-response relationship for adverse effects that might result from the Tier 1 assessments. The EDSP will also incorporate exposure information to the extent available. In July 2015, the U.S. EPA released its results for its first 52 pesticide chemicals. EPA also announced in June a plan to incorporate validated high throughput assessments and computational models into the EDSP to screen chemicals which could serve as an alternative for three of the 11 current assessments (estrogen receptor binding, estrogen receptor transactivation, and uterotrophic). EPA is planning to develop alternative screening methods for the remaining eight Tier 1 assessments to accelerate screening, decrease costs, and reduce animal testing.

China provided a summary of recent developments in its approach to EDCs. Pursuant to State Council Order No. 017 (2015), the Ministry for Environmental Protection ("MEP") is responsible for domestic EDC regulation and will be seeking to finalize its regulations by the end of 2017. Together with other ministries, including the Ministry of Agriculture, Information and Industry, and Information

Technology, MEP will be responsible for monitoring and risk assessments of EDCs. China welcomed the opportunity to receive more information and to continue information sharing on this topic.

U.S. industry noted its support for the EDSP and the risk-based screening and testing process it represents. Both industry and government have invested a huge amount of time and money into this process; for example, each of the 11 tests costs about \$1 million. The new testing methods are therefore critical to get greater certainty on a faster timeline. U.S. industry also noted its support for keeping this on the agenda and to report back at SOM1 about national-level developments and any developments at ICCM-4, including its work to broaden the available science. The OECD intervened to note its Advisory Group on EDC Testing and Assessment ("EDTA"). More information can be circulated to the CD.¹

5.D. Additional Ideas for Shared Goal 3 Activities

Moderated by Industry Co-Chair

Action Items

- The CD sought comments from economies on potential new ideas for Shared Goal 3 by October 16, 2015
- CD sought a written proposal from the U.S. Council for International Business (USCIB) related to the potential consideration by the VWG on Regulatory Cooperation of USCIB's proposal related to self-certification at Customs

The Dialogue opened the floor for potential new ideas on workstreams under Shared Goal 3, noting that typically the CD has fewer workstreams in this area than under Shared Goal 1. The U.S. Council of International Business ("USCIB") discussed the difficulty that some chemical companies and downstream users were facing related to regulatory requirements upon product import. USCIB therefore suggested the possibility of APEC work on a self-certification form in which importers could certify compliance with an economy's regulations. This would not replace the registration and assessment requirements, but would be designed to streamline customs processes. The U.S. has already implemented such an approach and it might have broader value. The CD welcomed the idea and requested a written proposal on the topic for potential consideration by its VWG on Regulatory Cooperation. The CD also agreed to seek additional comments and ideas intersessionally on potential Shared Goal 3 projects.

15:30 – 16:00	Coffee Break	
16:00 – 17:30	AGENDA ITEM 6	Information Exchange on Regional and National Regulatory Developments

Several economies sought to share information with CD members related to recent regulatory developments. The following updates were presented for informational purposes and were not presented to the Dialogue for decision.

¹ See <http://www.oecd.org/env/ehs/testing/oecdworkrelatedtoendocrinedisrupters.htm>.

6.A. Canada National Regulatory Development**Canada**

A government representative from Canada thanked the CD for its hospitality and made available two informational handouts for delegates related to recent Canadian regulatory developments: (1) Chemicals Management Plan Progress Report from Spring 2015; and (2) a summary of Canada's Chemical Management Plan, including a link to relevant resources. Canada has made substantial progress on its prioritization and review of chemicals thus far. It has removed roughly two-third of the 4,300 identified chemicals and is on pace to finish its review by 2020 as planned. Additional information is available online and in Canada's regularly published progress reports.

6.B.U.S. Chemical Legislation Developments**U.S. Industry**

U.S. industry provided a review of recent developments since the SOM1 meeting related to the ongoing effort to reform the U.S. Toxic Substances Control Act ("TSCA"). Since SOM1, bipartisan legislation has been introduced in both the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives ("House"). The bills are different in scope, but have attracted strong support from the broader stakeholder community, including state and federal government officials, industry, and non-governmental organizations ("NGOs"). The House bill passed in June by a vote of 398-1. The Senate bill currently has 54 cosponsors and has been passed out of Committee, but is waiting for debate by the full Senate. If the Senate bill passes, the two bills would be submitted to a Conference Committee to be reconciled. The combined bill would then be resubmitted to both houses and then, if passed, sent to the President. President Obama has indicated he will likely sign a bill that reaches his desk. If it does pass, it would represent one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation passed in the United States since 1991 (the Clean Air Act Amendments).

6.C.ASEAN-Japan Chemical Safety Database**Japan****Meeting Documents**

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/006 – ASEAN-Japan Chemical Safety Database

Japan provided an update of AMEICC activities on its development of a chemical safety database in coordination with ASEAN. The database aims to promote transparency, contribute to trade facilitation, and reduce compliance risk by sharing national regulatory information for member countries (ASEAN and Japan) in one location. The ASEAN-Japan Chemical Safety Database ("AJCSD") went into trial operation on April 6, 2015 and will go into full operation in April 2016.² Feedback is being sought from participants during the trial. The website provides the ability to search for particular chemicals and to then pull up the potentially related regulations across each of the related economies.

6.D. Update on NICNAS Reform Processes**Australia****Meeting Documents**

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/003 – Information Exchange on Regional and National Regulatory Developments – Update on National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme Reform Processes

² See <http://www.ajcsd.org>.

A representative from Australia's National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme ("NICNAS") provided an update on the agency's reform process. Noting that the full update had been provided at the Regulators' Forum on August 26, the presentation instead focused on the steps NICNAS is taking to implement GRP in its reform process. The goal of the reforms was to improve the existing regulation and enhance industry competitiveness while maintaining public health and environmental protection. NICNAS had identified that its assessment framework was not sufficiently based on risk (*i.e.*, the regulatory effort not proportionate to risk), that regulatory processes were inefficient (*i.e.*, that regulatory burden was not proportionate to risk), and there were inconsistencies in regulatory coverage.

Australia's Office of Best Practice Regulation had certified a Regulation Impact Statement ("RIS") developed by the Australian Department of Health that identified four options for reform: (1) base case (*i.e.*, no changes); (2) focus entirely on post-market assessments; (3) incorporate pre- and post-market assessments for new chemicals and post-market assessments for existing chemicals; and (4) full pre-market assessments for new chemicals and post-market for existing chemicals. The Australian Government selected option (3) to balance industry and other stakeholder input. Under Option 3, new chemicals are classified according to risk: Class 1 is Very Low Risk (automatic market entry); Class 2 is Low Risk (industry self-assessment, pre-market notification, and 10 percent post-market assessment); and Class 3 is Medium-High Risk (pre-market assessment and post-market audit). The reform implementation began on July 1, 2015 and will be fully implemented by September 1, 2018. NICNAS also noted the requirement under the Australian Government's Industry Innovation and Competitiveness Agenda and in its Deregulation Measures to use trusted international standards or risk assessments unless there is a good reason not to; this links to the Approved Foreign Scheme program Australia summarized in the 2014 Regulatory Cooperation Workshop.

6.E. Progress on the Management of Chemicals in Chile

Chile

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/027 – Progress in the Management of Chemicals in Chile

Chile then provided a presentation regarding developments in its chemical management. The Chilean chemical industry is made up of approximately 300 chemical companies which have grown rapidly as a result of the country's economic growth. The presentation summarized Chile's regulation of chemicals throughout their life cycle including at the Manufacturing, Transport, Storage, Usage, Disposal, and Import, stages in addition to regulations on Dangerous Chemicals, GHS, National Chemical Safety Policy, and Pollutant Release and Transfer Register which are all coordinated through the National Policy on Chemical Safety ("PNSQ") which has been in effect since 2008. Chile has recently been updating the PNSQ as a result of its signing of several international agreements and accession to the OECD. This update has four objectives: (1) strengthening the institution, regulatory framework, and control related to chemical management; (2) preventing chemical substances throughout their life cycle; (3) promoting research, training, and dissemination of chemical management; and (4) strengthening emergency preparedness and response.

The presentation provided a comprehensive review of Chile's regulatory framework including its 2010 law 20.417, the list of conventions to which Chile had acceded, and a full list of relevant regulations. The presentation also identified a series of studies that Chile had undertaken related to chemical management including in the areas of PCBs, POPs, GHS, Risk Assessment, and others. Finally, the presentation concluded by noting Chile's future goals to: (1) improve mechanisms for international

cooperation; (2) promote the sharing of information to ensure proper chemical management; (3) generate effective tools to improve chemical management; and (3) train officials on chemical management throughout the life cycle.

In response to a question, Chile noted that the Pacific Alliance (“Alliance”) had launched a range of initiatives on regulatory cooperation. While the chemical sector is not one of the current areas of focus, the Alliance has undertaken regulatory cooperation efforts on cosmetic products. The Alliance is starting discussions on potential new sectors in October and chemicals could be among them if there is sufficient interest.

6.F. Additional Regulatory Developments

Interested Economies

Meeting Documents

- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/007 – *2015 EU Regulations Updating*
- ❖ 2015/SOM3/CD/013 – *The Chemical Management Scheme and the Current Update on the System in Chinese Taipei*

Japan briefly noted Document Number 007 and called delegates attention to the remaining slides on EU regulatory developments that had not been discussed as part of the session on EDCs above.

Several other economies then provided brief updates on relevant developments. The Philippines noted that its rules and procedures to implement GHS were approved in May 2015. GHS will be implemented in tiers, focusing on controlled chemicals in 2016, high-volume chemicals in 2017, and ultimately mixtures in 2019. The Philippines also noted it was currently amending its chemical control order for mercury, as well as for arsenic. Chinese Taipei noted several updates related to its national inventory, including the development of an advanced search function. Malaysia and Indonesia provided updates and called delegates attention to the presentations they had made to the Regulators’ Forum.

A guest from the OECD summarized relevant OECD work programs. These include: an OECD program on plastic marine litter; the Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) program and an indication that the OECD would be willing to share information and organize workshops for non-OECD economies that were interested; a task force on hazard assessment and case studies for how to do read across; guidance on the risk assessment for metals that will be discussed at the workshop; and, a toolbox for substitution of chemicals for which the OECD would provide a link to the APEC Secretariat for circulation.

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

7.A. Summary of the Day and Action Items

APCIC

Action Items

- The CD agreed to circulate a draft set of Action Items immediately following the meeting, followed by a longer summary report once drafted

At the invitation of the Co-Chairs, the Advisor to the Co-Chairs provided a summary of the day’s discussions and read through the list of agreed action items. Several economies intervened to ensure the minutes reflected additional items including: (1) the open invitation for cooperation with the OECD’s Clearinghouse on New Chemicals including its workshop and clearinghouse in Canada on October 6-8, 2015; (2) the contributions made by the non-APEC members to the day’s discussions; and (3) the

possibility of regional capacity building on analogues. It was noted that a list of action items would be circulated the day after the meeting with a more comprehensive summary report to follow.

7.B. APEC Ministers (AMM) statement

Government Co-Chair

Action Items

- The CD agreed to seek inclusion of several key topics including: (a) regulatory cooperation, including the CD's priorities regarding GHS and the report to MRT, the GRP seminar, and the potential next steps including an implementation checklist; and (b) the CD's leading role in multi- fora collaboration within APEC including through collaboration with the Mining Task Force on the Risk Assessment of Metals workshop, with the OFWG and the SOM Friends of the Chair on Urbanization related to marine debris, and with the Economic Committee and Subcommittee on Standards and Conformance related to good regulatory practices

The CD discussed the possible topics for recommendation to the CTI and to Senior Officials for potential inclusion in the APEC Ministers Meeting ("AMM") statement. Building on the recognition in the MRT statement in May, the CD discussed recommending a focus on its: (1) regulatory cooperation and good regulatory practices work including the outcomes of the seminar discussion and the potential for follow-ups including the implementation checklist and contributions to the GRP seminar; (2) efforts to meet MRT instructions related to identification of GHS variance; and (3) leading role on promoting cross-fora collaboration, including through the Risk Assessment in Metals workshop that carries forward work from the Mining Task Force, the VWG on Marine Debris work with the OFWG, and the broader GRP collaboration with the SCSC and EC.

7.C. Document Classification

APEC Secretariat

Action Items

- The CD endorsed the Document Classification List after changing Document Numbers 003 and 009 to public documents.

The APEC Secretariat reviewed the document classification list. The CD agreed to publicly release documents 003 and 009 and to then endorse the classification list.

7.D. APEC 2016 Preparations

Peru

A representative from Peru provided an initial welcome to Peru's host year. Peru played a welcome video to introduce its host year and noted that it hoped to convey the message "Peru – Always beyond Your Expectations". The dates and locations of the meetings will be announced at the Informal Senior Officials Meeting in Peru in December 2015.

The Government Co-Chair concluded the meeting by noting the robust engagement and action items to which the CD had agreed throughout the day. He thanked the Philippines for its warm hospitality throughout the year, thanked his Industry Co-Chair for his continued leadership, and David Wu and Ingrid Kuman from the APEC Secretariat for their comprehensive support throughout the meeting. The meeting was brought to a conclusion at 5:50.

* * *