



SAICM/ICCM.3/INF/5



Strategic Approach  
to International  
Chemicals Management

Distr.: General  
18 August 2012

English only

---

**International Conference on Chemicals Management**

**Third meeting**

Nairobi, 17–21 September 2012

Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda \*

**Implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management:**

**Evaluation of and guidance on implementation and review and update of the Strategic Approach**

**Baseline estimates report 2006-2008: Progress in implementation  
of the Strategic Approach on International Chemicals  
Management**

**Note by the secretariat**

The secretariat has the honour to circulate in the annex to the present note the baseline estimates report 2006 – 2008 providing information on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management. The report has been prepared by the secretariat in accordance with the agreements reached by the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management. The report was provided in draft form to the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group of the International Conference on Chemicals Management held Belgrade, 15–18 November 2011. The report is provided for the information of participants and has not been formally edited

---

\* SAICM/ICCM.3/1



**Baseline estimates report 2006-2008**  
**Progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach to**  
**International Chemicals Management**

June 2012

Acknowledgement: The secretariat would like to acknowledge the contributions made by Slavena Georgieva, Armand Racine, Ingrid Rijk. Luz-Yenny Romero and Simonetta Spaviera-Mora in preparing the present baseline report

## List of contents

- List of tables
- I. Introduction
  - A. The issue
  - B. The Strategic Approach and its contents
  - C. The reporting modalities
  - D. Objectives and structure of this report
- II. Methodology
  - A. Challenges for the baseline report
  - B. Sources of available information
    - 1. Preliminary reporting questionnaires
    - 2. Information held by the secretariat
    - 3. Documentation from the second session of the Conference
    - 4. Information from secretariat of international organizations
    - 5. Baseline estimates reports prepared by specific stakeholders
  - C. Initial assessment of the available information
    - 1. Assessment of information from Governments
    - 2. Assessment of information from intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations
- III. Estimating the number of Strategic Approach participants
  - A. Governments
  - B. Non-governmental organizations
  - C. Intergovernmental organizations
- IV. Baseline results for SAICM indicators
  - A. Baseline results for Governments
  - B. Baseline results for non-governmental organizations
  - C. Baseline results for intergovernmental organizations
- V. Conclusions and discussion
  - A. Measures of progress
  - B. Baseline estimate findings
  - C. Considerations for future reporting

## Annexes

- I. Indicators for reporting by stakeholders on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach
- II. Reporting questionnaire: An example of one of the interim reporting questionnaires used over the 2006-2008 intersessional period of the International Conference on Chemicals Management
- III. List of Governments and organizations submitting initial reporting questionnaires over the period 2006-2008
- IV. Summary of baseline estimates for seven of the 20 adopted indicators for monitoring progress in SAICM implementation

## Executive summary

1. In accordance with the agreements reached by the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management the secretariat has prepared the present baseline estimates report for the period 2006–2008 using readily available sources of information and data, including responses to interim reporting questionnaires submitted during the first intersessional rounds of regional meetings, reports to the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management and publicly available sources such as the internet.
2. The approach taken by the secretariat to the preparation of the baseline report has been to extract information from the readily available sources that corresponded to the adopted indicators. The questionnaire developed for collecting information for the first periodic report was used to guide this work and ensure consistency. Information on whether a particular activity had been completed or was underway was tabulated for summation and numerical analysis using a spreadsheet. Because of the large amount of information potentially available, the secretariat accorded priority to information related to governmental activities. Baseline estimates of progress are possible for seven of the 20 indicators adopted by the Conference. Estimates for intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations are possible for three of these seven indicators. Data and information pertaining to the remaining 13 indicators varied in quality are not suitable for quantifying a reliable baseline estimate. No readily available information was found for the purpose of developing a baseline estimate for four of the 20 indicators.
4. The baseline estimates that are possible are characterized as predominantly estimates of initial implementation activities, including activities taken pursuant to the establishment of the Strategic Approach, such as designation of Strategic Approach focal points. Overall, the results show a high level of "baseline" activity especially in the case of Governments' commitment to the Strategic Approach, establishment of inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholders mechanisms, and identification and prioritization of chemicals management needs.
5. An estimate of the numbers of Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations participating in the Strategic Approach is necessary if estimates are to be comparable over time or expressed as percentages. Estimates are made of the numbers of participants in Strategic Approach regional meetings held over the period 2006-2008, the numbers providing written reports on their activities over this time and the numbers of official Strategic Approach focal points.

## I. Introduction

### A. The issue

6. The industrial consumption of chemicals and modern society's reliance on them for virtually all manufacturing processes make the chemicals industry one of the major and most globalized sectors of the world economy. Global consumption of chemicals has grown rapidly in the last decades, with the world chemical output increasing from 171 to 503 billion US dollars between 1970 and 1998<sup>1</sup>.
7. Acknowledgement of the essential economic role of chemicals and their contribution to improved living standards is tempered with the recognition of potential costs. These include the chemical industry's heavy use of water and energy and the potential adverse impacts of chemicals on the environment and human health. The diversity and potential severity of such impacts makes sound chemicals management a key cross-cutting issue for sustainable development.
8. The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) defined the goal that by 2020 chemicals should be used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse effects on human health and the environment (the 2020 goal). Over the past decades, significant progress has been made in chemicals management at national and international levels. Key instruments and processes have been established to address major chemicals management concerns. But these efforts have not so far, been sufficient to protect the environment and health the populations from chemicals risks.
9. Of particular significance in this regard are the gaps, overlaps and duplication in chemicals management activities at the international, national and local levels. This raises concern with regard to the changing patterns of global chemicals production and trade, with a progressive shift of portions of chemicals production and use from member countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) to developing countries and countries with economies in transition that lack the technical and financial capacity to manage chemicals soundly. By 2020, a third of global

<sup>1</sup> Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2001. *Environmental Outlook for the Chemicals Industry*. Paris, p. 28.

chemicals production and consumption is expected to occur in developing countries and those with economies in transition.<sup>2</sup>

## **B. The Strategic Approach and its mandates**

10. Acknowledging the need for further improvements in chemicals management, stakeholders participating in the first session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management adopted, in 2006, the Strategic Approach for International Chemicals Management. As a non-binding, inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholders policy framework, the Strategic Approach aims to guide efforts to achieve the WSSD 2020 goal.

11. The Strategic Approach includes the Dubai Declaration on International Chemicals Management, expressing a high level of political commitment to the Strategic Approach and calling for a strengthened focus on improved cross-sectoral governance for the sound management of chemicals throughout their life-cycle at the international, regional, national and local levels. An Overarching Policy Strategy sets out the scope, needs, objectives, financial considerations, principles and approaches, and implementation and review arrangements. Objectives are grouped under five themes:

- I. Risk reduction
- II. Knowledge and information
- III. Governance
- IV. Capacity-building and technical cooperation
- V. Illegal international traffic

12. The Declaration and Strategy are accompanied by a Global Plan of Action that serves as a working tool and guidance document to support implementation of the Strategic Approach. The many activities in the plan are to be implemented, as appropriate, by stakeholders, according to their applicability.

## **C. The reporting modalities**

13. Paragraph 24, of the Overarching Policy Strategy provides that the International Conference on Chemicals Management will undertake periodic reviews of the Strategic Approach. In doing so, it will receive reports from all relevant stakeholders on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach. The Conference will evaluate the implementation of the Strategic Approach with a view to reviewing progress against the 2020 target and taking strategic decisions, programming, prioritizing and updating the approach as necessary. Paragraph 28 b) assigns to the secretariat the function of reporting to the Conference on implementation of the Strategic Approach by all participants.

14. The modalities for reporting were further elaborated at the second session of the Conference (Geneva, May 2009), to include two distinct tracks:

(a) Arrangements for the preparation of a baseline report concerning all stakeholders for the period 2006-2008, based on the most recent data, and

(b) Arrangements for subsequent periodic reporting to sessions of the Conference commencing at the third report session of the Conference to be held in 2012 when a first report on progress for 2009-2011 would be considered.

15. A set of 20 indicators to be used by all stakeholders in reporting on progress on the sound management of chemicals was also agreed. The 20 indicators relate to specific chemicals management elements which are relevant to the objectives of the Overarching Policy Strategy of the Strategic Approach. The indicators as adopted by the second session of the Conference are contained in annex I of the present report.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 35; Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2008, *OECD Environmental Outlook to 2030*, p. 381.

## **D. Objectives and structure of this report**

16. This baseline report presents the results from the analysis of readily available information on Strategic Approach implementation from Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations (including those from civil society and the private sector) over the period 2006-2008.
17. The specific objectives of the report are to:
- (a) Determine the numbers of Strategic Approach stakeholders potentially engaged in implementation of the Strategic Approach, including Governmental, non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations;
  - (b) Determine a quantitative baseline estimate for each of the 20 adopted indicators using readily available information.
18. To ensure minimum consistency with future progress reporting, the baseline estimate for these initial activities is presented as far as possible in line with the adopted indicators of progress.

## **II. Methodology**

19. A baseline can be defined as “A measurement, calculation, or location used as a basis for comparison”<sup>3</sup>. The underpinning rationale for establishing a baseline in the context of an international instrument is to set the frame for monitoring progress in the achievement of the instrument’s objectives over time, by providing a snapshot of the situation before adoption of the instrument. This is generally done in a quantitative way to ensure a maximum level of objectivity and accuracy. However, it can be complemented by a qualitative assessment to avoid misinterpretation of the figures.

20. In order to measure progress in implementation of the instrument, the baseline is compared with similar information obtained by a periodic review of progress. Such review aims at providing a picture of the measures and activities undertaken during a given period, and ultimately to assess the level of achievement of the objectives defined in the instruments. To ensure comparability of data, the baseline and subsequent progress should ideally be measured using the same modalities and presented in the same units.

### **A. Challenges for the baseline estimate**

21. The scope of the Strategic Approach and the characteristics of the system for reporting on progress raise two main challenges for the development of a baseline as defined above:
- (a) For periodic reporting data on the 20 adopted indicators will be collected through an electronic tool to be developed by the secretariat. Using this tool, information on the indicators is foreseen to be provided by Strategic Approach stakeholders by responding to an electronic questionnaire specifically developed to assess the level of progress on the indicators. For the baseline report, this on-line reporting system was not yet in place. The secretariat therefore utilized existing questionnaires which had been completed by Strategic Approach stakeholders prior to regional meetings and the second session of the Conference. These questionnaires having been prepared before the development of the indicators did not explicitly cover many of the adopted indicators. Instead information was provided mostly in a narrative format.
  - (b) The sound management of chemicals is a broad undertaking that requires the implementation of a diverse set of actions. The types of actions required and the sequence for implementation varies significantly depending on the specific regional, national and/ or local situations. The baseline report for the Strategic Approach is to cover the period 2006-2008. The baseline assessment therefore covers the three first years of implementation of the Strategic Approach, instead of providing a snapshot the situation before its adoption.

### **B. Sources of available information**

22. The reporting modalities adopted by the second session of the Conference stipulate that the development of the baseline report should be based on the most recent available information. Therefore, data used to prepare this report were collected from the following sources:

<sup>3</sup> The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2000). Definition of a baseline. Fourth Edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, Updated in 2009. Available at: <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/baseline>

## 1. Preliminary reporting questionnaires

23. As an interim reporting measure before the adoption of the reporting modalities by the second session of the Conference, short questionnaires on the first efforts of Governments and organizations on implementation of the Strategic Approach were used by the secretariat particularly in the context of regional meetings held between 2006 and 2008. An example of one of the interim questionnaires is contained in annex II.

24. The interim reporting questionnaires tended to focus on initial actions that were underway in countries together with a general question on new activities underway on risk reduction, knowledge and information, governance, capacity-building and technical cooperation and illegal international traffic. The questions were very broad, often covering whole sections of the Overarching Policy Strategy such as "have activities been undertaken on risk reduction" and answered by "yes" and "no" questions, with the possibility to qualify the answers with additional information. In addition, the opportunity was given to add general comments, and some stakeholders attached additional documentation, including formal statements, strategic documents, and lists of activities undertaken as part of implementation of the Strategic Approach. The questions were open and consequently gave considerable latitude in how much detail was provided in answers.

25. The questionnaires were submitted prior to meetings such as regional meetings of the Strategic Approach and the second session of the Conference. Many Governments and organizations had answered more than one questionnaire over 2006-2008, the latest was analyzed first since it contained the most up-to-date information. Information from older submissions was added where relevant.

## 2. Information held by the secretariat

(a) **Lists of Strategic Approach focal points.** The secretariat maintains lists of official Strategic Approach focal points. These include the Strategic Approach national focal points designated by Governments, and focal points nominated by intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. In light of the period covered by the baseline report, all nominations of Strategic Approach focal points communicated to the secretariat before 2009 were included in the present report.

(b) **Quick Start Programme Trust Fund approved projects.** The secretariat administers a special trust fund - the Quick Start Programme (QSP) Trust Fund- for supporting the implementation of Strategic Approach objectives. Information on projects approved under the QSP Trust Fund in rounds I-V(closing on 29 August 2008) were considered for the present baseline report.

(c) **Lists of participants in regional meetings and sessions of the International Conference on Chemicals Management.** The secretariat prepares lists of participants to all meetings it organizes and therefore has records of the participation of Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations in Strategic Approach meetings over the baseline period. For the purposes of the present report, the number of Governments and organizations in all regional meetings and the second session of the International Conference was totaled to obtain an appreciation of the extent of participation in Strategic Approach meetings.

## 3. Documentation from the second session of the Conference

(a) **SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/1** - Ratification and implementation status of existing international instruments and programmes. This document provides information on the ratification and implementation status of existing international instruments and programmes relating to the sound management of chemicals as of 10 February 2009. Specifically, it presents the ratification status of the following international instruments and programmes and also presents information on the national implementation of the Globally Harmonized System of Classifications and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS), and on the development of National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and National Chemicals Management Profiles such those facilitated by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR):

- Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (BC);
- Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (RC);



- Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (SC);
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer;
- International Labour Organization Convention 170 on Safety in the Use of Chemicals at Work (ILO C.170);
- International Maritime Organization Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL); and
- International Health Regulations, 2005 (IHR).

(b) **SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/9** - Recognition of the Strategic Approach by the governing bodies of intergovernmental organizations. This document provides information on the formal recognition by the governing bodies of the seven participating organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC).<sup>4</sup>

(c) **SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/20** - Summary and commentary on submissions received from stakeholders in response to the questionnaire on Strategic Approach implementation. This document summarizes and comments on the answers to the questionnaire that were submitted by governments and organizations ahead of the second session of the Conference. Information is presented qualitatively and does not attempt to provide a quantitative picture from the submitted answers. As such, this document was mainly used for the general commentaries it provides on implementation of the Strategic Approach by governments and organizations.

(d) **SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/10** - Report by the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety on contributions to the implementation of the Strategic Approach.

(e) **SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/11** - Report by the World Health Organization. This document outlines the importance of the sound management of chemicals for the protection of human health, provides an update on the implementation of the Strategic Approach from a health-sector perspective since the adoption of the Strategic Approach and identifies further opportunities for action by the health-sector in this regard.

(f) **SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/3** - Report on activities of the InterOrganization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) and its participating and observer organizations in support of the implementation of the Strategic Approach. This document was examined to complement information in questionnaires submitted by participating organizations of the IOMC.

#### 4. Information from the secretariat of international organizations

26. Additional information on the status of ratification and implementation of international agreements and conventions was collected on the websites of some specific mechanisms to complement information available in document SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/1 (see above). These mechanisms include:

- (a) Organization for the prohibition of Chemical Weapons. (see: <http://www.opcw.org/about-opcw/member-states/status-of-participation-in-the-cwc/>)
- (b) United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (GHS) (see: [http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/implementation\\_e.html](http://www.unece.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/implementation_e.html))
- (c) Toxic Release Inventory Program, countries with PRTR (see <http://www.epa.gov/tri/programs/international/index.htm#h1>, (last updated 6 May 2009).

---

<sup>4</sup> The eight participating organizations of the IOMC are: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); International Labor Organization (ILO); United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); World Health Organization (WHO); World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The United Nations Development Programme is an observer organization in IOMC.

## 5. Baseline estimates reports prepared by specific stakeholders

27. In addition to the answers to the questionnaire prepared by the Strategic Approach secretariat, two organizations developed their own reports on the progress in implementing the Strategic Approach. These are:

(a) The International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), Baseline estimate report for the UN Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)<sup>5</sup>. Based on a new tool to correlate the results of the ICCA Responsible Care and Global Product Strategy initiatives with the 20 adopted indicators, the ICCA developed a report including information from 53 national chemical associations.

(b) Citizens' Report. Global Outreach Campaign on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), prepared by the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN), on behalf of six international non-governmental organization networks<sup>6</sup>. The Citizen's Report developed by IPEN on behalf of six international networks of non-governmental organizations describes the state of implementation of the Strategic Approach developing and transition countries from the perspectives of public interest groups and civil society organizations. The report presents information on activities undertaken by these organizations in contribution to implementation of the Strategic Approach. The approach followed in the report did not allow comparison with available information for other stakeholders and could not be used for this baseline. However, this document in itself provides valuable information on the contribution of non-governmental organizations to implementation of the Strategic Approach.

## D. Initial assessment of the available information

28. Future reporting on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach will be based on the answers provided by stakeholders to the on-line questionnaire and directly related to the 20 indicators. An initial assessment was therefore made to link information available for the baseline assessment with these indicators. Careful attention was paid to the comparability of information available for the various organizations, as well as the objectivity of the assessment.

29. It was only for two of the adopted indicators 10 and 11 that readily available information could be used unambiguously from the interim reporting questionnaires. Information provided in the interim reporting questionnaires proved difficult to use for other indicators for a number of reasons:

(a) The structure of the interim reporting questionnaires evolved over time and some questions were only included in later versions of the questionnaire. The questionnaires used for Governments and organizations differed in structure and content.

(b) Not all Governments and organizations reported each time they were requested to do so and therefore the type of information was not necessarily comparable within the same group of stakeholders.

(c) Questions in the interim reporting questionnaires were quite general and the level of detail provided in answers varied considerably, some answers provided a full list of activities, some only selected examples, some referred to attached documents of differing natures;

(d) In most cases, only the name of programmes and projects were provided with no detail on the specific activities undertaken. Linking these activities with the indicators was necessarily too subjective and partial to be interpreted as a reliable baseline on implementation of the Strategic Approach.

30. Additional sources of information such as official reports and websites helped completing the baseline estimate for four other indicators while secretariat records were used for information about the Quick Start Programme. Most of this additional information could only be reliably linked to the indicators in the case of Governments.

31. Consequently, the baseline estimates are presented separately for Governments, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations as the information on which they are based differs in a number of aspects. The construct of the baseline was in general more

---

<sup>5</sup> [http://www.icca-chem.org/ICCADocs/2010-06\\_ICCA\\_BaselineEstimateReport.pdf?epslanguage=en](http://www.icca-chem.org/ICCADocs/2010-06_ICCA_BaselineEstimateReport.pdf?epslanguage=en) (accessed 10 June 2012)

<sup>6</sup> [http://www.ipen.org/campaign/documents/education/citzreport\\_09.pdf](http://www.ipen.org/campaign/documents/education/citzreport_09.pdf) (accessed 10 June 2012)

problematic for intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations as some indicators were in their nature more directly relevant for Governments and their application to other organizations is subject to interpretation. Less other sources of comparable information were also available for these organizations.

## 1. Assessment of information from Governments

32. In the case of Governments, information could reliably be used to estimate a baseline for seven of the 20 indicators (numbers 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 17). Partial information was available for another ten indicators (numbers 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 20). No information was available for four indicators (numbers 1, 2, 7, and 18).

33. Despite a lack of completeness, this set of seven indicators can arguably be seen as relatively consistent as it includes activities that are fundamental as a basis to a national chemicals management system.

34. Available information was also analyzed by region and development status. While guidance accompanying the indicators adopted at the second session of the Conference included the recommendation to include an analysis of the stages of implementation, such an analysis could not be made because of the paucity of information in this regard.

## 2. Assessment of information from intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations

35. In the case of intergovernmental and non-governmental organization the questionnaires submitted to organizations prior to regional meetings (held between 2006 and 2008) were different to those utilized for Governments. In addition, some questions were addressed only to some groups of organizations limiting the amount of comparable information available.

36. As a result, only three indicators could reliably be linked with the available information (numbers 10, 11, and 17). In the case of inter-governmental organizations, information available for indicator 11 was incomplete. For the other 17 indicators, available information was not sufficient to draw any meaningful conclusions.

37. As the region and development status of non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations was not always possible to ascertain based on available information, such an analysis was not included in the baseline. Similarly, not enough information was available to reliably evaluate the stage of implementation of the activities of non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations.

## III. Estimating the number of Strategic Approach participants

38. Measuring progress in implementation of an international instrument first requires knowledge of the stakeholders to which the instrument applies. In effect, international instruments are developed by a certain number of participants who commit to undertake some specified actions in order to achieve an objective. Progress in implementation of the instrument is therefore measured inside of these boundaries.

39. Legally-binding conventions include a formal ratification procedure that signals the commitment to achieve the stated objectives, and at the same time defines the boundaries of the total population. As the Strategic Approach is a non-legally-binding international instrument, there is no formal ratification procedure signaling the commitment to participate, and no official list of 'Parties'. Participation in the sessions of the Conference is open to any Member State of the United Nations under some conditions<sup>7</sup>, and, similarly, to:

*“any accredited international non-governmental organization having activities, expertise and responsibilities consistent with the purpose and objectives of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management that has informed the secretariat in writing in accordance with rule 13 of its wish to be represented at sessions of the Conference and whose attendance is not objected to by one third or more of the governmental participants present when the Conference considers the request”<sup>8</sup>*

<sup>7</sup> These conditions are defined in the rules of procedure of the Conference adopted at ICCM2. See: SAICM/ICCM.2/15, *Report of the International Conference on Chemicals Management on the work of its second session*, Annex II/1: Rules of procedure of the International Conference on Chemicals Management.

<sup>8</sup> SAICM/ICCM.2/15, *Report of the International Conference on Chemicals Management on the work of its second session*, Annex II/1: Rules of procedure of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, p. 23.

40. In general, all participants have the same voice in the discussion<sup>9</sup>. This open, multi-stakeholders design underpins the Strategic Approach, but it also results in challenges for the identification of the stakeholders to which the Strategic Approach is relevant or who participate actively in its processes.

## A. Governments

### 1. Numbers of Government participants

41. Considering the rules for participation in the sessions of the Conference and in line with the open nature of the Strategic Approach, the number of Member States of the United Nations is considered the number of Government participants (194).

42. From another perspective there are a number of other measures of Government participation during 2006-2008 which are relevant.

#### (a) Participation in SAICM meetings

(i) 126 Governments were represented at the first session of the Conference and formally adopted the Strategic Approach.

(ii) 123 Governments were represented at the second session of the Conference and formally adopted the reporting modalities.

Responding governments by region			Total number of countries		Reports by region	
Region	Number countries	% Govs	Countries/region	% region	Number of reports	% reports
AFR	32	31.07	53	60.38	46	27.71
ASP	24	23.3	56	42.86	32	19.28
CEE	19	18.45	25	82.61	38	22.89
LAC	13	12.62	33	39.39	19	11.45
WEOG	15	14.56	29	51.72	31	18.67
Total	103	100	194	52.82	166	100

#### (b) Designation of a national focal point

A critical first step for participating in the Strategic Approach is the designation of a national focal point, as it provides a basis for communication with the secretariat. Based on the list of focal points kept by the Secretariat, 166 Governments had designated a national focal point as of 31 December 2008 (85.57 per cent of UN Member States).

#### (c) Submission of interim reporting questionnaires

A total of 166 interim reporting questionnaires from 103 Governments were submitted to the secretariat over the period 2006-2008 and were available for the work on the baseline estimate. More than half (53.09 per cent) of the UN Member States had submitted at least one completed questionnaire over this time. A list of those Governments submitting interim reporting questionnaires over the period 2006-2008 is contained in annex III.

### 2. Governments submissions by region

43. Under the Strategic Approach, Governments are organized in five regional groups. These are: Africa (AFR), Asia and Pacific (ASP), Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) and Western Europe and Others Group (WEOG)<sup>10</sup>.

44. The highest number of Governments submitting questionnaires came from the African region. Thirty-one per cent of African Governments submitted at least one questionnaire over 2006-

<sup>9</sup> This changes when decisions can't be made at consensus. In that case, decisions are made by a qualified majority of the Governments present and voting. Governments have also the possibility to exclude IGOs and NGOs from discussions on sensitive agenda items if accepted by a two-third majority of Governments "present and voting. SAICM/ICCM.2/15, *Report of the International Conference on Chemicals Management on the work of its second session*, Annex II/1: Rules of procedure of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, p. 23.

2008. However, looking at the proportion of responding countries within each region, the Central and Eastern European region submitted the highest number of reports (82.61 per cent). The lowest proportion of submissions was from the Latin America and Caribbean region (39.39 per cent).

### 3. Government submissions by development status

45. In general, 68.93 per cent of the Governments submitting questionnaires are categorized as developing countries<sup>11</sup>. Of those, least developed and low middle income countries represent 29.13 per cent and 20.39 per cent of those making submissions respectively. Other low income and upper middle income countries are relatively underrepresented with 6.80 per cent and 12.62 per cent of the total respectively.

Responding countries per Status of economic development		
Developing country	Number countries	% respondents
Least Developed Countries	30	29.13
Other Low Income Countries	7	6.80
Low Middle Income Countries	21	20.39
Upper Middle Income Countries	13	12.62
Total	71	36.60

46. Despite the relatively high proportion of responding countries of low income status, very few questionnaires from small island developing states were received. Only 20.0 per cent of small island developing states submitted questionnaires over the baseline period (7.77 per cent of the total respondents). In contrast, 61.3 per cent of non-small island developing states reported about their progress (92.23 per cent of the total respondents).

Responding SIDS			Total SIDS	
SIDS/ non-SIDS	Number countries	% countries	Total region	% region
SIDS	8	7.77	40	20.00
Non-SIDS	95	92.23	154	61.29
Total	103	100	194	52.82

## B. Non-governmental organizations

### 1. Number of non-governmental organization Strategic Approach participants

47. In general, the category 'non-governmental organizations' includes all organizations that are not officially recognized as a Governmental entity. A list of those non-governmental organizations submitting questionnaires over the period 2006-2008 is contained in annex III.

48. Beyond participation in sessions of the Conference, non-governmental organizations can participate in the Strategic Approach in a number of ways including participation in regional meetings, implementation of technical programmes and projects, and advocacy. There is no official directory of non-governmental organizations with interests in the area of sound chemicals management, although the Global Outreach Campaign conducted by the International POPs Elimination Network identifies more than 1000 relevant organizations in over 100 countries in this regard<sup>12</sup> and six international networks for non-governmental organizations. As is the case for Governments, the designation of a Strategic Approach focal point within a non-governmental organization is the primary mechanism for communication with the secretariat.

<sup>11</sup> According to the OECD Development Assistance Committee

<sup>12</sup> [www.ipen.org/campaign/documents/education/citzreport\\_09.pdf](http://www.ipen.org/campaign/documents/education/citzreport_09.pdf)

49. Non-government organizations can be further categorized as *civil society* and *private sector* organizations<sup>13</sup>. Similar to the networks described above by IPEN, private sector organizations are often associations of relevant companies and national associations. The International Council of Chemical Associations has reported in its baseline report<sup>14</sup> that there are 53 national associations of chemical companies who are members of ICCA. Some chemical companies would also be members of more than one association. Drawing a distinction between private and civil society associations is often difficult without further knowledge and research into the legal standing, membership and modes of operation of the organization. Categorizing the baseline estimates information results in terms of civil society and private sector organizations creates a very limited size group for the private sector organizations making results difficult to interpret in disaggregated form. A list of those non-governmental organizations submitting questionnaires over the period 2006-2008 is contained in annex III.

50. From the perspective of developing an understanding of the participation of non-governmental organizations in Strategic Approach institutions over 2006-2008:

- (a) 156 non-governmental organizations attended at least one Strategic Approach meeting, including 129 civil society and 27 private sector organizations;
- (b) 62 questionnaires were submitted from 44 non-governmental organizations (including 39 civil society and 5 private sector organizations).
- (c) 57 designated a focal point, 51 civil society and 6 private sector organizations.

51. The percentage of non-governmental organizations having an official Strategic Approach focal point is estimated as 36 per cent, using the number of non-governmental organizations participating in at least one Strategic Approach meeting as the denominator. However the designation of a focal point may not fully indicate the proportion of non-governmental organizations participating in the Strategic Approach. This could be due to a number of reasons including the fact a number of meeting participants may belong to one of a networks of umbrella non-governmental organizations.

52. The level of non-governmental organizations reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach can be calculated as 25 per cent taking the total of non-governmental organizations involved in Strategic Approach regional meetings during 2006 and 2008 as the basis.

## C. Intergovernmental organizations

### 1. Numbers of intergovernmental organization Strategic Approach participants

53. Broadly, the term 'intergovernmental organization' includes all those organizations established by a group of Governments and which the main official decision-making body gathers representatives of the participating Governments.

54. Estimating the number of inter-governmental organization participants in the Strategic Approach is also somewhat challenging. This category includes various types of organizations with different mandates at the regional and global levels (i.e. UN agencies, Bretton Woods institutions, regional integration organizations, etc.). As for non-governmental organizations there is no official list of all existing inter-governmental organizations working in the field of sound chemicals management.

55. From the perspective of developing an understanding of the participation of intergovernmental organizations in the Strategic Approach over 2006-2008:

- (a) 31 inter-governmental organizations attended at least one Strategic Approach meeting;
- (b) 15 submitted at least one reporting questionnaire (45 questionnaires in total); and
- (c) 13 designated an official focal point.

56. Many of the inter-governmental organizations submitted more than one written report on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach over 2006-2008, the average number being

<sup>13</sup> These categories include both organizations and federations/networks of organizations. The figures included in this report do therefore not necessarily reveal the full range of non-governmental organizations in the Strategic Approach.

<sup>14</sup> The International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), *Baseline estimate report for the UN Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)*, available at: [http://www.icca-chem.org/ICCADocs/2010-06\\_ICCA\\_BaselineEstimateReport.pdf](http://www.icca-chem.org/ICCADocs/2010-06_ICCA_BaselineEstimateReport.pdf)

three reports. Seven of the 15 organizations that submitted reports were participating organizations of the IOMC. These organizations were also represented in most if not all Strategic Approach meetings.

57. Thirteen (41.9 per cent) of intergovernmental organizations participating in Strategic Approach meetings had nominated an official focal point over 2006-2008. The percentage of intergovernmental organizations submitting a report on progress can be calculated as 48 per cent using the number of organizations participating in Strategic Approach meetings as the denominator. A listing of the intergovernmental organizations submitting interim reporting questionnaires is contained in annex III.

## IV. Baseline results for SAICM indicators

### A. Baseline results for Governments

58. This section presents the quantitative results of the baseline estimate for Governments. The results are structured by indicator, and include: i) a general picture of the indicator, and ii) a disaggregated view of the results by region and development status. Due to lack of comparable data, only seven of the 20 indicators could be assessed quantitatively.

59. As different sources of information were used for quantifying estimates, the same denominator could not be used for all seven indicators. When the submitted questionnaires were used as a source of information, the denominator is the total number of respondents. When other publicly available sources of information were used the total number of UN Member States is used as the denominator. The number of eligible countries was used for indicator 17 on the Quick Start programme of the Strategic Approach.

#### **Indicator 6: Number of countries providing information according to internationally harmonized standards**

60. For this indicator, sufficient information was not available from the questionnaires submitted by Governments. While not the only internationally harmonized labeling system<sup>15</sup>, the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) is one of the most comprehensive tools in this area.

<b>Number of Governments implementing the GHS</b>		
	Number	% UN Members
Yes	65	33.33
No	129	66.67
Total	194	100

61. Using information previously presented to the second session of the Conference<sup>16</sup> it is estimated that approximately one third of Governments were in the process of adoption of the GHS at the end of 2008. However, it should be noted that this includes different levels, as many of the activities addressing implementation are specific for different categories of chemicals for example, pesticides, workplace or occupational health and safety risks. Additional information available on the website of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe<sup>17</sup> shows more detailed information in this regard.

62. The geographical distribution of UN Member States in the process of adoption of the GHS at the end of 2008 shows that the Western Europe and Others Group is the region with the highest proportion of countries addressing implementation of the GHS. This was the case for 82.76 per cent of countries of this region, compared to only 13.21 per cent of the African region.

63. It appears from the proportion of countries of each development group the higher the income, the more countries have implemented GHS. A growing number of developing countries might be expected to show increased activities in relation to GHS implementation in the coming years.

<sup>15</sup> The WHO Recommended Classification of Pesticides by Hazard is recommended in the FAO International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides is also a widely recognized tool for classification of pesticides. Not entirely compatible with the GHS, it is now being harmonized with this newer, more comprehensive instrument.

<sup>16</sup> SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/1

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.unecp.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/implementation\\_e.html](http://www.unecp.org/trans/danger/publi/ghs/implementation_e.html)

Governments implementing GHS in different developmental groups		
Dev status	Number	% dev status
Least Developed Countries	6	12.24
Other Low Income Countries	2	16.67
Lower Middle Income Countries	11	24.44
Upper Middle Income Countries	18	46.15
Total	37	19.09

Governments implementing GHS by regional group		
Region	Number	% region
Africa	7	13.21
Asia Pacific	13	23.64
Latin America and the Caribbean	8	32
Central and Eastern Europe	13	39.39
Western Europe and Others Group	24	82.76
Total	65	33.33

#### **Indicator 9: Websites providing publicly available information**

64. As sufficient information was not available from the questionnaires to quantify a baseline for this indicator, the number of countries having an operational PRTR as reported in the US EPA website was used as a proxy.<sup>18</sup>

65. By the beginning of 2009, 31 PRTRs were operational (15.98 per cent of UN Member States).

66. Looking at the regional breakdown, it appears that countries from the Western Europe and Others Group have the largest number of operational PRTR systems (72.41 per cent of the countries), followed by the Central and Eastern European countries (39.13 per cent of countries). This result is largely consistent with countries adopting the PRTR protocol to the UN Economic Commission for Europe Aarhus Convention. No country from the African and Asia-Pacific regions is reported as having an operational PRTR as of 2009. Only one of the countries with an operational PRTR is classified as a developing country.

#### **Indicator 10: Number of countries that have committed themselves to implementation of the Strategic Approach**

67. Expressing a commitment to implement the Strategic Approach may take a number of forms. In addition to the designation of an official focal point these might include ministerial statements, resolutions, and development of a national Strategic Approach implementation plan. For this baseline, readily available information allowed only an assessment of the number of nominated focal points, and the development of national Strategic Approach implementation plans.

Governments with SAICM Implementation Plan		
	Number	% respondents
Yes	14	13.59
No	89	86.41
Total	103	100

68. Among all Member States of the United Nations, 164 had designated a national Strategic Approach focal point (85.57 per cent), indicating a high baseline level of activity.

69. Information for quantifying the development of a Strategic Approach implementation plan was extracted from the interim reporting questionnaires. The estimate for this indicator therefore uses the number of responding Governments as the denominator.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/tri/programs/international/index.htm#h1.last>



70. The proportion of Governments that reported having finished developing their Strategic Approach implementation plans is 13.59 per cent. Even though it does not capture the entire spectrum of forms for expressing commitment, evolution of the trends in development of implementation plans will be a useful part of future monitoring arrangements.

**Indicator 11: Number of countries with multi-stakeholders coordinating mechanism**

71. Two questions in the questionnaires addressed multi-stakeholder mechanisms by Governments. The first one was related to the establishment of inter-sectoral committees with an indication of the sectors involved. The second question asked whether a planning meeting of national stakeholders had been convened<sup>19</sup>.

Governments holding planning meeting for chemicals safety			Governments with Multi-stakeholders mechanism		
	Number	% Respondents		Number	% Respondents
Yes	80	77.67	Yes	80	77.66
No	23	22.33	No	22	22.33
Total	103	100	Total	103	100

72. The majority of respondents reported having established a multi-stakeholder mechanism (77.66 percent). These mechanisms appear to take various forms and include diverse groups of stakeholders. While some gather representatives from government bodies, others are reported to include non-governmental stakeholders such as private sector groups, civil society organizations, universities and research institutions, etc. The levels, mandates and powers of the committees can also vary significantly.

Number of sectors engaged in multi-stakeholder mechanisms					
	1-4 sectors	5-8 sectors	>8 sectors	N/A	Total
Number	5	23	23	29	80
% mechanisms	6.25	28.75	28.75	36.25	100

73. Similarly a significant majority of responding Governments indicated having convened at least one planning meeting of national stakeholders (77.67 per cent) in the baseline period.

74. Few multi-stakeholders mechanisms were reported to include less than five sectors (6.25 per cent of responding Governments). However, 36.25 per cent of the responding Governments did not provide any detail on the composition of the committee. When reported, the sectors involved most frequently included agriculture, environment, health, trade/industry, foreign affairs, finance/economy, labour, sciences/ education/academia, transport, customs, non-governmental organizations, private sector, and focal points of multi-lateral environment agreements.

**Indicator 12: Number of countries with mechanisms to implement key international chemicals priorities**

75. For assessment of this indicator, information on the adoption of the seven key chemicals management international instruments reported in SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/1 was reviewed<sup>20</sup>. In addition,

<sup>19</sup> This question could have been related to indicator 14 on the identification and prioritization of capacity-building needs. However, guidance accompanying the indicator specified to focus on publicly available plans.

<sup>20</sup> The group includes: Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (BC), the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade (RC), the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (SC), the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of the Vienna Convention

the website of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons was also consulted adding an eight instrument, the Chemicals Weapon Convention to the list. For legally-binding conventions, the number of ratifications was recorded, while for the others available information on implementation was included.

Adoption of 8 key international instruments for chemicals						
	0	1-2	3-4	5-6	7-8	Total
Number	1	3	20	72	98	194
%	0.51	1.54	10.26	36.92	50.77	100

76. Overall, half of the UN Member States were identified as adopting 7-8 international instruments over 2006-2008 indicating a very high level of baseline activity. Only one Government had not adopted any instrument. It has to be remembered however, that such estimates do not capture progress in the achievement of the objectives of the instrument themselves.

**Indicator 14: Number of countries that have identified and prioritized their capacity-building needs for the sound management of chemicals**

77. The number of countries that have identified and prioritized their capacity-building needs could not be assessed based on the information contained in the interim reporting questionnaires. The guidance accompanying indicator 14 specifies that data collection should focus on plans that are publicly available. Therefore, information on the development of the UNITAR National Chemicals Management Profile and of a Stockholm Convention NIP from the document SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/1 was used as a proxy.

Number of countries with specified plans for identification and prioritization of needs		
	Number UN Members	% UN Members
SC NIP	87	44.85
NCMP	102	52.58
No	5	2.58
Total	194	100

78. About half of UN Member States (52.58 per cent) were reported as having developed a National Chemicals Management Profile by 2009. Only slightly fewer countries had developed a Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plan (44.85 per cent). While these numbers are impressive it should be noted that many of these profiles and national implementation plans might have been developed prior to 2006 as they were largely part of initiatives that took place in late 1990s and early 2000s following the publication in 1996 of guidance for their development.<sup>21</sup> The development of these plans was also a significant part of enabling activities sponsored under the Stockholm Convention. It may be of interest in future years to monitor the updating and use of these plans or their integration with other planning tools for improving the sound management of chemicals.

Number of specified plans per regional group					
	NCMP		SC NIP		
		% region		% region	
AFR	31	58.49	28	52.83	
ASP	26	46.43	18	32.14	
CEE	14	60.87	12	52.17	
LAC	20	60.61	11	33.33	
WEOG	11	37.93	18	62.07	
Total	102	52.58	87	44.85	

on the Protection of the Ozone Layer, International Labour Organization Convention 170 on Safety in the Use of Chemicals at Work (ILO C.170), International Maritime Organization Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), the International Health Regulations, and the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) from the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

<sup>21</sup> <http://www2.unitar.org/cwm/nphomepage/index.html>

79. The proportion of countries having developed a National Chemicals Management Plan by is skewed towards the African and Latin America and Caribbean and Central and Eastern European regions. In many of these instances specific funding and bilateral arrangements supported work in these countries. Many countries in the Western Europe and Others Group were engaged in other activities to document the chemicals in use and prioritize their chemicals management priorities and so do not feature greatly in the baseline estimates.

**Indicator 17: Number of countries with projects supported by the Strategic Approach's Quick Start Programme (QSP) Trust Fund**

80. Information collected by the secretariat as part of their administration of the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund was used for this indicator. In line with the objective of the fund to support the implementation of initial activities in developing countries, 147 countries are eligible for QSP projects and hence this number was used as the denominator for this baseline measure.

81. The period covered by this report (2006-2008) included the first five rounds of QSP projects. A little under half of the eligible Governments (46.94 per cent) had at least one QSP project approved over 2006-2008. These projects totaled US\$83. 13,518,402 (US\$ 182,681 per project on The highest number of countries that had QSP projects awarded over this period are from the Latin America and Caribbean region (63.64 per cent) . Following this are countries from the African region (49.06 per cent, Asia and Pacific (30.36 per cent) and finally Central and Eastern Europe (21.74 per cent). Countries from the African region received the highest total funding overall (US\$ 5,045,896).

Governments with approved QSP projects in rounds I-V		
	Number of countries	% eligible countries
Yes	69	46.94
No	78	53.06
Total	147	100

Approved QSP projects (rounds I-V) by region			
	Number countries	% region	Funding (US\$)
Africa	26	49.06	5'045'896
Asia Pacific	17	30.36	3'189'351
Central Eastern Europe	5	21.74	1'116'684
Latin America and the Caribbean	21	63.64	4'166'470
Total	69	35.57	13'518'401

82. Countries from the category "Other low income countries" had the highest proportion of projects (58.33 per cent of the total number of countries in the category), followed by "Least developed countries" (51.02 per cent), and low middle income countries (48.89 per cent) . Thirty-three per cent of countries from the "Upper middle category" were awarded QSP projects during 2006-2008.

## **B. Baseline results for non-governmental organizations**

83 Due to the limited information available, only three indicators could be assessed quantitatively for non-governmental organizations (indicators 10, 11, and 7). The results are presented separately for civil society and private sector organizations. One of the main challenges in analyzing the civil society and private sector participation in Strategic Approach implementation is the unclear representation status of some of these in the reporting system. Not only is it difficult to distinguish between the legal status of the groups but as discussed earlier several of these groups represent groups of organizations. In addition, the range of information provided was quite variable and difficult to compare.

84. Another significant challenge for assessment of civil society and private sector non-governmental organizations is that that the formulation of some indicators are more directly relevant for Governments, while applying them for civil society and private sector organizations is open to interpretation.

### **1. Civil society organizations**

**Indicator 10: Number of organizations that have committed themselves to implementation of the Strategic Approach**

85. For the approximation of a baseline estimate for this indicator comparable information for the designation of a focal point and on the development of a Strategic Approach implementation plan was available.

<b>Civil Society organizations with SAICM implementation plan</b>		
	Number	%
Yes	26	66.67
No	11	28.21
NA	2	5.13
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>

86. In total, 51 civil society organizations had designated a focal point over 2006-2008 as recorded by the secretariat. In the absence of any data in on the total number of civil society organizations engaged in the sound management of chemicals it may be estimated that this figure represents a baseline estimate of 40 per cent when compared to the number of civil society organizations participating in Strategic Approach meetings over this period, slightly higher than when considered in combination with private sector organizations.

87. Thirty-nine civil society organizations reported on Strategic Approach implementation activities using the interim questionnaires ahead of Strategic Approach regional meetings. With regard to the development of a SAICM implementation plan, 26 (67 per cent) of the responding civil society organizations had started the development of such a plan over 2006-2008. Eleven indicated that they had not started such a plan (28 per cent of responding civil society organizations), while two did not answer this question (five per cent of the responding civil society organizations).

**Indicator 11: Number of organizations with multi-stakeholders coordinating mechanism**

88. Approximation of this indicator for non-government organizations is made more difficult by the fact that its formulation can be open to mixed interpretation.

89. The development of multi-stakeholder mechanisms for participatory decision-making is usually interpreted as something addressed by Governments entities, as it generally relates to national planning of policies for the sound management of chemicals. In addition, various types of non-governmental organizations are found which have a diversity of different activities at local, national, (sub) regional and global levels. Some are very small organizations with few resources, while some are rather important organizations or networks of organizations. Some undertake activities specifically at strengthening multi-stakeholders participation.

90. For the purposes of estimating a baseline data available was used from respondents to the interim reporting questionnaire which estimated approximately 49 percent of civil society respondents had participated in at least one national planning meeting.

<b>Civil Society participation in planning meeting of national stakeholders</b>		
	Number	%
Yes	19	48.72
No	14	35.90
NA	6	15.38
<b>Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100</b>

**Indicator 17: Number of civil society organizations with projects supported by the Strategic Approach's QSP Trust Fund**

91. Information collected by the secretariat as part of their administration of the Strategic Approach QSP Trust Fund was used for this indicator. The collection of information focused on projects where civil society organizations were the project applicant. The data does not provide any quantification of the participation by non-governmental organizations, including those from civil society, in the implementation of QSP projects. This participation is known to be widespread and effective.

Number and value of civil society QSP projects (rounds I-V)			
Number	% projects	US \$	% US \$
7	7.07	1'149'049	8.43

## 2. Private sector organizations

92. Five private sector organizations reported on implementation activities at least one occasion during 2006-2008. While this number may appear small, it can be seen that the organizations involved are typically very large organizations made up of many member companies and associations. For example the ICCA which comprises 53 national member associations.

Private sector organizations with SAICM implementation plan			Private sector participation in national stakeholder meetings		
	Number	%		Number	%
Yes	4	80.00	Yes	4	80.00
No	0	0.00	No	1	20.00
NA	1	20.00	NA	0	0.00
Total	5	100	Total	5	100

93. Twenty-six private sector organizations participated in Strategic Approach meetings. A number of these would also have been members of international associations. Over 2006-2008, six private sector organizations had nominated a Strategic Approach focal point, 23 per cent of those participating in Strategic Approach meetings. .

94. All but one of the six organizations with official focal points submitted written reports of the activities undertaken to implement the Strategic Approach over the baseline reporting period. In these reports, four of the five responding private sector organizations reported having established an implementation plan.

95. In relation to indicator 11, four of the five responding private sector organizations have participated in a planning meeting of national stakeholders.

96. In addition to reporting using the secretariats interim reporting questionnaires, ICCA also prepared a preliminary baseline estimates report aligning the 20 adopted indicators with existing reporting mechanisms utilized as part of its Responsible Care Global Charter and Global Product Strategy initiatives. Summarising the results of this work ICCA reported on activities contributing to implementation of the Strategic Approach in member associations in Western Europe and Others Group, Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America and Caribbean and Asia-Pacific and the level of completed activities, those being updated, those in-development and those where no progress could be reported. Such information could be form a useful part of a complementary report, particularly if subject to periodic reporting over subsequent years.

## C Baseline for inter-governmental organizations

**Indicator 10: Number of organizations that have committed themselves to implementation of the Strategic Approach**

97. Thirteen intergovernmental organizations (42 per cent) had nominated a Strategic Approach focal point over the period 2006-2008 including all but one of the participating organizations of the IOMC. As discussed earlier a larger group of 31 inter-governmental organizations participated in Strategic Approach regional meetings and 15 inter-governmental organizations provided a written report on their implementation activities. Eight organizations indicated having started the development of an implementation plan, while four answered that they had not started such a process and three did not provide any answer.

<b>Intergovernmental organizations with SAICM implementation plan</b>	
	Number
Yes	8
No	4
NA	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>

98. Significantly and in addition many intergovernmental organizations, particularly the participating organizations of the IOMC have expressed their commitments to the Strategic Approach through bringing information on their implementation actions to the attention of governing bodies (document SAICM/ICCM.2/INF/9 provides additional information). The wealth of information provided by inter-governmental organizations in their reports provided to the secretariat demonstrated a high level of activities, particularly by the participating organizations of the IOMC.

99. The relatively large number of intergovernmental bodies and groups participating in the Strategic Approach meetings but not nominating an official focal point might be explained by a lack of clarification in reporting arrangements, for example several appear to represent secretariats of conventions and other multilateral mechanisms with a number represented formally by UNEP. This may however illustrate an area where improved communication on activities that might contribute to Strategic Approach implementation could take place in the future and this could be facilitated by formal nomination of a focal point.

**Indicator 11: Number of organizations with multi-stakeholders coordinating mechanism**

<b>Intergovernmental organizations participation in meetings of national stakeholders</b>	
	Number
Yes	5
No	0
NA	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>

100. A high proportion (2/3) of intergovernmental organizations responded that the question about multi-stakeholder coordinating committee was not relevant to their situations. Noteworthy in this regard is the operation of the IOMC which is itself a mechanism for coordination among those intergovernmental organizations working in the UN system.

**Indicator 17: Number of organizations with projects supported by the Strategic Approach's Quick Start Programme Trust Fund**

101. While inter-governmental organizations can participate in QSP projects as executing agencies, this was not quantified as it was not considered to be part of the indicator.

## **V. Conclusions and discussion**

### **A. Measures of progress**

102. The purpose of a baseline is to develop a measurement against which progress over time can be compared. The paucity of comparable readily available information did not allow the establishment of such a baseline measure for all 20 indicators, but nevertheless for the first time the present report has succeeded in estimating a baseline for seven of the 20 adopted indicators.

103. In addition important information is provided on the level of participation in the Strategic Approach through reporting on progress in participation in meetings and nominating Strategic Approach focal points.

104. Paragraph 22 of the Overarching Policy Strategy mentions that implementation of the Strategic Approach could start with an initial planning phase to build capacity for sound management of chemicals. These activities are also the focus of the Quick Start Programme. As stated in its founding resolution (I/4), the goal of the fund is to “support initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities in developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing states and countries with economies in transition.”

105. Therefore, progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach is first measured by the establishment or strengthening of a coherent and coordinated planning process in order to ensure efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the activities. This involves measures such as: the development of a plan or strategy for sound chemicals management and the strengthening of cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder coordination.

106. In line with the strategic value of the Strategic Approach, the present report can be seen as providing a baseline on implementation of the Strategic Approach consistent with the above focus on initial steps towards the achievement of the sound management of chemicals, as stated in paragraph 22 of the Overarching Policy Strategy.

### **B. Baseline estimate findings**

107. The amount of available information considered in preparing the baseline report was considerable. Over the period 2006–2009, a total of 166 reports and questionnaires were submitted by 103 Governments, together with 42 reports and questionnaires by 15 intergovernmental organizations and 62 reports and questionnaires by 44 non-governmental organizations.

108. The main challenge of this present exercise lay in translating the information provided in the qualitative reports submitted to the secretariat into data that could be used to populate the 20 indicators adopted. The information was diverse and rich in qualitative detail. Reducing it to a “yes” or “no” answer for quantitative purposes proved to be a subjective task. The information tended to emphasize new activities in the reporting period, with less emphasis laid on the status of preexisting work.

109. Overall, comparable information that was available for this assessment did not allow the development of a comprehensive baseline for all of the 20 indicators adopted at ICCM2 for reporting on progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach and baseline estimates were only possible for seven of the 20 adopted indicators. Annex IV provides a summary of this information.

110. In general, the baseline results for Governments with regard to these seven indicators provide a high estimate of baseline activity, particularly the level of official Strategic Approach focal points, the establishment of inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholders mechanisms, and the implementation of international priorities. These results however would need to be tempered by the fact that 2006-2008 in fact reflects the first three years of implementation of the Strategic Approach and not therefore a true “baseline” before the adoption of the Strategic Approach. Particularly noteworthy are the high baseline estimates for the number of official Strategic Approach focal points in Governments, established of inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholders mechanisms, and the implementation of international priorities.

111. Far less conclusive elements could be extracted from available information on non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations contribution to implementation of the Strategic Approach.

112. In addition to the lack of readily available information on the adopted indicators, two other factors are considered critical. The first is that the number and nature of non-governmental organizations engaged in implementation of the Strategic Approach is very diverse and includes organizations with various mandates, capacities and roles in implementation of the Strategic

Approach. The number of organizations participating in Strategic Approach meetings is used as a conservative proxy for estimating the target number of non-government organizations. It is not known whether this is a sound basis for future reporting work.

113. The second factor is that the indicators adopted at the second session of the Conference for measuring progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach seem more targeted to the Governments than for non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations. However the level of reporting from these groups and the total data available does not allow definitive conclusions in this regard. The tailoring of the information collected by organizations in their own baseline estimate report might be considered further in developing indicators and providing supplementary information.

### **C. Considerations for future reporting**

114. In light of the results, the following considerations can be made for future reporting on progress.

115. The definition of a baseline for each of the 20 indicators is not completely possible from readily available information using the approach of the present report. For the majority of the indicators more reliable quantitative information will be obtained from the first progress report. Bearing in mind that several of the baseline results that this report has obtained provide indicate a high-level of activity a further refinement of the indicator may be useful in future reporting work. In this area it is understood that the first progress report will collect information on a range of activities for each indicator, providing a more sustainable reporting approach should one activity be completed early.

116. Clarifying the total number of organizations participating in the Strategic Approach could assist measuring progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach. In addition, knowledge of the potential Strategic Approach participants would be useful for both assessing and increasing implementation efforts.

117. As currently formulated, some indicators are more relevant for Governments than for other stakeholders. The wide array of activities that can be undertaken towards implementation of the Strategic Approach and the resulting diversity of organizations involved might justify tailoring the set of indicators to the different stakeholders e.g. civil society and private sector organizations, academia, the full range of intergovernmental organizations. This would facilitate stakeholders' reporting as well as interpretation of information for assessing progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach.

118. Clarifying the reporting status of umbrella organizations might also help improving the assessment of progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach. This would also clarify how to report for some organizations that are part of networks or federations.



## Annex I

### Indicators for reporting by stakeholders on progress in the implementation of the Strategic Approach<sup>22</sup>

The following 20 indicators were adopted by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its second session, in May 2009, along with guidance on the type of data to be collected from stakeholders. They are reproduced here from annex III of the report of that session, without the guidance.

#### A. Risk reduction

1. Number of countries (and organizations) implementing agreed chemicals management tools.
2. Number of countries (and organizations) with mechanisms to address key categories of chemicals.
3. Number of countries (and organizations) with hazardous waste management arrangements.
4. Number of countries (and organizations) engaged in activities that result in monitoring data on selected environmental and human health priority substances.
5. Number of countries (and organizations) having mechanisms in place for setting priorities for risk reduction.

#### B. Knowledge and information

6. Number of countries (and organizations) providing information according to internationally harmonized standards.
7. Number of countries (and organizations) that have specific strategies in place for communicating information on the risks associated with chemicals to vulnerable groups.
8. Number of countries (and organizations) with research programmes.
9. Number of countries (and organizations) with websites that provide information to stakeholders.

#### C. Governance

10. Number of countries (and organizations) that have committed themselves to implementation of the Strategic Approach.
11. Number of countries (and organizations) with multi-stakeholder coordinating mechanism.
12. Number of countries (and organizations) with mechanisms to implement key international chemicals priorities.

#### D. Capacity-building and technical cooperation

13. Number of countries (and organizations) providing resources (financial and in kind) to assist capacity-building and technical cooperation with other countries.
14. Number of countries (and organizations) that have identified and prioritized their capacity-building needs for the sound management of chemicals.
15. Number of countries (and organizations) engaged in regional cooperation on issues relating to the sound management of chemicals.
16. Number of countries where development assistance programmes that include the sound management of chemicals.
17. Number of countries (and organizations) with projects supported by the Strategic Approach's Quick Start Programme Trust Fund.
18. Number of countries (and organizations) with sound management of chemicals projects supported by other sources of funding (not Quick Start Programme funding).

<sup>22</sup> Extracted from the Report of the International Conference on Chemicals Management on the work of its second session SAICM/ICCM.2/15

**E. Illegal international traffic**

19. Number of countries having mechanisms to prevent illegal traffic in toxic, hazardous and severely restricted chemicals individually.
20. Number of countries having mechanisms to prevent illegal traffic in hazardous waste.

## Annex II

### Reporting questionnaire

An example of one of the interim reporting questionnaires used over the 2006-2008 intersessional period of the International Conference on Chemicals Management

24 June 2008

<b>Questionnaire for organizations on SAICM implementation for the information of the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its second session</b>		Please return by 30 November 2008 to:	
		SAICM secretariat 11-13 chemin des Anémones CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 86 31 Fax: +41 22 797 34 60 E-mail: saicm@chemicals.unep.ch	
Organization:		Person submitting this questionnaire: Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms. <input type="checkbox"/>	
Address:		Is this person the SAICM national focal point? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Functional Title:	
Phone:		Department / Section:	
		Email:	
Fax:			

*Please answer the following questions. If the space is insufficient, respondents are welcome to attach additional information.*

<p><b>1. Coordination arrangements</b></p> <p>a) Has a SAICM Focal Point been nominated? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b) In the case of large organizations, have inter-divisional coordination arrangements been put in place? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>c) If yes, please describe (e.g. composition of a coordinating committee or working group):</p>
<p><b>2. Initial planning</b></p> <p>a) Has a planning meeting or meetings of stakeholders within your organization or constituency been convened? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>b) If yes, please elaborate (e.g. describe the nature of the meeting(s) and indicate which stakeholders participated):</p> <p>c) Has work commenced on preparing a SAICM implementation plan for your organization? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>d) If yes, please elaborate (e.g. indicate the timeframe for preparing the plan and note its relationship, if any, to previous plans; describe the outcomes of any capacity needs assessment and prioritization exercises undertaken):</p>

**3. Assessment of progress**

a) Indicate, below, each of the five categories of objectives set out in the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy in which new and/or extended programmes, projects or activities been undertaken by your organization as part of SAICM implementation:

(i)  Risk reduction. Describe:

(ii)  Knowledge and information. Describe:

(iii)  Governance. Describe:

(iv)  Capacity-building and technical cooperation. Describe:

(v)  Illegal international traffic. Describe:

b) If desired, please attach a breakdown of new and/or extended programmes, projects and activities in relation to the 36 work areas set out in the SAICM Global Plan of Action.

24 June 2008

Other comments on SAICM implementation:

Signature: <b>X</b>	Date:
------------------------	-------

## Annex III

### List of Governments and organizations submitting initial reporting questionnaires over the period 2006-2008

#### Governments

The following 103 Governments submitted interim reporting questionnaires on at least one occasion over the period 2006-2008: Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, Chile, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Japan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Moldova, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Republic of Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, São Tomé and Príncipe, Senegal, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, St Vincent and Grenadines, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Togo, Thailand, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Yemen, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

#### Intergovernmental organizations

The following 14 intergovernmental organizations submitted interim reporting questionnaires on at least one occasion over the period 2006-2008: Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Chemical Dialogue; Basel Convention Regional Coordinating Centre for South-East Asia; Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA); Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO); Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS); Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); Organization of American States (OAS); Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production- Mediterranean Action Plan; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR); World Bank Group (WB); and World Health Organization (WHO).

#### Non-governmental organizations

##### Civil society

The following 39 civil society non-governmental organizations submitted initial reporting questionnaires on at least one occasion over 2006-2008: Armenian Women For Health & Healthy Environment (AWHE), Associated Labor Unions-Trade Union Congress Of The Philippines (ALU-TUCP), Association For Sustainable Human Development, Association Pour la Valorisation de l'Environnement et pour la Promotion d'une Gestion Rationnelle des Produits Chimiques (AVEPRC), Bangladesh Occupational Safety, Health and Environment Foundation (OSHE), Capetown University, Occupational and Environmental Health Research Unit, COLNODO Red de Desarrollo Sostenible, Community Development Association, Day Hospital Institute for Rehabilitation & Development (DHIRD), Ecological Restorations, ECOTOX Environment and Health NGO, Environmental Group FRI, Federacion Internacional de Sindicatos de Trabajadores de la Quimica, Energia, Minas e Industrias Diversas - ICEM America Latina Y Caribe, Golan Environment and Heritage Association (GEHA), Information Technology Common Initiative Group (Environmental Friendly Mechanical Workshop) Bamenda Cameroon (ITCIG), Informer, Sensibiliser et Eduquer sur les Pops (ISE-POP-CI), International Federation of Chemical, Energy, Mines and General Workers' Union (ICEM), International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC), JEA - The Ecological Youth Of Angola, Kenya Chemicals and Waste Management Network (KECAWMN), Les Amis de La Terre-Togo, Morocco Cleaner Production Centre (CMPP), National Cleaner Production Centre: Kenya, National Cleaner Production Centre: Zimbabwe, Occupational and Environmental Health Research Unit, Pesticide Action Network (PAN) International, Research And Education Centre For Development (CREPD), Safe Water African Community Initiatives, SLOVAKIA - Slovak Environmental Agency, Society Of Environmental Toxicology And Chemistry (SETAC), South African Chemical Workers Union, Suez Canal University, Sustainable Development Policy Institute (SDPI), Tanzanian Agricultural Workers Union, Union for the Defense of the Aral Sea and Amudarya, University Of Nairobi, Women in Europe for a Common Future (WECF), WWF(World Wide Fund For Nature), WWF Japan.

**Private sector organizations**

The following five private sector non-governmental organizations submitted initial reporting questionnaires on at least one occasion over 2006-2008: Organizations: Asociacion de Directivos y Técnicos Profesionales de la Industria del Petroleo "ADECO", Chemicals and Allied' Industries Association (CAIA), Croplife International, International Chamber of Commerce, and International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA).

## Summary of estimates for seven of the twenty adopted indicators for monitoring progress in SAICM implementation

### Baseline estimates (2006-2008)

SAICM Objective	Indicator	Short indicator name	Baseline estimates			Comments	Source
			GOV	IGO	NGO		
Knowledge & Information	6	Provision of information to internationally harmonized standards	33%			GHS	ICCM2 doc
	9	Websites providing information on chemicals	16%			PRTR	Website
Governance	10	Commitment to implement SAICM	14%	53%	67%	SAICM Implementation Plan	Questionnaire
		Official focal point	86%	42%	36% <sup>23</sup>	Official focal point. NGO & IGO denominator number of orgs participating in meetings	
	11	Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanism	78%		49%		Questionnaire
	12	Implementation of international priorities	51%			7-8 specified instruments	ICCM2 doc
Capacity-building & technical cooperation	14	Priority-setting for capacity-building needs	49%			Average of NIPs and SC NIP	ICCM2 doc
	17	Capacity-building supported by the Quick Start Programme	47%				QSP Eligibility

<sup>23</sup> For civil society organizations the figure is 40 per cent and for private sector organizations the figure is 26 per cent.