

23 July 2019

EU/MS comments to the draft paper *Other mechanisms to support implementation* prepared for IP-3 by the co-chairs

The EU and its Member States thank the co-chairs for their work in drafting the papers, which provide a good basis for discussions at IP3 in Bangkok. In general, we are supportive of the ideas and proposals presented in the paper. Considering the different types of texts included in the paper (ie. proposed text, considerations, lessons learnt, annexes), it would be useful to know how these various elements will be dealt with and how the relevant parts would get a formal status for negotiations in Bangkok. Please see below our comments to the text.

Other mechanisms to support implementation

Mandate from OEWG3: Request that the Co-Chairs, with support of the SAICM Secretariat, and in consultation with the Bureau, undertake further work on other mechanisms to support implementation.

In responding the request, the co-chairs have undertaken a review of appropriate and effective mechanisms for taking stock of progress; mechanisms for capacity-building; and a mechanism for updating the instrument over time as identified in SAICM/OEWG3.3/4.¹

Part a) Mechanisms for Taking Stock of Progress

Desired outcome:

- Ability to measure progress being made toward the objectives and targets.
- Ability to use the reports to inform national, regional and international activities, future updates to milestones and targets, as well as evaluation processes for any changes to the [SAICM]programme of work and / or future review of the agreement.

Proposed Text:

Institutional arrangements for taking stock of progress on the [sound management of chemicals and waste](#) will include, a periodic review process facilitated by the secretariat.

Stakeholders should make available data and information that allows for a review of progress toward achieving the overall vision and the objectives and targets.

¹ Additional measures to achieve multisectoral engagement is included in a separate document as it was a separate request of OEWG3.

Commented [NL1]: Overall supportive as reviewing progress regularly is important and measuring progress against objectives and targets should be done. This is a key element, laying out what progress reporting should focus on.

We should try to use existing reporting mechanisms where possible without being exclusively driven by this.

The other sections/parts in the papers do not have the same structure of "desired outcome".

Commented [NL2]: Overall supportive of the elements presented. The text is not fully operational and would benefit from being more precise and concrete, eg. replace "timely fashion" by "60 days ahead of a meeting" (para 3). We suggest to make the text clearer in the following aspects:

- How the national reporting can be compiled for a meaningful synthesis for a future ICCM (there is a need for development of formats/templates or indicators)?

- How this synthesis can be connected to a reviewing progress through ICCM or a higher level governance body?

Deleted: [Beyond 2020 SAICM]

Commented [NL3]: Data should be linked to the targets before they are finalised.

Data and information from stakeholders should be compiled, analysed and reports developed by the SAICM Secretariat, with assistance from a panel or body of experts if deemed needed, and tabled to ICCM.

These reports should also be made available to stakeholders in a timely fashion to facilitate discussion and allow for adaptation and response to and issue of concern, and for effective review, evaluation or updating of the approach.

Reporting processes must:

- 1) Occur regularly and at such a frequency to ensure collected data may be analysed and useful reports delivered to facilitate trend identification, evaluation against targets and milestones, and to assess overall programmatic performance (for example, every 4 years).
 - a. Progress against key targets should be measured every [X] years and presented in a report to the JCCM, as should any report on activities, staffing and budget of the Secretariat.
 - b. Progress against targets should be measured every [x] years and presented in a report to the JCCM, along with any suggested recommendations to address identified gaps
 - c. All strategic objectives should be reviewed on a rotational basis so that the entirety of the Approach is reviewed within a [x] year period (10 years?)
- 2) Minimize reporting burden through leveraging data and information obtained through complementary processes, for example reporting undertaken for Basel, Stockholm and Rotterdam Conventions, by other MEAs and/or IOMC organizations.
- 3) Be useful and allowing for ad hoc review of SAICM programming, particularly for the purpose of amending or updating programming to better align with global chemicals management trends and advancements or to respond to emerging policy issues.
- 4) Be inclusive of all identified sectors and stakeholders, including reporting against voluntarily-established targets, milestones or pledges from civil society organizations (CSOs) and industry.

The ICCM may decide to carry out reviews as needed of the effectiveness of specific areas of action.

The overall effectiveness of the program should also be evaluated after sufficient time has elapsed, linked to a timeline for renewal or strategic review of the program, possible at the same time as the review of Agenda 2030.

CONSIDERATIONS for Appropriate and Effective Mechanisms for Taking Stock of Progress:

Note: *This is a thought starter for discussion noting that the targets and milestones have yet to be discussed in any detail.*

Any process for taking stock of progress, including targets, milestones and indicators, should be established with the aim to provide relevant, useful information to inform national, regional, and international activities, and updates and evaluations to any future iteration of SAICM. Every effort to minimize a reporting burden on stakeholders and avoid duplication of work must be taken.

Commented [NL4]: Such panel or body of experts as referred to here does not exist, so this would need to be created. Is the proposal to have an ad-hoc time-limited Effectiveness Evaluation type of expert group as under the MEAs? The links with any future science-policy interface need to be clarified.

Deleted: [

Deleted:]

Commented [NL5]: Gaps in progress or data?

Deleted: [

Deleted:]

Commented [NL6]: Since SOs are timeless and aspirational such a review should only become relevant after quite some years (at least 15). Review is also often renegotiated, this would require a lot of work and we see this very ambitious even if 2030 agenda may trigger this. If targets would be reviewed every 4 years, we do not see the need to review the SOs.

Is it appropriate to link this to reporting and monitoring of progress?

Commented [NL7]: We support looking into strengthening this approach under the new framework. It is important that existing reporting is considered, including reporting done by industry on sustainability. Could also look at minimising/optimising by streamlining reporting cycles and merging reporting formats. That would also enable support especially to countries with challenges in reporting. Other SAICM stakeholders or non-parties to chemicals and waste MEAs would of course only report on relevant parts.

Commented [NL8]: It is not clear what is meant by this.

Commented [NL9]: The link to issues of concern is not clear since they have their own procedures.

Commented [NL10]: One option to consider is also to include data from Responsible Care progress reports issued by ICCA for the indicators.

Commented [NL11]: It is not clear to us what is meant here when referring to a program. See previous comments.

Commented [NL12]: When are these milestones to be agreed?

noting that the Strategic Objectives are intended to cover the range of priorities to support achievement of the vision, measurement of progress should be taken against the targets and milestones established under these Strategic Objectives and based on agreed indicators. Participants will want to consider the frequency, depth and methods for measurement of indicators of progress as well as the cost and benefits of doing so.

Certain activities such as progress against the 11 OOG elements may be considered key indicators of progress as they form the basis of the capacity for the sound management of chemicals and waste. They should therefore be more thorough and frequent. In other cases, we may need to build capacity before an issue can be measured directly. For example, there are no well-developed tools to measure changes in the long term impacts of exposure to multiple chemicals over a lifetime. Pragmatic choices may need to be made to first measure the ability to ensure an effective ban on a certain chemical of global concern as adopted under the MEAs for example.

One possible approach would be to agree to a set of key and SMART² indicators (against the Overall Orientation and Guidance elements (OOG) for example) that are measured and discussed at every ICCM meeting.

In addition to key indicators, progress under one strategic objective at a time should get special attention at each ICCM, [starting with A, B, E, C, D] along with any suggested recommendations to address gaps such as revisions to targets, additions to milestones, etc. This could reduce reporting burden while still feeding into any evaluation and proposed amendments to targets and milestones.

Finally, input received through the consultation process has suggested that stakeholders want the future SAICM to be proactive (harm prevention and in addressing emerging issues of concern), dynamic and flexible. Regular reporting which provides relevant information is key to achieving this vision. Therefore, reporting processes should facilitate an evaluation process linked to a timeline for renewal or strategic review of the program, possibly at the same time as review of Agenda 2030.

Currently, Governments carry the primary responsibility for reporting at the national level. In order to promote the multisectorial and multi-stakeholder nature of SAICM, a Beyond 2020 iteration should include reporting from non-Government actors against their pledged milestones or commitments, roadmaps. In addition to fostering greater/improved participation, reporting from diverse sources would increase the robustness of the data and information gathered, which in turn could be used to inform policy decisions and evaluations. This undertaking may carry new resource implications, which must be considered.

Lessons Learned from Existing Mechanisms under SAICM (adapted from OEWG report on progress from 2014-2016)

As noted in the draft report of the independent evaluation, the indicators have proved to be user-friendly, simple and straightforward.

Deleted: Consistent with the dictum of “what is measured gets done”, and ...

Commented [NL13]: More thorough and frequent compared to what? We support one reporting cycle for all progress.

Commented [NL14]: The targets should be SMART (rather than the indicators), linked to the strategic objectives and supported by indicators.

We should also consider how to link the future targets to those in other areas such as health, biodiversity, climate change and sustainable development. This could help mainstream chemicals and waste management.

A limited number of indicators would be important to limit the reporting burden and provide a high level view of progress.

It may be that taking a portfolio and programme approach to the ongoing work of SAICM may be more helpful in order for the Bureau and SAICM to review progress on an interim basis.

We also note that there are several definitions for SMART used in the Beyond 2020-process, the most common one should be used.

Commented [NL15]: Whether this is possible depends on the frequency of ICCMs and the details of the indicators. This could coincide with a comprehensive review by the science-policy interface.

Commented [NL16]: This paragraph mixes various aspects and gives reporting a role beyond its normal role, e.g. reporting is not done to decide on issues of concern.

² Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and time-based

Nevertheless, concerns remain regarding the effectiveness of the 20 indicators of progress. The activity-based indicators are subjective by nature and are therefore prone to interpretation by the respondents, which may result in under- or over-reporting of progress. While the online questionnaire collects comprehensive stakeholder data on the indicators, it is long and time-consuming to complete, which is likely to have contributed to the fall in submission rates over the years. Furthermore, several stakeholders started but did not finish the questionnaire. Another challenge is the inconsistency in reporting across countries.

The indicators of progress in their current state do not fully capture new or emerging policy issues. According to the draft report of the independent evaluation, stakeholders have expressed concerns that extending the application of the indicators to emerging policy issues could cause further challenges.

The indicators of progress are comprehensive and thus necessary and useful, yet in their current state they may not be the most effective means of assessing progress toward the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.

The IP1 Thought Starter suggested that the [Strategic Approach] should focus on key activities in the field of chemical safety, to maximize the chance for success while maintaining flexibility to respond to different national needs. The [Strategic Approach] stakeholders need to prioritize efforts to ensure the basic elements of sound management of chemicals and waste exist in all countries. Priority actions must continue in those countries - largely in the developing world - that still face challenges in this area, while also considering how to be responsive to the issues of concern and opportunities and challenges within the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

It is important to note that under Agenda 2030, Governments have the primary responsibility for follow-up and review, at the national, regional and global levels, in relation to the progress made in implementing the Goals and targets. In support of monitoring the implementation of Agenda 2030, there is an HLPF meeting every 4 years high-level political guidance on the Agenda and its implementation, identify progress and emerging challenges and mobilize further actions to accelerate implementation as part of the policy review process.

Commented [NL17]: Could this be written up as a target itself under SAICM to encourage participation in reporting? I.e. Countries will provide multi-sector reports on indicators of progress – a league table could be presented at each meeting and sharing of best practice for encouraging reporting.

Commented [NL18]: We agree that the current indicators may not be appropriate to reflect issues of concern and suggest that future indicators should be designed to capture them as well.

Commented [NL19]: We would suggest this to be deleted since it is not clear how this fits in this context and what is the added value of having it here.

Commented [NL20]: Is this part of the lessons learned?

ANNEX A: Existing Mechanisms under SAICM

(i) Progress reporting (from SAICM website and OEWG3 report)

Reporting on SAICM implementation is a key tool in assessing progress towards the achievement of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation's goal of sound management of chemicals by 2020. It also helps to assess progress on the individual objectives set out in the SAICM texts.

The Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS) in paragraph 24 provides that the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) will undertake periodic reviews of SAICM. In doing so, it will receive reports from all relevant stakeholders on progress in SAICM implementation. The ICCM evaluates the implementation of SAICM with a view to reviewing progress against the 2020 target and taking strategic decisions, programming, prioritizing and updating the approach as necessary.

Paragraph 26 of the Overarching Policy Strategy also assigns to regional meetings a role in reviewing progress in SAICM implementation.

The functions of the SAICM secretariat, which are set down in paragraph 28 of the Strategy, include reporting to the ICCM on implementation of SAICM by all participants.

Modalities for stakeholders to report on progress with respect to the implementation of SAICM were adopted at ICCM2. ICCM2 adopted 20 indicators of progress against the five Strategic Approach objectives (A. risk reduction, B. Knowledge and information, C. Governance, D. Capacity-building and technical cooperation, E. Illegal traffic). See Annex C for List of indicators for reporting progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach.

Four progress reports were prepared by the Secretariat: a baseline study covering 2006-2008 and reports for 2009-2010, 2011-2013 and 2014-2016.

As directed by ICCM4, the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) at its third meeting in April 2019 considered the need for a report for the period 2017-2019 for consideration by ICCM5. Noting that the development of progress reports was a time-consuming and resource intensive activity, OEWG participants considered whether there was an alternative, more effective approach for reporting on progress. It was agreed to request the secretariat to develop a simple report for the period 2017-2019 that, using existing data, provided an overview of Strategic Approach activities, accomplishments and challenges for consideration by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its fifth session.

The OEWG further agreed to request the secretariat to produce a paper setting out detailed options for modalities to assess progress beyond 2020, building on lessons learned and effective models from other areas, for consideration at the third meeting of the intersessional process, which could then develop recommendations on the report for consideration by the Conference at its fifth session.

(ii) Reports on EPI workplans (from OEWG3 report)

At its various meetings, ICCM has requested the lead agencies of IOMC, Governments and other stakeholders to report through the secretariat on progress in the implementation of resolutions on emerging policy issues. The emerging policy issues process had been an important element of the work of the Strategic Approach, which, owing [to](#) its non-binding nature had offered a forum to promptly consider the risks of such issues and possible responses thereto. Nevertheless, there had been challenges in tracking progress on emerging policy issues, and concerns had been raised that they were not time-bound. The co-chairs' paper had included emerging policy issues as a key element for the post-2020 period, under draft strategic objective C, on issues of concern that warranted global action. It was therefore important to reflect on experiences to date with regard to emerging policy issues and other issues of concern in order to support decision-making for the post-2020 period.

(iii) Reports on OOG (from OOG and paper at OEWG)

The OOG 6 core activity area set out the following: (f) Assess progress towards the [2020] goal of minimizing the adverse effects of chemicals on human health and the environment: identifying achievements, understanding the gaps in implementation and prioritizing actions for achievement by [2020].

Since its adoption, ICCM and OEWG meetings have included reports such as the Interim report on progress in the implementation of the overall orientation and guidance for achieving the 2020 goal of sound management of chemicals”.

OEWG3 was invited to take note of the progress achieved under the OOG; provide guidance to stakeholders in the next period in reaching the 2020 goal; and provide guidance to the secretariat in preparing its final report on progress at ICCM5. In the ensuing discussion, the importance of the OOG elements were stressed as crucial for achieving the sound management of chemicals and waste at the national and regional levels. However, the representative of OECD said that there was no indicator under the Strategic Approach to measure progress in setting up a management system for industrial and consumer chemicals. He drew attention to a proposed new indicator that would serve that purpose, as proposed in document SAICM/OEWG.3/INF/18.

(iv) Quick Start Program Report (OEWG QSP report)

At its first session, the International Conference on Chemicals Management, by its resolution I/4, decided to establish the Quick Start Programme (QSP) to support initial capacity-building activities for the implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, building upon the outcomes of the first session of the Conference and the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building. There have been regular reports on the status of projects funded under the program since its inception. An impact evaluation of the QSP program was completed in 2015.

(v) Reports on activities, staffing and budget of the Secretariat

Per OPS paragraph 29, ICCM1 requested the Executive Director of UNEP to establish and assume overall administrative responsibility for the secretariat of SAICM and to co-locate it with the chemicals and wastes cluster of UNEP. The Secretariat makes regular reports to meetings of the OEWG and ICCM on its activities, staffing and budgetary requirements and expenditures.

(iv) Independent Evaluation (OEWG evaluation summary paper)

The objective of the independent evaluation is to provide an analysis of SAICM activities from 2006-2015 that will support SAICM stakeholders to take an informed decision on future arrangements for the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020.

The independent evaluation draws on lessons learned with respect to the implementation of the Strategic Approach, including in relation to the:

- Impact of the Strategic Approach;
- Strengths, weaknesses and gaps in implementing the Strategic Approach;
- Progress towards targets;
- Efficacy of the institutional arrangements within the voluntary multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach of the Strategic Approach

ANNEX B: Questions (From the IP1 thoughtstarter):

- How can the future Strategic Approach develop measurable targets that support achievement of relevant Sustainable Development Goals? How can the Sustainable Development Goals be used to support the development of concrete measures that lead to reductions in toxic exposures?
- What is the best mechanism(s) or arrangement(s) to measure progress and success for the sound management of chemicals and waste?
- How can synergies with other reporting processes be promoted to avoid duplication and maximize efforts?
- How could reporting become less of a burden and more of an instrument for outlining plans for enhancing chemicals and waste management, as well as for reflection and learning?
- How can reporting measure reduction and elimination of adverse effects on human health and the environment?
- How can the Strategic Approach's measurable objectives developed in support of Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals be used to support future evaluations of progress for the sound management of chemicals and waste?

- How can the Strategic Approach assess progress in those dimensions of sustainability (e.g. social impacts and outcomes) that are not easily quantifiable?

Pragmatically:

- Do we still want OOG implementation measured or are these covered well enough under the new strategic objectives and targets which have integrated the OOG basic elements and could potentially be tracked through the development of milestones?
- Could/should there be different mechanisms for reporting for national implementation vs reporting under the targets, including the issues of global concern?
- What frequency of reporting would we like to see and is realistic given response rates to date (avoiding overburdening stakeholders/ finding synergies in reporting requirements)?
- Are there a key set of indicators that we would want to track more frequently?
- What timeframe would we like to see for an overall evaluation of the program?
- What is needed so that the contribution of the Beyond 2020 program to Agenda 2030 can be measured?
- How could this support negotiations of the sustainable development goals before 2030?

Annex C: List of Indicators

List of indicators for reporting progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach and the related basic elements of the overall orientation and guidance

The following 20 indicators were agreed upon by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its second session, in May 2009 (SAICM/ICCM.2/13, annex III).

<i>Strategic Approach objective</i>	<i>Indicator of progress</i>	<i>Basic element</i>
A. Risk reduction	1. Number of countries (and organizations) implementing agreed chemicals management tools	VIII: risk assessment and use of best practices
	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	I: legal frameworks
	4. Number of countries (and organizations) engaged in activities that result in monitoring data on selected environmental and human health priority substances	X: monitoring health and environmental impacts
	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	V: Globally Harmonized System
	7. Number of countries (and organizations) that have specific strategies in place for communicating information on the risks associated with chemicals to vulnerable groups	V: sharing data and information
	8. Number of countries (and organizations) with research programmes	X: monitoring health and environmental impacts
C. Governance	9. Number of countries (and organizations) with websites that provide information to stakeholders	V: sharing data and information
	10. Number of countries (and organizations) that have committed themselves to implementation of the Strategic Approach	IV: institutional frameworks and coordination
	11. Number of countries (and organizations) with multi-stakeholder coordinating mechanism	IV: institutional frameworks and coordination
	12. Number of countries (and organizations) with mechanisms to implement key international chemicals priorities	VI: industry participation III: implementation of international conventions
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 include the sound management of chemicals	VII: national budgeting processes
	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)	VI: industry participation
E. Illegal international traffic	19. Number of countries having mechanisms to prevent illegal traffic in toxic, hazardous and severely restricted chemicals individually	I: legal frameworks II: enforcement and compliance
	20. Number of countries having mechanisms to prevent illegal traffic in hazardous waste	I: legal frameworks II: enforcement and compliance

Part b) Capacity Building to strengthen the sound management of chemicals and waste

PROPOSED TEXT:

Capacity building measures should support sustained progress that improves the ability of a person, group, organization, or system at the national, regional and international level to strengthen the sound management of chemicals and waste toward the achievement of the strategic objectives of the [Beyond 2020 Approach]. Efforts should be made to foster a “learn by doing approach” applied to a specific situation and context. Capacity building occurs at many levels and involves all relevant stakeholders and sectors, including through:

- partnerships and collaborations at the national and regional level;
 - Country to country via technical cooperation, direct funding or in-kind support;
 - Via regional/subregional partnerships and collaboration;
 - Public – private partnerships;
 - Multistakeholder and multi-sectoral partnerships;
 - Sectoral collaboration activities;
 - Directly through engagement of academics or other experts or sources of knowledge;
- direct or indirect support from stakeholders
 - At a national level by determining capacity needs and accessing sources of information;
 - from industry, NGOs or other stakeholders;
- leveraging existing and new international collaborative activities
 - IOMC and its participating organisations, leveraging existing programs, activities and institutions;
 - As part of activities under Multilateral Environmental Agreements and relevant intergovernmental and international policy frameworks or forums;
 - Through activities undertaken within the [Strategic Approach] such as participation in work groups on issues of concern, regional meetings, ICCM events, etc.;
 - Clearinghouse mechanisms

CONSIDERATIONS:

The purpose of Capacity Building and Technical Cooperation

The overall purpose of capacity building and technology transfer is to enable the achievement of the strategic objectives. This includes supporting institutional strengthening to support Governments in their capacity to develop, adopt monitor and enforce policy, legislation and regulations, as well as to gain access to financial and other resources required to increase capacity for the sound management of chemicals and waste.

More specifically, to narrow the widening gap in capacities between developed countries on the one hand and developing countries and countries with economies in transition on the other hand, capacity building and technical cooperation is needed in the following areas:

- a. To increase the capacity for the sound management of chemicals and waste in all countries as needed, especially in developing countries and countries with economies in transition to address the Strategic Objectives and Targets identified and agreed to by the Conference for the Beyond 2020 period, and in particular to address the 11 basic elements of the Overall Orientation and Guidance document endorsed at ICCM4 and reaffirmed at ICCM5 that have been recognized as critical at the national and regional levels to the attainment of sound chemicals and waste management; *[link to Strategic Objective A]*
- b. To support the scientific, technical and policy knowledge and tools necessary to access, understand, analyse and create information related to sound management of chemicals and waste to enable informed decisions and actions; *[link to Strategic Objectives B, C and D]*
- c. To support participation in work to address Issues of concern [that warrant [global] [and] [joint] action] that have been identified, prioritized by the [Strategic Approach] under Strategic Objective C;
- d. To understand the needs of all countries, including especially developing countries, and to adopt sustainable and safer alternatives, including new technology and non-chemical alternatives *[link to Strategic Objective D]*
- e. To establish or strengthen partnerships and mechanisms for technical cooperation and the provision of appropriate and clean technology to and among developing countries and countries with economies in transition *[link to Strategic Objectives D and E]*
- f. To include capacity-building for the sound management of chemicals and waste as a priority in social and economic development strategies, including national sustainable development strategies, poverty reduction strategy papers and country assistance strategies, and to make chemicals an important part of national policy as consistent with *the Integrated Approach to Financing*; *[link to Strategic Objective E]*
- g. To promote coordination of and access to information on capacity-building for the sound management of chemicals and waste for all sectors and stakeholders and to enhance transparency and accountability; *[link to Strategic Objective E]*
- h. To build capacity for multisectoral engagement and look for opportunities to share information, harmonize and leverage efforts of networks in other sectors. *[Across all Strategic Objectives]*

Measures should also take into consideration Sustainable Development Goal Target 17.9 of the 2030 Agenda, the dedicated target to capacity- building which aims to *"Enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals including relevant chemicals and waste related targets and includes measures through North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation"*. *There is a need to promote the awareness of donors, multilateral organizations and other relevant actors of the relevance of chemical safety for poverty reduction and sustainable development. [link to Strategic Objective E]*

Mechanisms for Capacity Building:

Mechanisms for capacity building could include both training of individuals to provide the necessary skills and institutional strengthening in order to support the systematic implementation of the [Strategic Approach] at the local, national and regional levels in a coordinated way and across the full range of chemical safety needs. This can include strategic planning, policy and legislative/regulatory development, risk assessment and management, testing and research and monitoring and enforcement. Use should be made of information exchange mechanisms on capacity building in order to ensure coordination and maximum capacity to share information. Measures should also be facilitated by relevant agencies of the UN system and other international organizations to support developing countries, especially least developed countries in capacity building for developing resource-efficient and inclusive chemicals and waste management programmes.

Commented [NL21]: This raises the question of resources. In the previous section, financing is only mentioned in country-to-country cooperation under partnerships. Regarding external financing, relevant multilateral funds, including the Special Programme (SP) on institutional strengthening and the GEF, could be mentioned here as capacity building is the core purpose of the SP. Overall, the implementation of the integrated approach to financing of SMCW is relevant here and all of its three components (i.e. mainstreaming, private sector involvement and dedicated external finance), are equally important and mutually reinforcing.

Annex A – Extracted from the Open-ended working group 3 outcome document

The following strategic objectives will guide stakeholders in their efforts at all levels to address the sound management of chemicals and waste:

Strategic objective A: [Measures are identified, implemented and enforced in order to prevent or, where not feasible, minimize harm from chemicals throughout their life cycle [and waste];]

Strategic objective B: Comprehensive and sufficient knowledge, data and information are generated, available and accessible to all to enable informed decisions and actions;

Strategic objective C: Issues of concern [that warrant [global] [and] [joint] action] are identified, prioritized and addressed;

Strategic objective D: Benefits to human health and the environment are maximized and risks are prevented or, where not feasible, minimized through safer alternatives, innovative and sustainable solutions and forward thinking;

Strategic objective E: [The importance of the sound management of chemicals and waste as an essential element to achieving sustainable development is recognized by all[; adequate financial and non-financial resources are [identified and] mobilized; actions are accelerated; and necessary [transparent and accountable] partnerships are established to foster cooperation among stakeholders.]

Targets to support the attainment of each strategic objective are described below.

Strategic objective A targets:

Target A.1: Countries adopt, implement and enforce legal frameworks that address risk prevention and the reduction of adverse impacts from chemicals throughout their life cycle and waste.

Target A.2: Countries have sufficient capacity to address chemicals and waste issues nationally, including appropriate inter-agency coordination and stakeholder participation mechanisms, such as national action plans.

Target A.3: Countries are implementing the chemicals and waste-related multilateral environmental agreements, as well as health, labour and other relevant conventions, and voluntary mechanisms such as the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals.

Target A.4: Stakeholders have incorporated the sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycle and waste into their planning, policies and practices, thereby supporting the development and implementation of chemicals management systems and other sector-appropriate mechanisms.

Target A.5: Governments and industry ensure that workers are protected from the risks associated with chemicals and waste and that workers have the means to protect themselves.

Strategic objective B targets:

Target B.1: Comprehensive data and information for chemicals on the market are available and accessible, including information and data on properties, health and environmental effects, uses, hazard- and risk-assessment results and risk-management measures, monitoring results and regulatory status throughout their life cycle.

Target B.2: All stakeholders, in particular industries and regulators, have and are using the most appropriate and standardized tools, guidelines and best practices for assessments and sound management, as well as for the prevention of harm, risk reduction, monitoring and enforcement.

Target B.3: Information and standardized methods are available and used to understand the impacts of chemicals and waste for improved burden-of-disease and cost-of-inaction estimates, to inform the advancement of chemical safety measures and to measure progress towards reducing those impacts.

Target B.4: Educational, training and public awareness programmes on chemical safety and sustainability have been developed and implemented, including for vulnerable populations, along with worker safety curricula and programmes at all levels.

Target B.5: Countries and stakeholders are implementing training on environmentally sound and safer alternatives, as well as on substitutions and the use of safer alternatives, such as agroecology.

Strategic objective C targets:

Target C.1: Programmes of work including timelines are established, adopted and implemented for identified issues of concern.

Target C.2: Information on the properties and risk management of chemicals across the supply chain and the chemical contents of products is available to all to enable informed decisions.

Strategic objective D targets:

Target D.1: Companies adopt corporate policies and practices that promote resource efficiency and that incorporate the development, production and use of sustainable and safer alternatives, including new technologies and non-chemical alternatives.

Target D.2: Governments implement policies that promote innovation to facilitate the recycling and re-use of products, the adoption of sustainable and safe alternatives, including new technologies and non-chemical alternatives (e.g., the prioritized licensing of reduced-risk alternatives, assessment frameworks, labelling schemes and purchasing policies).

Target D.3: Companies, including from the investment sector, incorporate strategies and policies to support the sound management of chemicals and waste in their investment approaches and business models and apply internationally-recognized reporting standards where relevant.

Target D.4: Companies apply sustainable production principles and life-cycle management in the design of chemicals, materials and products, taking reduced-risk, design-for-recycling and non-chemical solutions and processes into account.

Target D.5: Industry associations promote change towards sustainability and the safe management of waste and of chemicals and consumer products throughout their life cycles, including in sharing information and building the capacity of small and medium-sized enterprises to reduce risks.

Strategic objective E targets:

Target E.1: The highest levels of stakeholder organizations, including government, industry, civil society and international organizations in all relevant sectors, formally recognize the importance of and commit to action on the sound management of chemicals and waste, and recognize its relevance to sustainable development.

Target E.2: Policies and processes for the management of chemicals and waste are integrated into national and regional development strategies.

Target E.3: Inter- and intra-sectoral partnerships, networks and collaborative mechanisms are established to mobilize resources, to share information, experiences and lessons learned, and to promote coordinated action at the regional and international levels.

Part c) Mechanisms for Updating the Beyond 2020 [SAICM]

Objectives

The objective of the mechanism will be to encourage a dynamic, flexible and responsive process for authorizing updating of the Beyond 2020 framework, while minimizing administrative and bureaucratic burden on the [International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM)], the Secretariat, Member States and stakeholders, and other relevant parties.

Proposed text:

A process for updating the Beyond 2020 framework or specific sections of the agreement, shall be initiated by ICCM triggered through the passing of a resolution calling for an updating process. This shall occur when updating of SAICM is needed to keep pace with changes and needs in global chemicals and waste management.

- i. The process for updating must take into consideration reporting, reviewing and evaluation processes and timelines, and must include, as necessary, recommendations of which specific sections of the agreement should or must be retained, amended, eliminated or updated. (The timeline for the first review could be linked to Agenda 2030.)
- ii. ICCM may create a mechanism such as a working group, monitoring body, or formal intersessional process, or another mechanism as appropriate, for the purpose of developing recommendations [and options including timelines for implementation] for updating the beyond 2020 [SAICM].
- iii. The mechanism will be empowered through delegated authority by the ICCM to direct the [SAICM] Secretariat or any subsidiary body or working group to undertake work in support of its mandate.
- iv. The budget for the mechanism will be provided for via the operational budget adopted by the [ICCM].

Considerations:

The Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS) establishes ICCM authority to undertake revisions and updates of SAICM. However, the nature of those updates, and a trigger for initiating an update have not been established.

The lack of an identified trigger to initiate an update leaves ambiguity as to how/ when to commence a process to update the instrument. A natural trigger would be at such time as a comprehensive evaluation has been undertaken and there is sufficient evidence that an update is needed to keep pace with changes and needs in global chemicals and waste management.

Commented [NL22]: Generally supportive

There are several policy considerations, however, of critical importance. These include how often [SAICM] should be updated, which elements of [SAICM] should be updated, and who should undertake the updating. Finally, how progress on the updating process will be reported must also be established.

An updating process logically must follow the reporting and evaluation process, given stock must be taken of both how well stakeholders are performing against the current strategic objects, targets and milestones, and where updating of SAICM is needed to keep pace with the changes and needs in global chemicals and waste management. The next logical place would be linked to Agenda 2030.

As this work is not currently part of the regular work of the ICCM, it is highly likely new expenses outside the current budget will arise and will need to be addressed in any decision to undertake a review.
