

Technical Working Group on Targets, Indicators and Milestones for SAICM and the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste Beyond 2020

UN/IOMC Group Homework January 2020

(Including 7-10 February comment round)

The homework assignment of the UN/IOMC group was:

- b) Identify a **limited number of high-level indicators that would help to communicate** with decision-makers high-level messaging and build political momentum (within the relevant UN and international organizations as well as with their constituencies). *For example, the proposal for a new indicator from the WHO/ILO joint estimates of the work-related burden of disease and injury: Mortality rate from diseases attributed to occupational risk factors.*
- c) Please identify a **maximum of 10, prefer approximately 5**. These indicators should consider the multi-sectoral nature of the sound management of chemicals and waste and be relevant in the context of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development.
- d) Identify any existing data-sets relevant to these high-level indicators, the link to the relevant SDG(s) and any gaps or potential challenges.

PART A: HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT IMPACT INDICATORS

The group proposes the following two health and environment impact indicators, which could sit at the VISION level¹:

1. Burden of disease attributable to chemicals

Methodology and data custodian: World Health Organization.

Availability of methodology and data: Established and data already periodically published. Latest publications (2012 and 2016 data, published in 2016 and 2018 respectively): <https://www.who.int/ipcs/publications/chemicals-public-health-impact/en/>

Feasible to update on an annual basis. Baseline for 2020 can be published.

Dissagregation: available by disease outcome, deaths, DALYs (disability-adjusted life years), country, sex, age. A number of occupational exposures are already included (e.g. poisoning, carcinogens, particulates). Also included is the data for SDG 3.9.3 mortality from unintentional poisoning.

Gaps/challenges/future work: Methodologies for inclusion of additional chemical exposures (currently limited to a small number of exposures for which data are available). Methodology to better disaggregate data for occupational exposures.

1.plus Burden of toxic stress to ecosystems attributable to chemicals

¹ (i) To protect human health and the environment from the [harmful] [adverse] effects of chemicals and [their] [associated] waste⁴, [towards] [to enable] [promote] [for] [to ensure] healthy lives and a sustainable, safe planet for all.

ALT (i) Healthy lives and a sustainable, safe planet for all by protecting human health and the environment from the [harmful] [adverse] effects of chemicals and [their] waste. (*compilation document arising from IP3*).

Commented [NS1]: This parameter is important and should be developed for all possible chemical exposure not only for poisoning, carcinogens and occupational exposures. However scientific method may not be clear at this moment and then I propose we will prepare assessment document for this indicator periodically, like, e.g., global chemicals outlook.

Commented [NS2]: Indicator for environmental impact should be necessary in addition to human health-related indicator. I propose also to prepare assessment document for this indicator, like global chemicals outlook.

Methodology and data will be discussed in the assessment document, like, e.g., global chemicals outlook.

Commented [NS3]: Common suggestion on 1 and 1 plus two indicators.

2. Burden of pollution on the environment

Methodology and data custodian: United Nations Environment Programme

Availability of methodology and data: The indicator will have various components. Methodologies have been established for a number of these components as classified under the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG Indicators (IAEG-SDGs). Several are Tier II indicators implying that data availability is limited. Capacity support for data collection and analysis will need to be provided to countries. Methodology and metadata/ formulas need to be developed for the full (composite) indicator.

Feasibility to update every two years need to be confirmed. Baseline for 2020 can be published for a number of components.

Disaggregation: Available by exposure to pollution per ecosystem/ habitat type (freshwater, marine, land and air) and some disaggregation to reflect proxies for loss of biodiversity. Components of this indicator could be mirrored/ complement elements in the post-2020 biodiversity framework that is currently under development. Where possible data will be disaggregated by gender and/or vulnerable group.

Gaps/ challenges/ future work: Some flexibility is needed for the development of the indicator framework as a number of important processes may provide new opportunities (such as the further development of SDG indicators and the post-2020 biodiversity framework) and to consider aspects in the longer term beyond 2030. Current methodologies and data sets focus on only a limited number of chemicals/ forms of pollution. Methodologies for inclusion of additional forms of chemicals and waste exposure or trends are needed to complement these and provide a more robust picture of pollution trends in the environment related to the management of chemicals and waste. As much as possible, these should be drawn from existing indicator frameworks and associated data flows, such as those for the SDGs and MEAs, including monitoring programmes. Relevant SDG indicators include those under targets 3.9, 6.3, 11.6, 12, 14.1 and 15.5, among others. A more in-depth analysis of SDG indicator methodologies may provide further insight in relevant sub-indicators that are used to build the full SDG indicators. It should be noted that many of the relevant SDG indicators are currently classified as Tier II², meaning that they are conceptually clear, have an established methodology and standards are available, but data are not regularly produced by countries. Capacity support will therefore be needed to assist countries for regular data collection, analysis and reporting. This would also be relevant for any new sub-indicators that may be proposed in the context of the new framework.

Commented [NS4]: Several data other than listed can be the information basis of this indicator, e.g.,
-Emission data, including various emission inventories
- PRTRs data
-Environmental monitoring data

PART B: ADDITIONAL HIGH-LEVEL CROSS-CUTTING INDICATORS

The group proposes the following additional high-level indicators which are cross-cutting, across a number of targets:

² Tier Classification for Global SDG Indicators – 11 December 2019 update

3. Number of countries that have legislation in place to manage industrial and consumer chemicals

A detailed proposal for the above indicator, to fill a key gap in current global indicators, was provided at OEWG3, and is contained in SAICM/OEWG.3/INF/18.³

In summary, to complement the impact of the GHS for the reduction of risks from industrial and consumer chemicals, many countries have implemented legislation allowing them to prioritise chemicals for risk management, perform a risk assessment on priority chemicals and implement, if needed, risk reduction measures based on the outcome of the risk assessment. Unfortunately, many countries still lack such legislation for industrial and consumer chemicals and cannot manage the risks of chemicals that have been recognised as needing risk reduction measures in other countries (e.g. chemicals listed on Annex III of the Rotterdam Convention).

It is proposed that the indicator counts countries that have implemented a legislatively mandated management system that covers a number of technical elements, such as data gathering, risk assessment and risk management. Developing risk assessments for individual chemicals or groups of chemicals requires considerable expertise and resources. To save resources it is important that countries cooperate and as much as possible and use what has already been performed in other countries. It is therefore proposed that countries also qualify if they implement risk management measures based on:

- risk assessments (fully or partially) performed in other countries;
- screening risk assessments; or
- generic risk assessments (e.g. certain combinations of hazards and uses for which a high probability of risk for human health or the environment is predicted, such as carcinogens in certain consumer preparations).

Methodology and data custodian: OECD

4. Implementation of the GHS

Implementation of the GHS provides a unique opportunity to show multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder work, with ILO, OECD, WHO, UNIDO, FAO, UNEP and UNITAR (and others, at least indirectly) running activities on this, as are governments, industry stakeholders, trade unions and NGOs.

A developing “coalition” under the GHS global partnership (ILO/OECD/UNITAR) is also bringing together stakeholders in order to promote implementation of the GHS. As such, there is a great opportunity for us to “succeed” against the proposed target (Alt 1 A.3: By 20XX [legal requirements] to implement the GHS have been adopted in countries) which can be a source for communication and highlighting. Some stakeholders, notably ECHA, have shown various tools to communicate the value of the GHS to consumers, and this could be utilized.

³ http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/Documents/meetings/OEWG3/inf/OEWG3-INF-18_additional_IOMC-indicator-.pdf

The implementation of the GHS is already an established indicator. More attention to the topic will provide more resources. In turn, this will allow for greater tracking of numbers of implementation. The data can be gathered periodically and regularly.

5. Countries which have implemented pesticide legislation based on the FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct

The group noted the lack of agriculture-related indicators in the current proposals. As such, the above is proposed.

This shows good cross-sector collaboration and is well-established. Furthermore, it represents key sectors that can easily be communicated and which relate to some of the largest sectors (health, labour, agriculture and environment), economic/sustainable development, and is applicable to all countries, notably least developed countries (thus, easily intersects with the SDGs), and with other relevant stakeholders.

The indicator is an already-established IOMC indicator.

6. Industry involvement

A key element to increasing levels of success in the new instrument will be the engagement with and contribution of the private sector. Possible high-level indicators could be:

Number of companies that implement sound management of chemicals/ responsible care policies- *this could be made broader to "... that implement broadly-accepted standards"*

Number of governments and the private sector applying extended producer responsibility (EPR)

These are key developing themes under the beyond 2020 framework, and thus could be key indicators. EPRs are valuable to policy makers and also engage with the public, increasing awareness of consumption and waste. Similarly, it helps with the waste element of the framework (without needing to define/decide on the scope of waste).

The indicator would seem to be easy to establish. The indicator could draw from SDG 12.6.1 'Number of companies publishing sustainability reports' (custodian: UNEP/ UNCTAD, Tier II) and the Global Reporting Initiative.

7. Waste-related indicators

To anticipate the inclusion of waste in the new indicator framework, it is suggested that indicators will include those that can be drawn from the suite of waste-related SDG indicators, and components therein, as relevant: 12.4.2 on hazardous waste (custodians UNSD/UNEP – partners OECD, Eurostat, UNU); 12.5.1 on recycling rate (custodians UNSD/UNEP, partners OECD/Eurostat/UNU, Tier III), 11.6.1 urban solid waste (custodian UN-Habitat, Tier II), and SDG 12.3.1a on food loss (FAO, Tier II) and 12.3.1.b food waste (UNEP, Tier II). Further work is needed to identify what the relevant elements are in this indicator suite for the new framework. The established waste-related SDG indicators embed a cross-sectoral approach and can provide further opportunities to foster cross-sectoral and multi-stakeholder collaboration.

8. Proportion of the sectors and stakeholders participating in the ICCM and its subsidiary bodies including the bureau and regional meetings.

The group proposes the above indicator relating to multisectoral and multistakeholder engagement in the beyond 2020 platform.

Rationale/Gaps/challenges: This indicator is proposed due to the considerable and sustained debate about the level of engagement in SAICM and the efforts being made to address this through multiple references in the text. A measure of whether this is being successful is needed. However it is recognized that this indicator will not capture the engagement of the sectors and stakeholders in actually implementing sound chemicals and waste management activities.

Data custodian: SAICM Secretariat.

Dissagregation: by sector and stakeholder group as defined in the text⁴; by meeting type (ICCM, bureau, regional meeting/region, gender, vulnerable groups etc).

Periodicity: published annually on the SAICM website.

9. Funding mobilised by governments, industry, IGOs, and civil society through mainstreaming to promote the sound management of chemicals and waste

A key element of the new framework is obtaining political awareness, and raising the profile. A key indicator could therefore be level of funding provided for this work. In climate change, there are high profile commitments of funding (I note an OECD document: “This work was undertaken in response to a request to provide analytical support to the preparation by developed countries of a roadmap for meeting the commitment of jointly mobilising USD 100 billion per year by 2020 for climate”); can this be replicated for chemicals and waste.

The data could be compiled by the beyond 2020 secretariat following submissions from funds' providers. The indicator is not yet developed, but could follow this methodology: The cumulative funds available from the GEF, the Special Programme and any other identified funding mechanisms could be easily put together. Then, where bilateral donors, industry or other partners' funding is reported, this can be added to the total. As this would be a way to promote what they are doing (funding), it can be expected that this would be forthcoming. The Quick Start Programme followed a similar approach.

⁴ Sectors are understood to include, but not be limited to, agriculture, environment, health, education, finance, development, construction and labour.

Stakeholders include [but are not limited to] Governments, regional economic integration organizations, intergovernmental organizations, civil society, industries, businesses, the financial sector, development banks, academia, workers, retailers and individuals. (*compilation document arising from IP3*)

TWG/Document/8