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Objectives of Evaluation

• Set out in Annex to ICCM Resolution IV/4
• Assess the strengths, weaknesses and gaps in implementing the SAICM 2006-2015
• Outcome of the evaluation will enable the inter-sessional process to develop recommendations and enable ICCM5 to take a decision on sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020
Available Documents

Main documents:

• SAICM/IP.1/5 – Interim report of the independent evaluation of the Strategic Approach for 2006 – 2015

• SAICM/IP.1/5/Add.1 – Interim report for the independent evaluation of the Strategic Approach for 2006 - 2015 - Section (VI) F: Identifying and taking action on regional and sub-regional needs for advancing sound management of chemicals and waste

Other document:

• SAICM/IP.1/INF/4 – Independent evaluation focus group sessions - Note by the Independent Evaluator
Evaluation Approach

- Inclusive and participatory evaluation process
- Work closely with the regional and national focal points through their responsibilities to act as an effective conduit for communication on SAICM
- Work with focal points and stakeholders from civil society organizations, trade unions, health, industry and the United Nations agencies
- Grounded in a Theory of Change approach
What is a Theory of Change approach?

- Explore how change happens more broadly and what that means
- Less focus on activities, deeper reflection on change
- Suits complex situations where cause and effect are less predictable and difficult to understand:
  - Identifies vision of success and preconditions for success
  - Maps actors involved and relationships
  - Aligns strategies identifying what organisation can do directly and those in collaboration with others
Why a Theory of Change for SAICM?

- Complex nature of SAICM as an international voluntary agreement with multiple actors and differing perspectives
- Combining retrospective and prospective approaches
- Both explanatory and exploratory
- Theory developed will reflect perspectives of different actors involved in SAICM
Stages in Evaluation

• Interim report – November 2016 to January 2017

• Comprehensive evaluation and review period – February to October 2017

• Draft report – end of 2017

• Final report – OEWG3 in 2018
Interim Report: on line survey

• 185 responses (143 English; 22 French; 20 Spanish)
• 69% government; 9% international organisation;
  1% NGO:TU; 14% Industry; 1% NGO: health;
  6% NGO: public interest (n=175)
• 57% national focal point; 2% regional focal point;
  10% inter-governmental org focal point; 9% bureau;
  10% NGO focal point; 13% Industry focal point (n=143)
• 23% Africa; 10% Asia-Pacific; 11% Central & Eastern Europe;
  14% Latin America & Caribbean; (n=175)
  23% Western Europe & Other Group; 18% Global
• 57% male 43% female (n=127)
Perceptions of degree of success in achieving the Strategic Approach OPS objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Some success</th>
<th>Little success</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk reduction</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal int traffic</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Degree of success in incorporating the SAICM emerging policy issues and other issues of concern your activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very Successful</th>
<th>Some Success</th>
<th>Little Success</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lead in paint</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemicals in products</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nanotech</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSLEEP</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endocrine</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environ persistent</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perfluorinated</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highly hazardous pesticides</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance to SDGs

• Concerns about chemicals and waste embedded throughout most of SDGs – goals and targets
• Opportunities for further mainstreaming of chemicals and waste in national development plans
• Vulnerable groups highly visible in targets
• Achieving targets will depend on achieving five overarching policy objectives
• Depend on collaboration and cooperation between SAICM stakeholders
SAICM 20 indicators in measuring progress towards the 2020 goal

- Beyond 2020 – challenge and opportunity to align indicators of progress to the SDG targets
- User friendly, simple and straightforward
- Represent a good baseline...BUT
- Evolved over time
- Not focused on measuring impact
Draft Report Process

• Focus Group discussions during the intersessional meeting
• Engagement with stakeholders at the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm COPs (April / May 2017)
• Other Focus Group discussions and one-to-one interviews with stakeholders
• Engaging with stakeholders to ensure perspectives are included
• Comprehensive and complete assessment of evaluation
• Presented to the intersessional process considering SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 at its second meeting.
Final Report Process

• Draft report to be circulated to all stakeholders, inviting feedback and comments
• Follow up discussions with individual stakeholder representatives
• Report will reflect the feedback and comments
• Finalized for OEWG3
Last Note

• This is your evaluation!
• The work of the evaluator is to ensure that your voices are heard
• Aim to produce a final report that reflects the views of stakeholders