

SAICM/IP.4/CRP.1

Distr.: General
29 August 2022

English only

Fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4)
Bucharest, Romania, 29 August – 2 September 2022

Proposal for a Measurability Structure – a Roadmap

Submission by the Government of the United Kingdom

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note contains a submission by the Government of the United Kingdom. It is reproduced as received by the secretariat, without formal editing.

Annex: Proposal for a Measurability Structure – a Roadmap

Objective

- Noting the requirement for technical input, this paper aims to outline the need for the IP4 process to identify a potential measurability structure to organise and facilitate the desired outcome at ICCM5. We envision that further technical work by a working group would be necessary ahead of ICCM5. The broad mandate of this group would be to:
 - recommend a number of indicators (e.g., process and impact indicators where data is more readily available, building on the work by the IOMC)
 - recommend a finalised measurability structure
 - make any recommendations on how target wording could be improved to enhance measurability

Once an indicator measurability structure has been agreed at ICCM5, a subsequent technical expert group will be tasked with developing and finalising the indicators, with the involvement of IOMC organisations.

Context

The Independent Evaluation of SAICM noted some progress in developing a monitoring and evaluation framework for assessing progress made towards the 2020 goal, but also noted several weaknesses including the methodology of reporting and the absence of impact or outcome indicators.¹

On 23rd March 2021 a [webinar](#) was held to assist considerations on indicators and reporting for ‘SAICM beyond 2020², by providing the stakeholder community for this process with examples of how other UN frameworks have met this need.

During the webinar, attendees gave **high importance to: the implementation and impact** of the framework, its enablement of **broad-base participation**; and having indicators to **support progress reporting**. In addition, the following were drawn out as positive / desirable aspects of other global frameworks:

- easy-to-use monitoring and reporting tools;
- scalability of targets and indicators at global, regional and national levels;
- flexibility of what to report; and
- supportive of capacity building.

The development of the new beyond 2020 instrument provides us with the opportunity to address these aspects within a flexible organising structure for measurability.

¹ [FinalReport_Independent-Evaluation-SAICM-2006-2015.pdf](#)

² [Microsoft Word - SAICM indicators webinar 23 Mar2021 Report final](#). Organised by the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), in co-ordination with the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), and was supported by the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra).

An option for a measurability structure

The proposed potential structure builds upon the existence of **process and impact indicators** which can be associated with specific targets and would actively support ‘taking stock of progress’. This does not mean that every target should have two distinct indicators; indeed, efforts should be made to map indicators and targets to lessen the burden. These can then be divided into three distinct layers (again understanding that not all the layers may be relevant or needed for all indicators):

- **‘Global’** – based on data that is available on a global basis, for example human health statistics, and which can point to global impact as part of impact assessment. These are arguably the least burdensome on governments and may also allow for some disaggregation of national level data. This level of indicator would likely require a custodian organisation to be responsible for its maintenance.
- **‘National for global’** – based on data that is available on a national (stakeholder) level and can be aggregated to form a global (or regional) indicator, which could be used to measure progress both in terms of impact assessment as well as being well-suited to process monitoring.
- **‘National for national’** – based on data that is required to inform domestic (stakeholder-specific) reporting obligations, or which is needed to inform Level 2 indicators. This could also cover complementary activities, not covered by the targets directly. Recognising that developing robust indicators can take several years, use of national indicators in the first, interim period may help to increase participation in reporting. Use of these should be at a country’s discretion.

To ensure reporting on indicators can be completed by all stakeholders, use of **tiering in terms of the data required**, in a similar structure to the proposed monitoring guidance for the Minamata convention effectiveness evaluation, could help to build capacity by encouraging progressing use of more challenging data sets, based on available resources.

Figure 1: A schematic illustration of the option for a measurability structure

