



Survey on stakeholders' experience of the virtual working group process conducted between October 2020 and February 2021 to support the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

The objectives of the survey are:

- (i) To gather information about the views and experiences of stakeholders of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) to inform the design of future work during the intersessional process;
- (ii) To increase ownership and shared responsibility through engagement with SAICM stakeholders and the use of their experience and suggestions to plan the next phase.

The SAICM secretariat will disseminate the survey and analyse and share the results. The survey will be circulated widely, including to all SAICM focal points.

*: required

A. Respondent information

1. Please indicate your country.*

Click or tap here to enter text.

2. Please indicate your region.*

- Africa
- Asia and the Pacific
- Central and Eastern Europe
- Latin America and the Caribbean
- Western Europe and others
- Global

3. Which stakeholder group do you belong to?*

- Government
- Intergovernmental

- Non-governmental
- Private sector
- Academia
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

4. Which organization do you belong to?

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

5. You are responding to this survey as:

- A representative of a stakeholder
- A representative of a network
- A representative of a coalition
- An individual
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

6. Did you register for any virtual working group meetings?*

- Yes (please go straight to question 8)
- No (please continue with the survey)

7. If you did not register for any of the virtual working group meetings, please specify the reason(s) and then go straight to question 27.*

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

8. Which virtual working group meeting(s) did you register for?*

- 1: Targets, indicators and milestones, on 2 November 2020
- 1: Targets, indicators and milestones, on 23 November 2020
- 1: Targets, indicators and milestones, on 7 December 2020
- 1: Targets, indicators and milestones, on 12 January 2021
- 1: Targets, indicators and milestones, on 1 February 2021

- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 27 October 2020
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 5 November 2020
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 19 November 2020
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 3 December 2020
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 17 December 2020
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 7 January 2021
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 14 January 2021
- 2: Governance and mechanisms to support implementation, on 4 February 2021

- 3: Issues of concern, on 16 November 2020
- 3: Issues of concern, on 14 December 2020
- 3: Issues of concern, on 18 January 2021
- 3: Issues of concern, on 2 February 2021

- 4: Financial considerations, on 18 November 2020
- 4: Financial considerations, on 16 December 2020
- 4: Financial considerations, on 20 January 2021
- 4: Financial considerations, on 10 February 2021

9. Did you provide written comments?*

- Yes (please continue with the survey)
- No (please go straight to question 12)

10. If you provided written comments, please specify on whose behalf the comments were provided:*

- On behalf of an individual government/stakeholder
- On behalf of a group of governments/stakeholders

11. How often did you provide comments?*

- 1–2 times
- 3–4 times

- 5–7 times
- 8 or more times

B. Review of stakeholders' experience of the virtual working group meetings held between October 2020 and February 2021

12. Did you participate in any of the online meetings?*

- Yes (please go straight to question 14)
- No (please continue with the survey)

13. If you did not participate in the online meetings, please specify the reason(s) and then go to question 19.

Click or tap here to enter text.

14. In general, how did the Webex platform work for you?*

- Well
- Not very well
- Not well at all

15. Did you encounter any problems?*

- Yes (please continue with the survey)
- No (please go straight to question 18)

16. Please indicate the kinds of problem that you encountered.*

- Connectivity
- Sound
- Video
- Chat
- Hand-raising function
- Other (please specify) Click or tap here to enter text.

17. Please indicate the main reason(s) for the problems encountered.*

- Poor internet connection
- Lack of equipment
- Time zone differences
- Conflicting meetings
- Other (please specify)[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

18. Did you use the chat box during the virtual working group meetings?*

- Yes
- No

19. Did you find all the necessary information and documentation on the SAICM website?*

- Yes
- No

20. Were you able to access the calendar of meetings?*

- Yes
- No

21. Was the timing acceptable to you in relation to your time zone?*

- Yes
- No

22. Were the virtual working group meetings announced in a timely manner?*

- Yes
- No

23. Were the documents for the virtual working group meetings made available in a timely manner?*

- Yes
- No

24. How much time did you need to consult the documentation and be sufficiently prepared for the virtual working group meetings?*

- 1–3 days
- 1 week
- 2 weeks
- More than 2 weeks

25. How much time between the virtual working group meetings was needed for you to digest the meeting summaries and prepare for subsequent sessions?*

- 1 week
- 2 weeks
- 3 weeks
- More than 3 weeks

26. Was the overall schedule of the four virtual working group meetings manageable for you?*

- Yes
- Not really
- Not at all

C. Potential future process

This section focuses on aspects of possible future virtual work, based on the experience of the first phase of the virtual work, including areas for improvement.

27. Which of the following functionalities are useful for you?*

- Group chat
- Private chat
- Breakout rooms
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

28. Have you used other technologies/meeting platforms that you think would be better suited to the virtual working group meetings?*

- No

- Yes, Microsoft Teams
- Yes, Zoom
- Yes, GoToMeeting
- Yes, other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

29. Do you think that the same meetings should be held several times, in smaller groups, in different time zones?*

- Yes
- No

30. Which starting time would work best for you for future meetings?*

- 4.00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (New York) / 10.00 a.m. Central European Time (Brussels) / 5.00 p.m. Japanese Standard Time (Tokyo) / 9.00 p.m. West Samoa Time (Apia)
- 5.00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (New York) / 11.00 a.m. Central European Time (Brussels) / 6.00 p.m. Japanese Standard Time (Tokyo) / 10.00 p.m. West Samoa Time (Apia)
- 6.00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (New York) / 12.00 p.m. Central European Time (Brussels) / 7.00 p.m. Japanese Standard Time (Tokyo) / 11.00 p.m. West Samoa Time (Apia)
- 7.00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (New York) / 1.00 p.m. Central European Time (Brussels) / 8.00 p.m. Japanese Standard Time (Tokyo) / 12.00 a.m. West Samoa Time (Apia)
- 8.00 a.m. Eastern Standard Time (New York) / 2.00 p.m. Central European Time (Brussels) / 9.00 p.m. Japanese Standard Time (Tokyo) / 1.00 a.m. West Samoa Time (Apia)
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

31. Would tools such as online simultaneous interpretation be useful for enhancing inclusiveness and participation?*

- Yes
- No

32. Would an opportunity for regional dialogue be helpful for your region?*

- Yes
- No

33. Would you need support to participate effectively in an online process?*

- Yes (please continue with the survey)

No (please go straight to question 35)

34. Please indicate the support that you would need.*

- Access to conference facilities in embassies/United Nations offices/hotels
- Financial support for an internet connection
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

35. Which of the following would be helpful for future virtual work?*

- Exchange and dialogue
- Improved mutual understanding
- Generation of new ideas
- Conflict resolution
- Discussion of text
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

36. Do you think that stakeholders who are unable to participate actively in meetings should be allowed to provide written submissions PRIOR to the meeting?*

- Yes
- No

37. Do you think that stakeholders who are unable to participate actively in meetings should be allowed to provide written submissions AFTER the meeting?*

- Yes
- No

38. In addition to a second round of virtual working group meetings, which of the following options could be implemented to advance the intersessional process until face-to-face meetings are again feasible?*

- Regional briefings/meetings
- Smaller expert group meetings
- Open-ended online forums
- Other (please specify) [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

39. Do you have any other suggestions for further increasing engagement in the preparations for the fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 and for the fifth session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management?*

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

40. In your view, and within the mandate of the intersessional process, what are the priority areas that require further discussion in order for progress to be made in 2021?*

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)