

Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)

SAICM/InfDisc/4

Distr.: General

20 October 2008

English only

Informal discussions on preparations for the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management

Rome, 23–24 October 2008

Item 3 (b) of the provisional agenda*

Preparatory discussions on issues to be considered by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its second session: Modalities of reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach

Summary of reporting project outcomes

Note by the secretariat

1. Reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach will be a key tool in assessing progress towards the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation goal of achieving the sound management of chemicals by 2020. Paragraph 24 of the Overarching Policy Strategy provides for the Conference to carry out a number of key functions in relation to reporting, namely “to undertake periodic reviews of the Strategic Approach”; “to receive reports from all relevant stakeholders on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach and to disseminate information as appropriate;” and “to evaluate the implementation of the Strategic Approach with a view to reviewing progress against the 2020 target and taking strategic decisions, programming, prioritizing and updating the approach as necessary.”
2. In order to assist the development of appropriate reporting modalities, the Government of Canada has sponsored a project to develop a set of draft indicators for reporting progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach and a baseline estimates report. The project was carried out by the consulting firm Resource Futures International, with guidance provided by an international project steering committee.
3. The secretariat has the honour to provide in the annex to the present note, a summary of reporting project outcomes including the experience of stakeholders in pilot testing the possible indicators for reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach.
4. Participants in the present informal discussion may wish to review the outcomes of the reporting project to discuss whether the indicators that have been developed provide a good basis for consideration by the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management of an approach for formally reviewing progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach. In doing so, participants may wish to discuss:

* SAICM/InfDisc/1

- (a) a procedure for incorporating the experience gained through the pilot testing of the indicators so that a revised and improved set of indicators can be considered by the Conference at its second session;
 - (b) their views on the baseline estimates report and how it should be considered by the second session of the Conference.
5. Participants in the present discussion should refer to the following documents:
- (a) SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4 for full details of the possible indicators for implementation of the Strategic Approach. Annexes 1-4 of this document contain the indicators for Governments, non-governmental and civil society organizations, industry and intergovernmental organizations respectively;
 - (b) SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.1 for a compilation of the experience gained from pilot testing the possible indicators for Governments which has been carried out by the Governments of Belarus, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Germany, Liberia, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, and South Africa;
 - (c) SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.2 for a submission by the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA) on the possible indicators for industry;
 - (d) SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.3 for the African regional position on the development of modalities for reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach;
 - (e) SAICM/InfDisc/INF/5 for the baseline estimates report for possible indicators for reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach prepared by the international consulting firm Resource Futures International, also under the auspices of the Canadian Government-sponsored project referred to above.
6. The present note is prepared for the information of participants in the informal discussions. It has not been formally edited.

Annex

Summary of reporting project outcomes

Background

1. Reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach will be a key tool in assessing progress towards of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation goal of achieving the sound management of chemicals by 2020.
2. The official Strategic Approach texts provide, in paragraph 24 of the Overarching Policy Strategy, that the International Conference on Chemicals Management will undertake periodic reviews of the Strategic Approach. Functions of the Conference include in subparagraph 24 (a) “to receive reports from all relevant stakeholders on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach and to disseminate information as appropriate,” and in subparagraph 24 (b) to “evaluate the implementation of the Strategic Approach with a view to reviewing progress against the 2020 target and taking strategic decisions, programming, prioritizing and updating the approach as necessary.” The functions to be performed by the secretariat are also set out in the Overarching Policy Strategy and include in subparagraph 28 (b) “to report to the Conference on implementation of the Strategic Approach by all participants.”
3. In order to assist the development of appropriate reporting modalities, the Government of Canada has sponsored a project to develop a set of possible indicators for reporting progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach; and a baseline estimates report. The project was carried out by the consulting firm Resource Futures International, with guidance provided by an international project steering committee. Steering committee members included representatives nominated by Strategic Approach regional groups; industry; civil society groups; the Strategic Approach Quick Start Programme Executive Board and Trust Fund Implementation Committee; and the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC). The project to develop the possible reporting indicators was carried out from July 2007 to March 2008. During this period the steering committee held five teleconferences, facilitated by the Government of Canada. Comments provided by steering committee members at all stages of the project were compiled and made available by the secretariat on the Strategic Approach website, www.saicm.org, together with the summary records of each teleconference.
4. Progress reports on the project to develop modalities for reporting on the implementation of the Strategic Approach have been provided at relevant stages in the course of preparations for the project and during its implementation, including, to the Asia-Pacific region at its meeting held in Bangkok from 21 to 23 May 2007, to EU-JUSSCANNZ* countries at their second meeting held in Paris on 12 February 2007, to the Latin American and Caribbean region at its meeting held in Panama City from the 14 to 16 February 2008, to the African region at its second regional meeting held in Dar es Salaam, from the 16 to 17 July 2008 and to the Central and Eastern European region at its second meeting held in Bucharest, from 8 to 9 September 2008.
5. Participants in the informal discussions on preparations for the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management have before them the draft provisional agenda and the draft annotated provisional agenda for the second session of the Conference (document SAICM/InfDisc/7.) The draft provisional agenda includes under item 4 (c) “Modalities for reporting by stakeholders on progress in implementation”. Paragraph 18 of the draft provisional annotated agenda states that “The Conference may wish to consider the draft indicators and other reporting modalities developedwith a view to deciding on indicators to guide future reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach.”

* Japan, United States, Switzerland, Canada, Australia, Norway and New Zealand

Possible indicators

6. The Canadian Government-sponsored project has resulted in sets of possible indicators for reporting progress with the implementation of the Strategic Approach, one set for each of four groups of stakeholders; Governments, non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations, industry; and intergovernmental organizations. The draft reporting indicators are available in the form of questionnaires. Copies of the questionnaires are contained in document SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4 and may also be downloaded from the Strategic Approach website, www.saicm.org. At the present time the questionnaires are only available in English.

7. An overview of the indicators for the different stakeholder questionnaires is given in the appendix to the present document. The indicators are presented in the form of sets of questions, of which there are between 15 and 23 depending on the stakeholder group concerned. The questions are organized in seven sections which reflect the categories of objectives set out in the Overarching Policy Strategy, namely, Section A: Risk reduction, Section B: Knowledge and information, Section C: Governance, Section D: Capacity-building and technical cooperation and Section E: Illegal international traffic. The last remaining sections, Section F and Section G, address financial considerations (part V of the Overarching Policy Strategy) and institutional arrangements respectively. The sets of questions for each stakeholder group generally address the same types of information although there are some variations depending on the roles and activities of the stakeholder group in respect of chemicals management.

8. Within each section of the questionnaire, the questions address selected aspects of chemicals management for which information on progress with implementation is sought. For example, one of the questions for Governments in Section B asks whether knowledge and information on chemicals is adequate. This is done with reference to a number of elements such as chemicals inventories, product registers and contaminated environments.

9. The principal gauge for judging progress is whether or not a particular tool, instrument or activity is in place and if so, its implementation status. This is typically characterized as “not planned”, “in development” or “completed”. The annotation “updating” is proposed to be used if the tool, instrument or activity is completed but is being updated at the time of responding to the questionnaire or if updating has been done since 2006. Expected progress is tracked by periodic reporting. The questionnaires have space for descriptive or explanatory text to be added by the respondent and this is requested particularly if an activity is not in place or not planned. A supplementary gauge for monitoring progress is through the use of sub-questions which ask whether the work reported on applies to certain chemical categories.

11. Accompanying each stakeholder questionnaire is a set of definitions and instructions for completing them. The questionnaires are designed to be completed by the Strategic Approach stakeholders at the national level and the information aggregated on a regional and global basis in order to enable progress on implementation of the Strategic Approach to be reviewed periodically by the Conference. Further analysis based on the development status of countries, for example, least developed countries, is also anticipated.

12. When finalized, it is intended that the questionnaires would be made available in electronic form, perhaps using a similar electronic reporting system to that used by the secretariat of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, which assists countries in the task of compiling and submitting information under that Convention. This is also expected to accommodate reporting in different UN languages and to assist the secretariat in aggregating the data and in enabling the results to be analysed more efficiently and for different types of graphical presentation. The work to make an electronic data entry form can only be undertaken when the modalities for reporting by stakeholders have been agreed and the indicators are in their final form.

Pilot testing of the possible indicators

13. In order to assist in the finalization of the possible indicators a pilot testing phase was initiated in April 2008 by the secretariat. In this phase a number of Governments and other stakeholders expressed an interest in completing the relevant questionnaires with the objectives of:

- (a) providing information and feedback on the experience of a sample of stakeholders in gathering the proposed indicator information;
- (b) testing whether the information requested is feasible and practical to collect for each of the four stakeholders groups;
- (c) enabling any modifications to the indicators, including possible new indicators to be based, as far as possible, on the experience of the different stakeholder groups;
- (d) determining whether the associated guidance for collecting the indicator data is complete;
- (e) eliminating to the maximum extent any duplication of information being requested, taking into account other reporting mechanisms, for example, those of the chemical and wastes multi-lateral environment agreements.

14. Nine Governments participated in the pilot testing of the possible indicators for Governments and provided the results of their experiences to the secretariat. These were three Governments from the Central and Eastern European region; Belarus, the Czech Republic, and Romania; four Governments from the African region, Egypt, Liberia, Nigeria, and South Africa; the Government of Panama from the Latin America and the Caribbean region and the Government of Germany from the Western European and Others Group. The Governments of Zimbabwe and of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia also participated in discussions in the pilot testing phase but were unable to complete formally a report on their pilot testing experiences in the timeframe established for the project.

15. One industry group, ICCA, participated in the pilot testing of the possible indicators for industry and has provided a submission on its experience.

16. In addition to the pilot objectives above, the Government of Germany addressed several additional aspects including the usability for reporting about chemicals management status in Germany, and the relevance of the questions in the regional context considering the national and regional status of implementation of the Strategic Approach.

Results of pilot testing

17. The information contained in the completed questionnaires provided by the volunteer Governments was extracted and compiled in a series of tables by the secretariat so that the responses and indicator data could be compared. Document SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.1 prepared for the present informal discussions contains these tabulated and compiled results. The intent of the compilation was to qualitatively evaluate the overall responses. This is important to ensure the validity of future quantitative data aggregation, particularly when the indicators are being used widely by Strategic Approach stakeholders as part of their responsibilities to periodically report on progress with implementation.

18. Overall the pilot testing is an important step forward in considering the modalities of reporting. The results suggest, however, that the proposed indicators do need to be refined if they are to be used successfully for the periodic reporting on progress with the implementation of the Strategic Approach.

19. Before considering the main findings of the pilot testing, three aspects of the possible indicators deserve special mention in order to put the results of the pilot testing into context. Firstly the information sought through the questionnaires was anticipated to be existing factual information, however the respondents found that it did not exist in the same or an easily accessible place. All respondents spoke about the need to consult with a range of national authorities in order to complete the questionnaire. Secondly even though there are only a limited number of questions, 23 in total for the Government testers, when all the different sub-questions or elements are taken into account, the total adds up to 186 sets of results (as contained in document SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.1.) Streamlining the number of questions, and particularly reducing the

numbers of the sub-questions or elements would be useful in reducing both the effort required in completing the forms and consulting with other agencies for Governments and also the resources needed for an overall analysis. Thirdly, the format for the questionnaire used for the pilot testing was particularly cumbersome and did not lend itself well to the pilot testing exercise, either for the pilot testers or the secretariat in compiling the results. In the face of these difficulties the commitment of the Governments participating in the pilot testing exercise is particularly appreciated.

20. An overall report of the findings of the pilot testing and is being completed by the secretariat. The following highlight some of the scope for modifying the possible indicators under consideration in the present informal discussions:

(a) **Narrative text** is invited in filling in the questionnaires to provide further information or for describing the status of activities. This step was valuable in the pilot testing phase as in several areas of the questionnaires it was only when narrative text was provided that it became clear that the questionnaire was being interpreted in different ways or was not specific enough. All questions which have evoked large narrative responses should be reviewed to determine if the question can be asked in a more specific way. An example of this is the first question on national plans and profiles (table 1 of SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.1). A variety of plans are identified, sometimes several for each respondent with overlapping status of implementation and addressing overlapping categories of chemicals. However, if the purpose of the question was to gather information on how many countries had national chemical profiles or national implementation plans for the Strategic Approach this would not be possible. One respondent indicated that the Strategic Approach was being implemented by integration into relevant departmental activities. This is an answer to a different question about how the Strategic Approach is being addressed by Governments. This question is not explicitly asked in the set of questions although it may be implicit in question 23 which asks whether there is an inter-ministerial mechanism for the implementation of the Strategic Approach. On a practical level, if the provision for narrative information remains, provision will need to be made for its translation.

(b) **Unclear questions and terms** were identified in a number of areas of the questionnaire. For example, in relation to the status of national baseline information respondents did not know how to provide the implementation status for *unintentional releases* and *resources identified*. Similarly the terms *chemicals screening, compliance monitoring*, and the term *product use controls* in the questions on what chemicals management tools were in place; and the term *exposure pathway* in people in the questions on knowledge and information were among those stated to be unclear. Other issues encountered and which may invalidate the overall reporting on progress are the use of terms which were only understood and applicable in some countries or which would differ depending on the legislative frameworks in place, for example questions involving the terms *new chemicals* and *existing chemicals* which would be expected to differ substantially between countries.

(c) **Duplication of questions** between the different sections of the form. This was apparent in a number of areas, for example questions on what legislation existed for different categories of chemicals was repeated in form 1 on national baseline information and in the form 4 concerning national policies and legislative frameworks.

(d) **The use of "in development", "completed", and "not planned"** as measures to gauge progress. In general this was supported by the pilot test testers as a way of enabling progress to be monitored. It was found however, not to be relevant in all cases, for example those where a simple "yes" and "no" answer may be more relevant such as in response to questions such as "Have national capacity building needs for the sound management of chemicals been identified?" When this measurement of progress is called for at the same time as questions requiring separate detail for various sub-classes of chemical then form filling and interpretation becomes overly complicated. Use of either of these additional measures could be used more sparingly in the questionnaires.

(e) **The use of chemical categories** to provide additional specificity was not generally supported in all the cases where it was used. Areas where its use seemed appropriate included in relation to the question about what chemicals legislation was in place (for example, question 4) but for others such as the status of waste management measures, data gathering, and information provision it appeared to be superfluous.

(f) **The need for a better balance** of indicators in the different sections of the questionnaire. Sections A to G of the possible indicators for Governments run to 23 sets of questions each of which has a number of sub-questions or elements giving a total of 186 questions. Most of these sub-questions fall into the sections A and B on risk reduction and knowledge and information which have 63 and 25 sub-questions respectively. Comparatively very few questions are included about institutional arrangements (Section G, 4 questions), illegal international traffic (Section E, 3 questions) and capacity-building (Section E, 20 questions).

21. Several of the questions seek information that is relevant to reporting under multilateral environment agreements and also the recent International Health Regulations (2005). Further work and discussion is needed in this area to find solutions. The questions most affected are those relating to hazardous waste management, those seeking information on the status of national implementation plans under the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), those seeking information on the status of activities relating to POPs, those seeking information on the ratification of various international agreements and those where there is the possibility of extending the usefulness of the reporting for example, those enabling a link with the availability of different environmental and bio-monitoring data or those enquiring about the adequacy of analytical laboratories. It may be noted that in this latter case work is going on under the auspices of both the Stockholm Convention and the International Health Regulations to assess and strengthen capacities. It can be seen from these examples that just because information relates to reporting provisions in other instruments this is not necessarily the sole consideration.

22. There are two principal questionnaires that refer to the Quick Start Programme (QSP) Trust Fund of the Strategic Approach. One concerns proposals made in the three strategic priority areas of the QSP and one asks whether proposals had been made to other funding sources. A number of points arise in this case. The first questionnaire seeks information that is generally made publicly available on an ongoing basis by the secretariat (with the exception of proposals in development, declined or before the QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee). In this case it might be agreed that the information could be easily provided directly by the secretariat removing some of the reporting burden from countries. Secondly there is an ambiguity in the intent of question 22 in the section on financial considerations, referring as it does to "QSP proposals made to other funding sources." Presumably this could mean proposals addressing enabling capacity building needs, although this is not clear. Another problem which arises in the questionnaire is the use of the term "donor" and "recipient" country. These terms are not generally applicable and cause confusion. Related to this concern, question 22 about "mainstreaming" chemicals management are only asked of donor countries, although the question is more generally applicable. Participants in the present informal discussion may also wish to reflect on the information gathered through the separate questionnaire to assist preparations to evaluate the financial performance of the Strategic Approach (refer to document SAICM/InfDisc/3) in the case that any core questions other than those already being considered in the present possible indicators need to be included.

23. Finally, the secretariat also notes that while the possible indicators have not been formally edited, there are some numbering and typographical errors in the current proposed indicators which will need correction in any revised set to be prepared.

Submission from the ICCA

24. The proposed indicators for industry for reporting on progress in implementing the Strategic Approach are set out in Annex 3 of document SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4. An overview comparison of the indicators proposed for industry with those of other stakeholders is contained in appendix 1 of the present document.

25. ICCA has prepared a submission on the proposed indicators for industry in reporting on the implementation of the Strategic Approach as a contribution to the pilot testing. The submission from ICCA is contained in document SAICM/InfDisc/4/Add.2. ICCA has systematically considered the proposed indicators and taken into consideration the experience it has gained through the preparation and development of the ICCA Responsible Care Global Charter and the Global Product Strategy. The submission notes that the monitoring and tracking of the environmental, health and safety performance of a significant part of the industry has been in place since 1988 and that with the launching of the Global Product Strategy by ICCA at the first session of the Conference in Dubai, there are new possibilities for improvements. Accordingly the ICCA submission suggests a number of modifications to the proposed indicators in sections A to E and sets out how certain elements can be used to enhance the effectiveness of the proposals while at the same time building on existing work by industry. The submission identifies challenges with the proposed section F on financial considerations and draws attention to possibilities for reducing duplication and redundancy of the indicators between the different sections of the questionnaire. Using a proposed metric to gauge progress with implementation such as the proposed “Not planned”, “In Development”, “Completed” or “Underway” is supported.

Views from regional meetings

26. At its recent meeting, held from 16 to 17 July 2008 in Dar es Salaam, the African region, adopted a regional position on the development of modalities for reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach. The position is contained in the document SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4/Add.3.

27. The position includes specific comments on the proposed questionnaires for collecting indicator data and a number of recommendations for improving the questionnaires and means of encouraging their completion. The African regional position confirmed the importance of reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach at a national level in order to measure progress towards the 2020 goal for the sound management of chemicals set out in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. The African region recommends that a) the questionnaire should be made more user-friendly; b) the questionnaire approach should be combined with national meetings to facilitate collection of the information; c) there is a need to consider what information that stakeholders can reasonably provide; and d) provision of resources for information gathering to complete the questionnaire will be crucial to facilitate effective reporting.

Temporary reporting arrangements for the second session of the Conference

28. The informal “Friends of the Secretariat” planning group for the second session of the Conference has proposed that in the current absence of a periodic reporting mechanism agreed by the Conference, Strategic Approach stakeholders should be given the opportunity to provide basic information on progress in implementation by completing a temporary questionnaire. Accordingly the secretariat has revised the former questionnaire used to solicit information in advance of regional meetings during 2006 to 2008 and has issued a temporary questionnaire in June 2008. This questionnaire is available on the Strategic Approach website and has already been used to prepare for the second Central and Eastern European regional meeting on the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, held from 8 to 9 September 2008 in Bucharest, Romania. Responses to the temporary questionnaire in preparation for the second session of the Conference are sought from all stakeholders by 30 November 2008.

29. The temporary questionnaire for reporting on progress in implementation of the Strategic Approach is not intended to be considered an alternative to the detailed draft reporting indicators that will be addressed by the second session of the Conference.

30. The secretariat had also issued a questionnaire for stakeholders ahead of the present informal discussions, to gather information to assist preparations for evaluating the performance of the financing of the Strategic Approach at the second session of the Conference. The questions in this questionnaire include many that are also feature in the set of possible indicators developed under the Government of Canada-sponsored project.

Baseline report

31. In order to monitor progress in implementing the Strategic Approach it was assumed to be necessary to have a baseline against which to measure progress. As part of the Canadian Government-sponsored project to develop the draft indicators for reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach, a baseline estimates report was prepared on selected indicators by the international consulting firm Resource Futures International. In the absence of agreed indicator information being available from Strategic Approach stakeholders this report has been prepared using readily available published information for the period from 2002 to 2007. The report is contained in document SAICM/InfDisc/INF/5 for the present informal discussions and is also available on the Strategic Approach website, www.saicm.org.

32. In June 2008, following the delivery of the report, the secretariat requested comments on the completeness of the information sources used to compile the baseline estimates report and sought proposals as to additional sources of relevant information to order to assist in preparing for discussion on this issue at the second session of the Conference. No additional information or comments have been received by the secretariat.

33. The main finding of the baseline estimates report is that for the period from 2002 to 2007 there is a lack of quantifiable comparable data on chemicals management that is systematically collected within regions or internationally, including for many key risk management and governance indicators. The lack of even a core set of data is seen by the authors as something that will seriously undermine efforts to evaluate progress with the implementation of the Strategic Approach.

Conclusions and possible next steps

34. The use of indicators for reporting on progress with implementation of the Strategic Approach will greatly facilitate the Conference in evaluating its progress. Beyond the upcoming second session of the Conference there are a further three sessions of the Conference foreseen by 2020, the year associated with the Johannesburg Plan of Action goal of achieving the sound management of chemicals. Consideration of indicators of progress at the upcoming session of the Conference will therefore be a necessary step to enable formal reports to be made at its subsequent three sessions.

35. The Government of Canada-sponsored project to develop modalities for reporting on the implementation of the Strategic Approach has made an important contribution to enabling consideration of this issue at the second session of the Conference. The pilot testing phase has resulted in a wealth of information and experience and has shown a number of areas of the possible indicators where modifications should be made improve the proposed indicators. These modifications include refinement of the questions, improving their clarity, removing duplication between sections of the questionnaire and reducing the use of chemical categories to a minimum, only where this additional detail is necessary.

36. The experience with routine reporting ahead of regional meetings and the use of recent temporary questionnaires has shown that obtaining a good return rate from stakeholders will be an ongoing challenge. However, this is the experience of similar voluntary reporting schemes elsewhere. The use of the temporary reporting questionnaires has resulted in much useful narrative information, particularly in descriptions of bilateral and regional project support. A way to build this into a revised set of indicators should be examined.

37. The Strategic Approach is to be implemented on a voluntary basis by stakeholders and as such not all stakeholders may be able or willing to report on all indicators of progress. More than one stakeholder has referred to the resources needed for completing the questionnaires. Although the information is existing, the efforts in gathering it together and filling out the questionnaires can be still significant in some cases. Little attention has so far been given to the use of the indicator data at a national level and if Governments were able to use the reporting tool to fulfil some of their needs at a national level then the additional resources to submit the information to the Conference may be less of an obstacle. Many of the indicators are consistent with the work needing to be done

in identifying national priorities and developing national SAICM implementation plans and assessing capacity-building needs. Ways to better align and use the reporting instrument in strategic planning could be considered, including as well as in the context of national and regional meetings. Similarly the availability of an electronic reporting tool could help with such as shift away from seeing reporting as an end in itself. Given the experience that valuable factual narrative information has provided if narrative reporting, for example, names and reference to chemical plans and profiles, then this information could also make a useful contribution to the information clearinghouse function of the Strategic Approach. Use of the electronic reporting system could enable such information to be submitted more easily updated.

38. The pilot testing has resulted in a common view that the number of indicators should be reduced. Over and above reductions that are possible through revision and modification of the current proposed indicators, if further reductions are seen as essential then consideration might be given to developing a core set of indicators with a supplementary set available for those Governments with a wish to report in more detail. Ensuring comparability at the level of the core indicators would enable additional data to be reported to provide a more in-depth view in selected areas. Such an approach would also lend itself to the development of additional indicators as experience with periodic reporting over the years develops.

Appendix

Overview of possible indicators for reporting on implementation of the Strategic Approach for the different stakeholder groups

(refer to SAICM/InfDisc/INF/4 for full questionnaires)

SAICM OPS Section	Overview of indicator information	Form number in relevant stakeholder questionnaire			
	Respondent information				
a)	Country name, SAICM regional group, development status LDC or Economy in transition and contact details for respondent	GOV			
b)	Title of NGO, SAICM regional group in which NGO operates and contact details for respondent		NGO		
c)	Title of international industry association, respondent contact details and description of the make-up of the association by top 4 industry sectors represented (expressed as percentage of membership from nominated industry sectors)			Industry	
d)	NGO title, SAICM regional group and respondent contact details				IGO
Section A	Risk reduction	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
a)	Status of national baseline information on chemicals risk management activities Implementation status for each of a selected set of baseline information topics for <i>specified chemical categories</i> plus description/explanation if not planned.	Form 1			
b)	Types of tools/instruments to promote preventive measures (Pollution prevention) Implementation status for each of a <i>selected set of tools/instruments</i> for specified <i>chemical categories</i> plus description/explanation if not planned	Form 2	Form 2	Form 2	Form 2

Section A	Risk reduction continued ...	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
c)	<p>Types of tools/instruments to minimize risks to human health and the environment Implementation status for each of a <i>selected set of tools/instruments</i> for <i>specified chemical categories</i> plus description/explanation if not planned <i>Form 3.1</i> applies for government respondents who indicated Y for environmental monitoring requesting additional information on <i>status of specified environmental pollutant/media</i> <i>Form 3.2</i> applies for government respondents who indicated Y for biomonitoring requesting additional information on status of <i>specified types of human biomonitoring data</i></p>	Form 3 3.1 3.2	Form 3	Form 3	Form 3
d)	<p>National policies and legislative frameworks for risk management Implementation status for <i>selected national policies and legislation</i> for environment and/or human health for <i>specified chemical categories</i> plus description/explanation if not planned</p>	Form 4			
e)	<p>Instruments to reduce generation of hazardous waste Implementation status for each of a <i>selected set of selected parameters relating to hazardous waste</i> for <i>specified chemical categories</i> plus description/explanation if not planned</p>	Form 5			
f)	<p>Policies and legislative instruments for environmentally sound recovery and recycling of hazardous waste Implementation status for both policy and legislative responses for <i>specified types of hazardous materials and waste</i> plus description/explanation if not planned</p>	Form 6	Form 4 (promotion)	Form 4 (promotion)	Form 4 (promotion)
g)	<p>Strategies to assist with pollution prevention and risk reduction activities for the sound management of chemicals List titles of strategies applicable to SAICM, whether in place before 2006, whether funds are available to implement and describe whether budgets for implementation have increased or not relative to 2006. If no strategies whether specific review has taken place to determine applicability to SAICM. Implementation status, participation rates of industry association membership, funds allocated for implementation and whether or not verifiable reporting system in place for specific SAICM implementation strategies including Responsible Care, Global Charter, Global Product Stewardship plus description/explanation as appropriate</p>		Form 1	Form 1	Form 1
h)	<p>Specific stakeholders involved in activities Identify and describe which of a <i>specific list of stakeholder groups</i> are worked with and identify relevant partnerships</p>		Forms 5	Form 5	Form 5
i)	<p>Partnerships with other sectors of society in support of SAICM implementation</p>		Form 6	Form 6	Form 6
Section B	Knowledge and information	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
j)	<p>Adequacy of knowledge and information on chemicals management to enable assessment and management throughout Assessment of adequacy of information (<i>adequate/inadequate</i>) resulting from <i>selected set of types of instruments</i> plus description</p>	Form 7			

k)	Availability of health and safety information on chemicals in support of risk reduction and decision to the public and vulnerable groups Whether or not information is available to <i>specified stakeholders</i> for each of a <i>list of selected information categories</i>	Form 8			
l)	Sharing information with other countries: Information produced on risk reduction and other tools for promotion of best practices in chemicals management /harmonization Whether or not information is shared through each of <i>four specific types of cooperation</i> . Description if no information shared	Form 9			
m)	Initiatives to promote and support knowledge and information on health and safety and best practices for chemicals management Implementation status for each of a selected list of types of initiative for <i>specified chemical categories</i> plus description or explanation if not planned		Form 7 & 8	Form 7	Form 7 & 8
n)	Type of “service” mechanism or instrument used to deliver knowledge Describe whether types from a <i>selected list</i> are used		Form 8.1	Form 7.1	Form 8.1
o)	Research in support of sound management of chemicals Identify and describe types of research from a <i>selected list</i>		Form 9	Form 8	Form 9
Section C	Governance	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
p)	National chemicals priorities Implementation status and description of approaches/mechanism used for identifying priorities, whether priorities are consistent with SAICM and whether budgets have increased or decreases for priority setting since 2006.	Form 10			Form 10
q)	Regional, bilateral and other forms of cooperation on sound management of chemicals Description of types of cooperation undertaken and implementation status	Form 11			
r)	Country ratification of selected chemicals-related multilateral environment agreements and initiatives Ratification status and plans and implementation status and plans for <i>list of selected international agreements</i>	Form 12			
s)	Public consultation on sound management of chemicals in key sectors Status of public consultation for <i>specified list of stakeholder groups</i> together with description and/or explanation if not planned	Form 13			
t)	Strategic priorities (and comparative advantage) for chemicals management Implementation status, whether integrated with organizations workplan and/or strategies		Form 10	Form 9 (1)	
u)	Mainstreaming of sound management of chemicals into other areas of work Describe efforts		Form 11		Form 11
v)	Reporting mechanisms for national associations to show progress towards SAICM implementation (Y/N)			Form 9 (2)	

Section D	Capacity building and technical cooperation	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
a)	National capacity-building needs identified for sound management of chemicals Description and implementation status for identification of capacity-building needs together with lead agencies involved and whether needs identified/reviewed or updated with reference to 2006	Form 14			
b)	Areas in which capacity for the sound management of chemicals has been strengthened since the adoption of SAICM in 2006 Identification of which of a <i>selected list of capacity-building activities</i> for specified chemical categories have been strengthened Description of activities carried out in cooperation with other countries.	Form 15			
c)	Sound management of chemicals as a priority issue in key national planning policy Description/explanation of how SAICM has been incorporated and whether or not are steps being taken in this regard	Form 16			
d)	Partnerships and mechanisms for provision of technical cooperation and clean technology to developing countries established since 2006 Description of type of partnership/mechanism and future plans	Form 17			
e)	Institutional capacity Describe whether institutional/capacity and/or technical barriers identified, and describe resource mobilization plans and training programmes that exist for chemicals management work		Form 12		Form 12
f)	Survey of national members about training/education in support of SAICM implementation Description & details of whether conducted in developing countries			Form 10	
Section E	Illegal international traffic	GOV	NGO	Industry	NGO
a)	National legislation to prevent and punish illegal traffic in toxic, hazardous, banned and severely restricted chemicals Description of legislation in place including whether or not consistent with provision of illegal traffic of Basel Convention (Art.9)	Form 18			

b)	Status of regional cooperation on prevention and control Implementation status of cooperation of illegal traffic in toxic, banned and severely restricted chemicals and whether or not the work applies to <i>selected groups charged with control/compliance</i> .	Form 19			
c)	Programmes in place to assist with measurement and control of illegal international traffic Describe, give implementation status and identify <i>selected groups</i> to whom programme applies		Form 13		Form 13
d)	Guidance/Training provided in support of illegal international traffic			Form 11	
Section F	Financial considerations	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
a)	Proposals made to (or supported by) the SAICM QSP Trust Fund If country is eligible for funding provide a brief description, year, amount requested, and outcome for each of the three main areas of SAICM QSP strategic objectives together with descriptions of contributions to approved projects made from government or industry budgets. For NGO, provide brief description, of cooperation /partnership with countries and contribution in monetary terms for each of the three main areas of SAICM QSP strategic objectives	Form 20	Form 15	Form 13	Form 14
b)	Proposals made (or funds contributed) to funding sources other than SAICM If country is eligible for funding provide a brief description, year, amount requested, and outcome for each of the three main areas of SAICM QSP strategic objectives for other funding mechanisms	Form 21	Form 16	Form 14	Form 15
c)	Incorporation of mainstreaming of sound management of chemicals into Official Development Assistance (ODA) of national aid agencies in donor countries Description of efforts made	Form 22			
d)	Budgets for development and implementation of chemicals management strategies/activities Indicate relative size compared to 2006		Form 14	Form 12	Form 16
Section G	Institutional arrangements	GOV	NGO	Industry	IGO
a)	Inter-ministerial and or inter-institutional mechanism for implementation of SAICM Status of mechanism for <i>specified list of ministries/institutions</i> and whether or not in place before or after the adoption of SAICM (2006)	Form 23			
b)	Designated SAICM Focal point Coordination with other NGOs for SAICM implementation Briefly describe actions		Form 17		Form 15

