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Executive Summary

On 23\textsuperscript{rd} March 2021 a webinar was held to assist considerations on indicators and reporting for ‘SAICM beyond 2020\textsuperscript{1}’, by providing the stakeholder community for this process with examples of how other UN frameworks have met this need. This report presents a summary of the presentations in the webinar, along with the results of interactions with the participants.

The webinar was 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). It was held via Zoom with a morning and afternoon session of the same programme, to accommodate as many time zones as possible, and with interpretation to French and Spanish.

The webinar was attended by about 70 participants for each session. The webinar registrations were from 158 people from over 35 countries, of which 89 were from government, 32 from non-government organisations, 9 from the private sector, and 26 from UN agencies.

After most of the presentations in the webinar the participants were invited to submit responses using the online program Mentimeter, which produces summary graphics of the responses. The number of respondents to each question was between 25 and 35. Please note that the results from the Mentimeter exercise in this report are from only the webinar participants who used this online tool and are not representative of all SAICM stakeholders.

Summary of the programme

The SAICM Secretariat provided considerations on reporting mechanisms and indicators for ‘SAICM Beyond 2020’. As well as ‘process indicators’ on the implementation of SAICM, they supported a need for ‘impact’ indicators on the state of the environment and public health regarding chemicals and waste.

The Co-Facilitators of Virtual Working Groups 1 and 2 gave an Overview of progress and remaining steps for targets and indicators beyond 2020. Their considerations on further work included:

- A need to reflect on the formulation of the Strategic Objectives since they were formulated in April 2019;
- a need to consider targets together with the strategic objective formulations to establish a comprehensive indicator framework for the new instrument;
- Targets need to be considered in a reiterative process and together with the indicators;
- Some targets may be considered as higher-level targets or indicators, or in the High-level Declaration.

The IOMC introduced their proposed indicators for SAICM implementation.

UNEP-WCMC presented summary information on the target, reporting and indicators used in three frameworks or agreements of the United Nations, with the aim of providing information and ideas for the development of SAICM beyond 2020:

- International Health Regulations (IHR)
- Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
- Convention on Biological Diversity and proposed targets, indicators and reporting for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

At the end of the second webinar session there was time for some Mentimeter questions on important indicator and reporting issues for SAICM beyond 2020.

\textsuperscript{1} ‘SAICM beyond 2020’ is used in this report as a short name for the instrument that will be agreed as a result of the intersessional process to prepare recommendations regarding the Strategic Approach and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020. [http://www.saicm.org/Beyond2020/IntersessionalProcess/tabid/5500/Default.aspx](http://www.saicm.org/Beyond2020/IntersessionalProcess/tabid/5500/Default.aspx)
Topics identified in the webinar of relevance to future discussions on ‘SAICM beyond 2020’

The main section of the report and its Annex give all the information presented on the three frameworks or agreements and the Mentimeter results. Topics identified in the presentations and participants’ responses which may be of relevance in future discussions on ‘SAICM beyond 2020’ include:

- The importance of developing SAICM beyond 2020 to include **a focus on its impact and implementation**, with important roles of indicators and reporting mechanisms in achieving this;
- The **different legal status of the frameworks or agreements**, from legal binding (IHR) to not linked to any other agreement (Sendai Framework);
- All three example agreements had some form of **instrument for national implementation**, with associated targets, indicators and reporting. They were mostly designed as **global frameworks for national adaptation and implementation**;
- All three example agreements had developed **online platforms for reporting and communicating progress**. The importance of such user-friendly platforms was a common theme.
- The International Health Regulations have **indicators measured by defined levels of capacity**;
- The Sendai Framework has global implementation and **impact indicators for use by all countries, as well as nationally customised targets and indicators**, developed with scientific input;
- The draft post-2020 global biodiversity framework is considering **milestones to 2030**, and a set of **headline indicators** for all Parties as part of a more comprehensive monitoring framework.
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SAICM Secretariat: Considerations on reporting mechanisms

Brenda Koekkoek and Delfina Cuglievan presented considerations from the independent evaluation of SAICM, which examined previous work to develop indicators for reporting, and highlighted uses for an indicator framework which require further development. Many of the indicators developed to date have been ‘process’ indicators, on the implementation of SAICM. The evaluation identified a need also for ‘impact’ indicators on the state of the environment and public health regarding chemicals and waste. A clear demonstration of progress using indicators will help to demonstrate the impact of SAICM and to gain political support.

To date the SAICM Secretariat has produced three progress reports and a fourth one is due to be released, subject to ICCM-5. For the Third meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020, the SAICM Secretariat produced the report: ‘SAICM/IP.3/10 Secretariat analysis of options for modalities to assess progress beyond 2020’. This identified a need to track progress using multiple sources and for different stakeholder groups, considering different ways to report on the proposed Strategic Objectives for SAICM beyond 2020 (Figure 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Focus of the actions</th>
<th>Key data holders</th>
<th>Key hooks</th>
<th>Potential methods for data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>National level implementation</td>
<td>National governments, Convention secretariats</td>
<td>SDGs 3,6,11,12 Circularity, Health</td>
<td>National data collection, voluntary national reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Data collection, availability, information generation and repositories</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Science-based data</td>
<td>Supply chain data, collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Addressing areas not addressed elsewhere including potentially activities related to regulation, science and data</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Science, sustainable development, circularity, health, collaboration</td>
<td>Circularity, SDG 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Innovation, research and development, sustainable solutions</td>
<td>Academia, private sector</td>
<td>Circularity, SDG 12</td>
<td>In-depth sector reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mobilizing finances, establishing partnerships</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>SDG 3, 6, 12, 17</td>
<td>Periodic ‘special contributions’ linked to SDGs, analyze project results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: SAICM Secretariat suggestions of methods of data collection for proposed Strategic Objectives for SAICM beyond 2020

The Secretariat encouraged webinar participants to consider other models, beyond processes already in place, to further develop the SAICM approach to reporting and indicator frameworks.
Figure 2. Results from the first and second webinar sessions of participant’s responses via Mentimeter to the question, “in one to three words, what is the most important thing for SAICM beyond 2020, in response to the Secretariat’s presentation?” The most frequently shared input is largest in the word-cloud.

The survey respondents gave a high importance to the implementation and impact of the framework, and of having indicators to support progress reporting.
Virtual Working Groups 1 and 2: Overview of progress and remaining steps for targets and indicators beyond 2020

With restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the postponement of the **fourth meeting of the intersessional process considering the Strategic Approach and sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020 (IP4)** and the **fifth session of the International conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5)**, the ICCM5 Bureau and the co-chairs of the intersessional process have proposed to establish a number of Virtual Working Groups (VWGs) to support the work of the intersessional process to advance its deliberations.

The co-facilitators of VWG1 ‘Targets, Indicators and Milestones’, Silvija Kalnins and Wajira Palipane, presented on the progress made by the group towards the development of an indicator framework, and the next steps. The indicator framework’s proposed vision and scope, and the ongoing deliberations on its wording, demonstrates the complex and delicate balance needed for this framework to support and represent all stakeholder needs.

---

### IP2 Meeting
March 2019

- Co-chairs paper was discussed (identification of Strategic Objectives and target formulation).
- Outcome document was annexed to the meeting report and submitted to the OEWG3 meeting for its consideration.

### OEWG2
April 2019

- Introduction of co-chairs paper and proposal on SO and targets.
- No discussions on targets, discussion on vision, scope and SOs. Introduced brackets.
- Outcome document was annexed to the meeting report and submitted to the IP3 meeting for its consideration.

### IP3
October 2019

- Partial discussions took place on vision, scope and the strategic objectives.
- Discussions on targets, principles and approaches were not sufficiently considered within the contact group.
- Outcome document was annexed to the meeting report.

### Technical Working Group
January 2020

- Development of outcome documents SAICM/P4/5 and SAICM/P4/INF/15. Used as basis for discussions of VWG1.

---

**Figure 3: Steps taken to develop targets and indicators prior to VWG1, presented by Silvija Kalnins (co-facilitator for VWG1)**

Co-facilitators of VWG2 ‘Governance and Mechanisms for Implementation’, Karissa Kovner and Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn, introduced Section G of the proposed framework, aiming to enable global progress through the facilitation of national level contributions by reviewing and evaluating progress for further improvement. The aims of the proposed reporting process are to uncover opportunities for scaling up and improvement, to share information and to assess the need for enhanced efforts and, as needed, further prioritization.

Some of the issues faced by VWG1 in the development of targets and indicators were described by co-facilitator Silvija Kalnins. These ranged from the use and definition of terminology, and the harmonization of targets and indicators across stakeholder groups. Outcomes from the VWG include a document of possible formulations of targets based on stakeholder input, and two options for further work were proposed.
Considerations moving forward:

- There have been no substantive discussions on the formulation of the Strategic Objectives since before the OEWG3 in April 2019, thus through discussions, participants identified a necessity to reflect upon them in the future;
- The VWG identified a need to consider targets together with the strategic objective formulations to establish a comprehensive indicator framework for the new instrument;
- Targets need to be considered in a reiterative process and together with the indicators, in order to capture and develop a comprehensive indicator framework for the instrument including considerations of resources and capacities for monitoring implementation;
- Some targets may be considered as higher-level targets or indicators, or in the High-level Declaration.

Figure 4: Summary of considerations for VWG1 Targets, Indicators and Milestones
The survey respondents gave a high importance to designing the framework to make an impact, and to having achievable indicators and “SMART” targets developed together in an iterative process with broad participation.
IOMC Indicators of progress in implementing SAICM

Bob Diderich introduced the work of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) on indicators for the implementation of SAICM.

**8 initial IOMC indicators of progress (2015)**

1. Number of countries that have achieved core capacities for chemicals under the international Health Regulations (WHO)
2. Number of countries with National Profiles (UNITAR)
3. Number of countries with a PRTR (UNITAR)
4. Number of countries with poisons centres (WHO)
5. Countries with controls for lead in decorative paint (WHO and UNEP)
6. Countries which have implemented pesticide legislation based on the FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct (FAO)
7. Number of parties to the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm, and Minamata Conventions
8. Implementation of the GHS (UNITAR, ILO, UNECE)

*Figure 6: Initial IOMC indicators for SAICM*

These process related indicators, which have since evolved, relate to core capabilities needed nationally for SAICM implementation, and link to Section A of the proposed beyond-2020 framework. Each indicator is hosted by a UN agency or process, alongside existing processes and reducing burden on national governments. Each indicator is represented visually, often as maps, with further detail and data included.

*Figure 7: Example of IOMC indicator of progress, by OECD*
Overview on targets, reporting and indicators from three UN frameworks

Philip Bubb from UNEP-WCMC introduced the target, reporting and indicator frameworks used in three frameworks or agreements of the United Nations, with the aim of providing information and ideas for the development of SAICM beyond 2020. These frameworks were the International Health Regulations (IHRs), the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

**International Health Regulations (IHR):**

Adopted by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2005, the IHRs are a legally binding instrument of international law that aims for international collaboration between countries in agreement. The regulations aim to maintain core national capacities to prevent, protect against, control, and provide a public health response to the international spread of disease.

The IHR indicator framework is designed around 13 ‘core capacities’ regarding public health events, with 24 indicators each measured by five levels of capacity. Alongside the indicator framework, the WHO have produced a series of ‘benchmark’ suggested actions including guidance for improving IHR capacity.

Implementation of the framework is supported by National Action Plans for Health Security (NAPHS). Countries monitor and evaluate their progress in the development and maintenance of their national capacities for the IHR through a State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool (SPAR). The monitoring and evaluating framework also includes voluntary external evaluation, to further explore how their national progress and capacity for IHR has impacted them nationally.

The reporting mechanism is based in an online platform, e-SPAR. The platform monitors rates of reporting and progress at national and regional scales and displays this visually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implementation reporting</th>
<th>Impact reporting</th>
<th>Use of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **13 Capacities re public health events**  
  - no dates  
  - legally binding  
  - National governments | State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool (e-SPAR) & website  
  WHO Global Health Observatory website | | Promote action for low Capacities  
 Public communication of IHR capacity levels |
| National implementation instrument  
 National Action Plan for Health Security | Implementation indicators  
 24 indicators for 13 Capacities  
 Levels 1 to 5 of performance for each indicator  
 Benchmarks for the Capacities | Impact indicators | Data providers  
 State Parties |

The webinar participants were invited to share their thoughts on the most important elements to consider, **in response to the introduction of the IHR frameworks**, for SAICM in developing an indicator framework via Mentimeter (Figure 9).
**Mandatory National Action Plans and Reporting**

**Lessons learned**

**Good Reporting Tool**

**Capacity is Key to Impact**

**Capacities Not Just Outcomes**

**Targeted Indicators**

---

**Online Reporting Platform**

**National Action Plans**

**Levels Capacities**

**Actions and Communication as Outcomes from Indicators**

**Annual Online Reporting System**

**Accountability**

---

**Legally Binding for Governments**

**To Improve the Capacity to Manage Chemicals and Waste at the National Level and to Be Able to Communicate Progress to the Public and Politically**

**Might Be Too Far Away from an Indicator-Based System**

**Use Existing Relevant Indicators, Include High Level Indicators**

**Actions Differ to Indicators and Are About Capacity**

**Legally Binding**

---

**Template for Reporting that is Easy to Use and Reduces the Reporting Burden**

**NATIONAL ACTION PLAN**
Some of the common topics identified in the Mentimeter responses on the IHR presentation included:

- the legally binding nature of the IHR,
- the use of capacity levels to measure and report on implementation of the IHR,
- the value of a good and simple online reporting mechanism,
- and the existence of national action plans.
Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction

Adopted in 2015 with targets for the year 2030 and supported by the UNDRR, the Sendai Framework operates on the premise that the State has the primary role to reduce disaster risk, but that responsibility should be shared with other stakeholders.

The Sendai Framework promotes accountability through transparency and is designed for clear communication of national and regional progress against the objectives in the targets. Countries self-report to the Sendai Framework via an online tool, the Sendai Framework Monitor. This tool also supports countries to produce their national strategies for disaster risk reduction and share data.

The framework consists of seven outcome related targets which were developed by an open-ended Intergovernmental Expert Working Group. The targets are quantitative and measurable, four are relating to drivers or risks and they should be reduced, while the other three relate to increasing capacities nationally. There are no definite limits set by the framework for these targets, but there are clear goals and priorities for action set out.

The framework also includes 38 global outcome related indicators, with technical guidance on how to collect the data needed in reporting, which allow for global progress to be understood. Alongside the global indicators, each country is encouraged to identify additional ‘output’ and ‘input’ related indicators tailored to their national context, to improve links to national policies and priorities. The Sendai Framework can be applied regionally and nationally, and it is not legally binding nor is it associated with any Multi-lateral Agreement.

Implementation is supported by the production of national disaster risk reduction strategies and guidelines for national capacity building. Bi-annual progress reports detail progress against the targets, measured and presented in a quantified way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Implementation reporting</th>
<th>Impact reporting</th>
<th>Use of reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 global - for disaster risk reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• By 2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• national targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendai Framework Monitor online tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial Global Assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sendai Framework Monitor online tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial Global Assessment reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote accountability for implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide international &amp; national action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public communication of progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The audience was invited to share their thoughts on the most important elements to consider, in response to the introduction of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, for SAICM in developing an indicator framework via Mentimeter (Figure 11).
Some of the common topics identified in the Mentimeter responses on the Sendai Framework presentation included:

- the existence of targets and indicators of impact/outcome and of implementation/process,
- the design of the framework at global, national and local scales,
- the non-legally binding nature of the framework.
**Convention on Biological Diversity**

Currently the CBD is in the process of developing a **new framework for post-2020**, which maintains a ‘Vision’ and four ‘Goals’ for 2050 with ‘Milestones’ to be reached by 2030 and 20 ‘Action Targets’. From these targets, a monitoring framework will be developed with indicators and targets for each monitoring element. There is a proposal that the monitoring framework may also be used to identify gaps in national commitments and capacity. The proposed global biodiversity framework places clear emphasis on the means of implementation, creating an enabling environment and promotes responsibility and transparency.

The CBD **Strategic Plan** for Biodiversity 2011-2020 consisted of 20 Aichi Targets. These targets were accompanied by a list of over 50 ‘indicative’ indicators, which were not mandatory and instead optional for countries to support reporting to the convention. These indicators were developed by an expert group with support from the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership at UNEP-WCMC.

The CBD is primarily implemented via National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and has online national reporting every four years. Global Biodiversity Outlook reports are produced every five years, accompanied by Local Biodiversity Outlooks to include contributions of indigenous and local knowledge. Within these reports, progress towards the Aichi Targets are measured using several indicators, the data for which is produced by IPBES and other scientific groups on biodiversity.

![Figure 12: Summary of the targets and indicators framework of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.](image)

The audience was invited to share their thoughts on the most important elements to consider, in **response to the introduction of the Convention on Biological Diversity**, for SAICM in developing an indicator framework via Mentimeter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science Policy Platform</th>
<th>Simple and efficient</th>
<th>Need for strong implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(GEF) Funding facilitates reporting</td>
<td>Keep it simple</td>
<td>Agreement of quantitative metrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea of headline indicators</td>
<td>collaborations and partnerships</td>
<td>Establish Science Policy Interface Keep reporting effort limited but meaningful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science Policy Platform Need for strong implementation GEF funding facilities reporting</th>
<th>Indicator development is hard and demanding technical work...</th>
<th>information triggers next steps in collaboration with all stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work together across boundaries</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>headline indicators, impact indicators and reporting indicators</th>
<th>limited number of targets</th>
<th>impact &amp; outcome; identify gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform</td>
<td>We need to connect efforts!</td>
<td>Needs to be more streamlined and synergies recognised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation and impact assessment</td>
<td>Govt and stakeholder commitments in voluntary mechanism</td>
<td>Milestone for 2030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need to be clear that Parties have flexibility in reporting - not all indicators need to be reported by all</th>
<th>Participation of NGOs in data collection for reporting - must be financially and institutionally underfed-</th>
<th>Too many different roles for indicators - confuse stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure synergies between the agendas, e.g. pollution is about emissions NOx, SOx, POPs, Mercury, pesticides use...</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>linkages between different mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive framework with reporting and review mechanism</td>
<td>implementation and impact assessment</td>
<td>headline indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of the common topics identified in the Mentimeter responses on the CBD presentation included:

- the existence of a science-policy platform,
- to make linkages between the chemicals and biodiversity frameworks,
- the idea of headline indicators for all countries to use and a wider set of optional indicators,
- the idea of milestones to a target.
Mentimeter Survey

At the end of the second session of the webinar time allowed for the following Mentimeter questions to be posed to the webinar participants:

1. How important is it for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’ to have:

   - An online tool for submitting indicator data and reporting on progress (3.6)
   - A few ‘headline indicators’ (3.8)
   - A few ‘impact indicators’ on the health of people and the environment (4.4)

2. How important are the following uses of global indicators for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’?

   - Measuring progress towards targets to understand priorities for action (4.3)
   - Communicating to supporters and wider society the progress and needs for the targets (4.4)
   - To identify stakeholders needing more support (3.9)
3. In the earlier Mentimeter exercises, UNEP-WCMC identified the following words as important for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’. Which of these keywords are most important?

Additionally, the webinar participants were asked to provide feedback on the webinar:

1. How useful was this webinar for your participation in the development of ‘SAICM beyond 2020’?

2. Which session of the webinar was most useful?
## Annex 1: Agenda and presenters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration (mins)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Introduction to the purpose, agenda and operation of the webinar.</td>
<td>Philip Bubb (UNEP-WCMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SAICM Secretariat considerations on reporting mechanisms and indicators for 'SAICM Beyond 2020'.</td>
<td>Brenda Koekkoek and Delfina Cuglievan (SAICM Secretariat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentimeter exercise and results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Overview of progress and remaining steps to have 'SAICM beyond 2020' targets and indicators.</td>
<td>Silvija Nora Kalniņš and Wajira Palipane (Co-facilitators of VWG1 Targets, Indicators and Milestones) Karisa Kovner and Teeraporn Wiriwutikorn (Co-facilitators of VWG2 Governance and Mechanisms for Implementation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentimeter exercise and results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IOMC indicators for SAICM implementation</td>
<td>Bob Diderich (IOMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>International Health Regulations (IHR) indicators and Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool.</td>
<td>Philip Bubb (UNEP-WCMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentimeter exercise and results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lessons from the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction on targets and indicators, and on using monitoring to support implementation.</td>
<td>Philip Bubb (UNEP-WCMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentimeter exercise and results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lessons from the Convention on Biological Diversity on proposed targets, indicators and reporting for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.</td>
<td>Philip Bubb (UNEP-WCMC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mentimeter exercise and results and webinar feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Presentation slides

LEARNING FROM OTHER UN FRAMEWORKS
FOR SAICM BEYOND 2020 INDICATORS

23rd March 2020

Webinar purpose

• To assist the development of ‘SAICM beyond 2020’ with some examples from other UN processes on targets, indicators and reporting

• To assist some stakeholder input on these topics

• Not a negotiation! No conclusions.
Webinar organisers

UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) with IOMC

and support from UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)

Who is here?

• Approx. 90 registrations for each session
• From 35+ countries
• Africa – 10
• Asia & the Pacific – 6
• Eastern European – 8
• Latin American & Caribbean – 11
• Western European and Others - 15
Webinar Programme

- Introduction
- SAICM Secretariat on reporting & indicators
- Overview of progress for 'SAICM beyond 2020’ – Co-facilitators VWGs 1 & 2
- Information on targets, reporting and indicators for:
  - International Health Regulations
  - Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
  - Convention on Biological Diversity
- Participants' responses – via Mentimeter
- Closure

A report and recording will be available on the SAICM website

SAICM Secretariat - Reporting and Indicators

- Brenda Koekkoek
- Delfina Cuglievan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Strategic Objective</th>
<th>Focus of the actions</th>
<th>Key data holders</th>
<th>Key hooks</th>
<th>Potential methods for data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>National level implementation</td>
<td>National governments, Convention secretariats</td>
<td>SDGs 3, 6, 11, 12, Circularity, Health</td>
<td>National data collection, voluntary national reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Data collection, availability, information generation and repositories</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Science-based data</td>
<td>Supply chain data, collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Addressing areas not addressed elsewhere including potentially activities related to regulation, science and data</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Science, sustainable development, circularity, health, collaboration</td>
<td>Circularity, SDG 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Innovation, research and development, sustainable solutions</td>
<td>Academia, private sector</td>
<td>Circularity, SDG 12</td>
<td>In-depth sector reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mobilising finances, establishing partnerships</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>SDG 3, 6, 12, 17</td>
<td>Periodic ‘special contributions’ linked to SDGs, analyse project results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overview of progress and remaining steps for targets and indicators beyond 2020

Co-facilitators VWG1 Targets, Indicators and Milestones
Silvija Kalnins (Latvia), Wajira Palipane (Sri Lanka)

Co-facilitators VWG2 Governance and Mechanisms for Implementation
Karissa Kovner (USA), Tecaporin Wiriyutikorn (Thailand)
Vision and Scope

*SAICM/OEWG.3/9*

**Vision**

[Strengthening the sound management of chemicals and waste in the long term requires a] [the] vision shared by all stakeholders:

(i) To protect human health and the environment from the [harmful] [adverse] effects of chemicals and [their] [associated] waste, [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.

**Scope**

The scope encompasses [the environmental, economic, social, health, agricultural and labour [all] aspects of managing chemicals and [their] [all] waste[s], in order to enhance sustainable development [and [non toxic] circularity [environmental integrity] [and the protection of human rights] [and resource efficiency]]. The instrument takes due account of the instruments and processes that have been developed to date and is flexible enough to take account of new ones without duplicating efforts.

---

**9. IP2 Meeting March 2018**
- Co-chairs paper was discussed (identification of Strategic Objectives and target formulation).
- Outcome document was annexed to the meeting report and submitted to the OEWG3 meeting for its consideration.

**OEWG3 April 2019**
- Introduction of co-chairs paper and proposal on SO and targets.
- No discussions on targets, discussion on vision, scope and SOs introduced brackets.
- Outcome document was annexed to the meeting report and submitted to the IP3 meeting for its consideration.

**Technical Expert Workshop on Indicators September 2019**

**IP3 October 2019**
- Partial discussions took place on vision, scope and the strategic objectives.
- Discussions on targets, principles and approaches were not sufficiently considered within the contact group.
- Outcome document was annexed to the meeting report.

**Technical Working Group January 2020**
- Development of outcome documents SAICM/IPA/3 and SAICM/IPA/INF/15. Used as basis for discussions of OWG1.
VWG on governance
Taking Stock of Progress

Section G

Expectation for Reporting

On a regular basis, all stakeholders -- from a broad range of sectors -- should report on their efforts to meet the vision statement by providing focused information on efforts to implement the agreed strategic objectives and targets.

Goals of reporting

- identification of successful outcomes, gaps, or challenges
- drive opportunities for scaling up and improvement
- share information
- assess the need for enhanced efforts and, as needed, further prioritization

What are we trying to achieve with Section G?

Allow the SAICM community to review and evaluate progress such that the opportunities for global progress can be realized and successfully achieved through the facilitation of national level contributions.

Approaches Provided for Success for Section G and Link to Section H

- Encourage broad stakeholder participation
- Make data and information publicly available
- Consider recommendations based on reporting
- Make linkages to other agreements, initiatives, etc.
- Avoid duplicative reporting
- Minimize reporting burden for all stakeholders
- Continue to independently evaluate progress
- Update the instrument when needed based on results (Section H)
The following issues, as identified through the TWG and VWG process

- The term “waste” and how it would be reflected;
- Although in general it was agreed that targets need to be made “SMART,” some aspects of formulation that would assist in this were not decided:
  - Reference to “countries” or “governments”;
  - Elaboration of timeframe for targets such as “by 20xx”;
- Terminology and definitions—some terms, though broadly accepted and used, may need defining or achieving common understanding:
  - “Circular economy,” in order to avoid vague elements of targets;
  - Sustainable alternatives, reference to sustainable and green chemistry
- Manageability & effectiveness of the target/indicator framework:
  - Number of targets
  - Balance between qualitative and quantitative targets and indicators
- Missing concepts and issues in the current targets (accident prevention and response, gender disaggregated data, 11 basic elements of the Overall Orientation and Guidance)
- The name of the future instrument.

VWG1 Outcomes

- The group developed a document of possible formulations of targets based on points of convergence of views expressed by stakeholders during the virtual meetings and in the electronic submissions received, including new targets for which the formulations gained overall support.

- The group has decided that more work needs to be done before IP4 and/or ICCM5 on targets, indicators and milestones. The group has put out two options for consideration in the outcome document. The ICCM5 Bureau will be making the final decision on how this work moves forward.

Options for further work include:

- **Option 1** proposes a continuation of work on targets, indicators and milestones by a policy expert group, similar in nature to the current VWG on targets.
- **Option 2** combines work of a policy expert group with work by a subgroup more technical in nature, which would prepare specific work on indicators. UNEP, along with other International Organizations, including members of the IOMC, have expressed their support to take the lead in the indicator part of the work.
Considerations moving forward

- There have been no substantive discussions on the formulation of the Strategic Objectives since before the OEWG3 in April 2019, thus through discussions, participants identified a necessity to reflect upon them in the future;
- The VWG identified a need to consider targets together with the strategic objective formulations to establish a comprehensive indicator framework for the new instrument;
- Targets need to be considered in a reiterative process and together with the indicators, in order to capture and develop a comprehensive indicator framework for the instrument including considerations of resources and capacities for monitoring implementation;
- Some targets may be considered as higher-level targets or indicators, or in the High-level Declaration.

Thank you

For more information regarding the work of the Virtual Working Groups visit

http://saicm.org
IOMC indicators of progress

Bob Diderich

23 March 2021

IOMC indicators of progress

- To contribute to tracking future progress of SAICM, the IOMC proposed at ICCM-4 (2015) a concise set of quantitative indicators from verifiable sources and for which global data are available.

- Indicator data is displayed in map form wherever possible to provide quick access to the country or region of interest.

- 8 indicators originally proposed

- Link: [https://www.who.int/iomc/indicators_saicm/en/](https://www.who.int/iomc/indicators_saicm/en/)
8 initial IOMC indicators of progress (2015)

1) Number of countries that have achieved core capacities for chemicals under the International Health Regulations (WHO)

2) Number of countries with National Profiles (UNITAR)

3) Number of countries with a PRTR (UNITAR)

4) Number of countries with poisons centres (WHO)

5) Countries with controls for lead in decorative paint (WHO and UNEP)

6) Countries which have implemented pesticide legislation based on the FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct (FAO)

7) Number of parties to the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm, and Minamata Conventions

8) Implementation of the GHS (UNITAR, ILO, UNECE)

New IOMC indicator by OECD

Number of countries with legislation in place to manage industrial and consumer chemicals
New indicators proposed by ILO

1. Number of member States with national Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) profiles

Countries with Occupational Safety and Health National Profiles

2. Number of member States with national recording and notification systems that allow regular reporting against SDG indicator 8.8.1 (frequency rates of fatal and non-fatal occupational injuries)

Data availability for SDG Indicator 8.8.1

- Fatal and non-fatal occupa\-tional injuries (IC/NI):\-o\-c\-tional injuries, rough year available
New indicators proposed by ILO

3. Number of ratifications of up-to-date ILO Conventions related to chemical risks

Ratification Status of Chemicals Convention (No. 170) and Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents Convention (No. 174)

“...The IOMC vision is to shape a sustainable future through coordinated global action to achieve the sound lifecycle management of chemicals and waste for healthy lives and the environment.”

THANK YOU

For more information, please visit:

www.iomc.info
Information on targets, reporting and indicators:

- International Health Regulations
- Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
- Convention on Biological Diversity

UNEP-WCMC
Philip Bubb
Suggested actions needed to improve IHR capacities

**Benchmark 17.1:** Mechanisms are in place for surveillance, alert and response to chemical events or emergencies.

**Objective:** Establish policies, legislation, plans and capacities for surveillance, alert and response to chemical events or emergencies.

**01 NO CAPACITY**

No mechanism in place to detect and respond to chemical events, poisonings or emergencies.

**04 DEMONSTRATED CAPACITY**

- Establish links with key international chemical/toxicology networks for support in the management of chemical events and poisonings.
- Ensure all relevant personnel receive regular training on surveillance, alert and response to chemical events and poisonings.
- Share a routine basis information on chemical events, chemical event risk assessments and response action with relevant agencies.
- Monitor on a routine basis, the timeliness of the information sharing mechanism about events and potential risks.
International Health Regulations (IHR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IHR MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK</th>
<th>Status Pakistan self-assessment annual reporting (SPAR)</th>
<th>After action reviews (AAR)</th>
<th>Simulation exercises (SimEx)</th>
<th>Voluntary External Evaluations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Monitor progress towards implementation of IHR core capacities</td>
<td>Assess objectively IHR contributions to health security</td>
<td>Assess objectively IHR contributions to health security</td>
<td>Evaluate objectively IHR contributions to health security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandate</strong></td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focussen</strong></td>
<td>Existence of capacities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Every 6 years</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Periodicity</strong></td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Tools to support countries in monitoring their progress in the development and maintenance of the national capacities required by the IHR”

Electronic State Parties Self-Assessment Annual Reporting Tool (e-SPAR) is a web-based platform proposed to support State Parties of the International Health Regulations (IHR) to fulfill their obligation to report annually to the World Health Assembly (WHA) on the implementation of capacity requirements under these Regulations and to encourage the transparency and mutual accountability between States Parties towards global public health security, under the WHO IHR Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

Main challenges
Based on the analysis of the latest annual reporting data, the top challenges are:
- CT2 Chemical Events: 52%
- CT1 Radiation Emergencies: 50%
- CT1 Points of Entry: 50%

Average of capacities per WHO region (Updated on 33-09-2020)
- 44% APAC
- 71% EMRO
- 66% AFRO
- 75% SEARO
- 61% WPR
- 69% EMRO

Average of capacities for all WHO regions: 64%

IHR Capacity Progress
Global Average - CT2 Chemical Events

- 2018
- 2020
- 2021
- 2022

- CT2 Chemical Events
- CT1 Radiation Emergencies
35.

International Health Regulations - World Health Organization

**Targets**
- 13 Capacities re public health events
  - no dates
  - legally binding
  - National governments

**Implementation reporting**
- State Parties Self-Assessment
- Annual Reporting Tool (e-SPAR) & website
- WHO Global Health Observatory website

**Impact reporting**

**Use of reporting**
- Promote action for low Capacities
- Public communication of IHR capacity levels

**National implementation instrument**
- National Action Plan for Health Security

**Implementation indicators**
- 24 indicators for 13 Capacities
- Levels 1 to 5 of performance for each indicator
- Benchmarks for the Capacities

**Impact indicators**

**Data providers**
- State Parties

36.
"The State has the primary role to reduce disaster risk but that responsibility should be shared with other stakeholders."

It’s a Framework!

Not legally binding.

III.B.

Target B: Substantially reduce the number of affected people globally by 2030, aiming to lower the average global figure per 100,000 in the decade 2020-2030 compared to period 2005-2015.

Number of Injured or Ill People Attributed to Disasters: 2018

Target C: Substantially increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020.

Alignment of National DRR Strategies with the Sendai Framework: 2015-2019

[Links to UN publications for data and strategies]
“Strong accountability is one of the cornerstones of the Sendai Framework for DRR”

Sendai Framework Monitor

- Online tool
- 38 global indicators
- For self-reporting by countries
- Display & download data
- Support national disaster risk reduction strategies

https://sendaimonitor.undrr.org/

Global target: A: Substantially reduce global disaster mortality by 2030, aiming to lower average per 100,000 global mortality between 2020-2030 compared with 2005-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A-1 (compound)</th>
<th>Number of deaths and missing persons attributed to disasters, per 100,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>Number of deaths attributed to disasters, per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>Number of missing persons attributed to disasters, per 100,000 population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator A-1: Number of deaths and missing persons attributed to disasters, per 100,000 population

Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASELINE</th>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>PREVIOUS YEAR</th>
<th>SELECTED YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>2005-2010</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-64.2%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRESS OF GLOBAL TARGETS

COUNTRY REPORTING OVERVIEW

- **195** countries total
- **100** Not started
- **82** in progress
- **4** ready for validation
- **9** validated

TARGET REPORTING OVERVIEW

- A: Mortality - **127** Not started, **14** in progress, **18** ready for validation, **38** validated
- B: People affected - **127** Not started, **37** in progress, **9** ready for validation, **22** validated
- C: Economic Loss - **121** Not started, **40** in progress, **6** ready for validation, **18** validated
- D: Critical infrastructure & services - **153** Not started, **19** in progress, **7** ready for validation, **16** validated
- E: Disaster risk reduction strategies - **121** Not started, **21** in progress, **13** ready for validation, **40** validated
- F: International cooperation - **167** Not started, **33** in progress, **5** ready for validation, **22** validated

---

https://sendarimonitor.undrr.org/
Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015–2030 – UNDRR

**Targets**
- 7 global - for disaster risk reduction
  - By 2030
  - A framework
  - National targets

**Implementation reporting**
- Sendai Framework Monitor online tool
- Biennial Global Assessment reports

**Impact reporting**
- Sendai Framework Monitor online tool
- Biennial Global Assessment reports

**Use of reporting**
- Promote accountability for implementation
- Guide international & national action
- Public communication of progress

**National implementation instrument**
National DRF Strategies

**Implementation indicators**
- 16 global indicators for Targets E, F & G
- National custom targets & indicators

**Impact indicators**
- 22 global indicators for Targets A, B, C, D
- National custom targets & indicators

**Data providers**
National governments

---

Convention on Biological Diversity

- Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020
  - 20 Aichi Targets
  - List of 'indicative' indicators

National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)

- National Reports every 4 years
- Global Biodiversity Outlook reports every 5 years

- Post-2026 global biodiversity framework
By 2020, pollution (1), including from excess nutrients (2), has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aichi Biodiversity Target</th>
<th>Assessment of Progress</th>
<th>Summary of Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pollution, including from excess nutrients, pesticides, plastics and other waste, continues to be a major driver of biodiversity loss. Despite increasing efforts to improve the use of fertilizers, nutrient levels continue to be detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity. Plastic pollution is accumulating in the oceans, with severe impacts on marine ecosystems, and in other ecosystems with still largely unknown implications. Actions taken in many countries to minimize plastic waste have not been sufficient to reduce this source of pollution. The target has not been achieved (medium confidence).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global Biodiversity Outlook 5

Intergovernmental Science Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

Global Assessment in 2019

www.ipbes.net/global-assessment

www.bipindicators.net

Theory of change proposed for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

https://www.cbd.int/gbo5

Proposals for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Four Goals for 2050 and eight Milestones to them for 2030

2030 Milestones for Goal A

A.1 The area, connectivity and integrity of natural systems increased by at least [5%].

A.2 The number of species that are threatened is reduced by [X%] and the abundance of species has increased on average by [Y%].

Twenty ‘Action Targets’ for 2030

(a) Reducing threats to biodiversity

Target 6. By 2030, reduce pollution from all sources, including reducing excess nutrients [by X%], biocides [by X%], plastic waste [by X%] to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health.
Draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Table 1 – Interim formulation of 2050 goals and milestones and associated monitoring elements and indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Updated 2050 goals and milestones (Not for review)</th>
<th>A. Components of the 2050 Goal</th>
<th>B. Monitoring Elements</th>
<th>C. Indicators</th>
<th>D. Period of availability of baseline data and frequency of updates</th>
<th>Row Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal A The area, connectivity, and integrity of natural ecosystems increased by at least [X%]; supporting healthy and resilient populations of all species while reducing the number of species that are threatened by [X%] and maintaining genetic diversity.</td>
<td>A1. Increased extent of natural ecosystems (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems)</td>
<td>Trends in area of forest ecosystems</td>
<td>Forest area as a proportion of total land area (SDG indicator 5.14)</td>
<td>1990–2015</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2. Increased extent of natural ecosystems (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems)</td>
<td>Trends in area of terrestrial ecosystems</td>
<td>Biodiversity (habitat index)</td>
<td>2001–2010, annually</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3. Increased extent of natural ecosystems (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems)</td>
<td>Trends in area of mangroves</td>
<td>Forest cover</td>
<td>2005–2016, every 5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4. Increased extent of natural ecosystems (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems)</td>
<td>Trends in area of coral reefs</td>
<td>Live coral cover</td>
<td>1990, annually</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5. Increased extent of natural ecosystems (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems)</td>
<td>Trends in area of seagrass ecosystems</td>
<td>Global seagrass extent</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A6. Increased extent of natural ecosystems (terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems)</td>
<td>Trends in area of other marine and coastal ecosystems</td>
<td>Global seagrass extent</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDICATORS FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

Information Document prepared for SBSTTA24 by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership and incorporating inputs from peer review

Note by the Executive Secretary

- 155 indicators identified as suitable for use
- Many more indicators could be improved for use
- Gaps identified
- A useful summary of the issues in indicator development + suitability assessment method.
Proposal for headline indicators for the monitoring framework of the post-2020 GBF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2050 Goals, milestones and Targets</th>
<th>Headline indicators</th>
<th>Components of the Goals and Targets</th>
<th>Component indicators</th>
<th>Complementary indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target 6.</strong> By 2030, reduce pollution from all sources, including reducing excess nutrients [by %], bisphenol [by %], plastic waste [by %] to levels that are not harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and human health.</td>
<td>6.0.1 Proportion of water with good ambient quality (freshwater and marine)</td>
<td>6.1. Reduction of pollution from excess nutrients</td>
<td>6.1.1. Nitrogen balance (in rivers from SDG indicator 6.3.2 and in oceans from SDG indicator 14.1.1)</td>
<td>6.1.1.1. Trends in Loss of Reactive Nitrogen to the Environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0.2 Plastic debris density</td>
<td>6.2. Reduction of pollution from bisphenol</td>
<td>6.1.2. Phosphorus balance (in rivers from SDG indicator 6.3.2 and in oceans from SDG indicator 14.1.1)</td>
<td>6.1.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0.3 Pesticide use per area of cropland</td>
<td>6.3. Reduction of pollution from plastic</td>
<td>6.3.3. Fertilizer use</td>
<td>6.1.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0.4 Promotion of municipal solid waste collected and managed in controlled facilities out of total municipal solid waste generated by cities</td>
<td>6.4. Reduction of pollution from other sources</td>
<td>6.1.4. Pesticide use by type of pesticide</td>
<td>6.1.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.5. Plastic debris density by location (e.g., litter, floating debris, debris in the sea column, debris on the sea floor)</td>
<td>6.1.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.7. Hazardous waste generated per capita, and proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment (SDG indicator 12.4.2)</td>
<td>6.1.7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1.8. Recycling rate (from SDG indicator 12.5.1)</td>
<td>6.1.8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements of the proposed reporting and review mechanism for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

[Diagram showing the proposed reporting and review mechanism]

Global data products: Biodiversity, progress and other indicators of global and regional biodiversity
Regional data products: Biodiversity, progress and other indicators of regional and national biodiversity
National data products: Biodiversity monitoring system, including headline, component and detailed indicators
Other data products: Local and specific data products

[Diagram showing data flow and reporting processes]
Thank you

For more information please contact:

events@unep-wcmc.org
Annex 3: Mentimeter responses

Session 1

In response to SAICM Secretariat's presentation:

In response to VWG1 and VWG2 presentation:

In response to presentation on International Health Regulations:
From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?

- Mandatory national action plans and reporting
- Lessons learned
- Online reporting platform
- Good reporting tool
- Capacity is key to impact
- Whole capacities
- Capacities not just outcomes
- Targeted indicators
- Shared online reporting system

From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?

- National Action Plans
- Legally binding for governments
- To improve the capacity to manage chemicals and waste at the national level and to be able to communicate progress to the public and politically
- Actions and communication as outcomes from indicators
- Might be too far away from an indicator-based system
- Use existing relevant indicators, include high level indicators
- Accountability
- Actions fidelity to indicators and use about capacity
- Legally binding
In response to presentation on The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction:
In response to presentation on the Convention on Biological Diversity:

From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?

- Headline indicators, impact indicators and reporting indicators
- Limited number of targets
- Impact & outcome; identify gaps
- Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform
- We need to connect efforts
- Needs to be more streamlined and synergies recognised
- Implementation and impact assessment
- G胭and stakeholder commitments in voluntary mechanism
- Milestones for 2030

From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?

- Need to be clear that Parties have flexibility in reporting; not all indicators need to be reported by all
- Participation of NOCs in data collection for reporting - must be financially and institutionally undertaken
- Ensure synergies between the agendas, eg pollution is about emissions NOx, SOx, POPs, Mercury, pesticides use...
- Flexibility
- Implementation and impact assessment
- Too many different roles for indicators - consult stakeholders?
- Linkages between different mechanisms
- Headline indicators
Session 2

In response to SAICM Secretariat’s presentation:
In response to VWG1 and VWG2 presentation:

In response to presentation on International Health Regulations:
In response to presentation on The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction:

**SAICM Indicators Webinar report**

**From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?**

- Impact and accountability
- Impact indicators :)
- Different levels of indicators for different stakeholders
- Low reporting levels
- Framework approach, invite everyone
- National output level targets
- Implementation and impact report
- Impact and process together
- Number of countries reporting for meaningful results

**From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?**

- High reporting rates
- National legislation on disaster risk reduction
- Scalable
- Poor reporting
- Visualisation of indicators
- Accountability
- Risk reduction strategies
- The process can make the impact...
- Strong scientific input
In response to presentation on the Convention on Biological Diversity:

From this presentation, what is the most important thing (in 1 to 5 words) for SAICM beyond 2020?

- Science Policy Platform
- Simple and efficient
- Need for strong implementation
- (GEF) Funding facilitates reporting
- Keep it simple
- Agreement of quantitative metrics
- Idea of headline indicators
- Collaborations and partnerships
- Establish Science Policy
- Interface
- Reporting effort limited but meaningful
- Work together across boundaries
- Monitoring

- Indicator development is hard and demanding technical work...
- Information triggers next steps in collaboration with all stakeholders
Final Mentimeter questions:

**How important is it for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’ to have…?**

- An online tool for submitting indicator data and reporting on progress: 2.6
- A few ‘headline indicators’: 3.8
- A few ‘impact indicators’ on the health of people and the environment: 4.4

**How important are these uses of global indicators for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’?**

- Measuring progress towards targets to understand priorities for action: 4.3
How important are these uses of global indicators for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’?

- Communicating to supporters and wider society the progress and needs for the targets: 4.4

How important are these uses of global indicators for ‘SAICM beyond 2020’?

- To identify stakeholders needing more support: 3.9
Feedback on the Webinar Mentimeter:

How useful was this webinar for your participation in the development of ‘SAICM beyond 2020?’

Not at all

3.4

Extremely useful