CANADA’S FEEDBACK ON:
VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON TARGETS, INDICATORS AND MILESTONES

FOURTH REQUEST FOR ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

18 January 2021

**Group Mandate:** make proposals that progress work on this topic in lead-up to IP4, building on the outcome of the Technical Working Group as presented in meeting documents SAICM/IP.4/3 and SAICM/IP.4/INF/15. Specific tasks include:

(i) Finalize the targets proposal currently set out in SAICM/IP.4/3, with a view to enable multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral commitment and action, where appropriate;

(ii) Develop a set of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets.

**Instructions for providing electronic feedback:**

Please provide electronic feedback on:

**Part (ii)** Set of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets.

Please refer the following meeting documents for more detailed information on each target:

- **SAICM/IP.4/3** - Proposed targets prepared by the Technical Working Group on targets, indicators and milestones for SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020
- **SAICM/IP.4/INF/15** - Supplementary information on proposed targets prepared by the Technical Working Group on targets, indicators and milestones for SAICM and the sound management of chemicals and waste beyond 2020

Please submit your feedback, if possible in a Microsoft Word file to the SAICM Secretariat at saicm.chemicals@un.org, with a copy to delfina.cuglievan@un.org by **25 January 2021**.
PART (ii) Set of recommendations for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets

Canada’s General Comments:

- Canada prefers Option 2 but has some comments on the mandate and proposal moving forward (in track changes in the Option 2 section).
  - We see much benefit in utilizing the expert knowledge offered on indicator development (including indicators already in use), particularly with regards to providing advice on what data is available/measurable and in determining how to collect data that is not currently available.
  - We agree with the need for an iterative process between the indicators/expert group and the targets/policy group. With this in mind, given the focus on targets over the past few months, it seems timely to have a similar period of focused effort on indicators.
  - There is also possible time saving/efficiency with this option as the iterative work will allow the formulation of targets and indicators to evolve together and help to avoid inconsistencies between the lists of targets and indicators should indicator development be delayed to after targets are finalized.
  - It will be important that these discussions are informed by indicator experts, by those knowledgeable about managing and reporting on chemicals and waste programmes/activities and include experts from different sectors and stakeholder groups.
- We see Option 3 (no work until a face to face IP4 or ICCM5) as the least preferable since there is still much work to be done and further progress could be made at this time via an expert group on indicators. We also do not know for sure when such face to face meetings will be possible under the current global pandemic situation. We are concerned that in the potentially lengthy period between now and such time as stakeholders could meet face to face, the valuable work done to date will be forgotten and the considerable work yet to complete rushed.

- We understand the concern of a number of stakeholders in terms of capacity and technical challenges to participate in virtual work. We suggest that challenges might be overcome if the deliberations take a slower pace with longer timelines for stakeholders to review material and provide written feedback to allow more participation). We are open to other ideas on how the work could be structured to promote participation until such time as face to face meetings are once again feasible.

- While Option 1 is similar to option 2 in mandate (seemingly integrating the work on both targets and indicators), we have concerns that the focused attention needed on the complexities of indicators and data sources informed by experts in the field would be lost in this scenario and progress potentially stalled or slowed.

- If the group decides on Option 3, we think it might be beneficial to have some proposal/recommendations on how the work on targets, indicators and milestones will be picked up again at IP4 and/or ICCM5.

General considerations:

1. There was general agreement that there was considerable progress in meeting the mandate of the
VWG1. However, additional work is needed before decisions on targets, indicators and milestones can be made;
2. Indicators should be meaningful, i.e. providing a realistic picture of the effectiveness of the monitored measures with regard to achievement over time of the Strategic Objectives and Targets;
3. Indicators should be limited in number to make the review manageable and ensure compact and easy to communicate reporting outcomes;
4. The monitoring effort should be as simple and affordable as possible without challenging the significance of the review process. It should therefore be referenced to indicators that are monitored already, as far as possible, taking into account existing reporting schemes and data custodians outside the health and environment sectors as well;
5. Regarding the indicators process, UNEP and UNECE have expressed willingness to support the development of an inventory on indicators.

Review of recommended options for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets

Table 1. VWG1 recommended options for a process to establish indicators and milestones for finalized targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy group</td>
<td>Policy expert group + Technical expert subgroup (data experts/statisticians)</td>
<td>No more work until IP4 and/or ICCM5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modality</td>
<td>Fully virtual</td>
<td>Fully virtual with feedback from the technical expert subgroup to the policy expert group</td>
<td>TBC IP4 and/or ICCM5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When</td>
<td>Present to IP4 and/or ICCM5</td>
<td>Present to IP4 and/or ICCM5</td>
<td>July 2021¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Open participation + electronic feedback by all participants</td>
<td>Open participation + electronic feedback by all participants</td>
<td>ICCM5 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 1: Policy expert group

Key considerations:

¹ Pending decision of the Bureau on dates for IP4/ICCM5.
Following the definition of work provided by the VWG, a regional, multistakeholder, multisectoral balanced group will add to existing information and work on target formulation for the targets identified by the VWG under Strategic Objectives A-E.

**Participation**

Participation will include VWG1 participants plus any other SAICM stakeholder interested in participating.

**Reference documents for the group:**

a) [SAICM/IP/3/INF/2](#) presented at IP3 in Bangkok at the beginning of October 2019.
b) The documents prepared by the 2020 Technical Working Group (Geneva, Feb 2020) on proposed targets and reflections upon possible indicators ([SAICM/IP/4/3](#)) and Supplementary information on proposed targets ([SAICM/IP/4/INF/15](#)).
c) Outcome document of the Virtual Working Group 1 on Targets, Indicators and Milestones (VWG1) (forthcoming).

**The mandate of the group would include:**

1. Review of progress in terms of target formulation and based on the results of the:
   a) VWG2 on Governance and mechanisms to support implementation;
   b) VWG3 on Issues of concern;
   c) VWG4 on Financial considerations.

   Propose refinements to targets [CDN1](#) and respective indicators where deemed necessary [CDN2](#) and taking into account the considerations provided by the group(s).

2. Advance the work on indicators [CDN3](#) and develop an indicators framework [CDN4](#) as far as possible.

3. Revisit the targets and, if necessary, provide suggestions for adjustments in target wording needed to provide clarity in the indicator framework.

4. Make recommendations to IP4 and/or ICCM5.
Option 2: Policy expert group + Technical expert subgroup (data experts/statisticians)

Key considerations:

Following the definition of work provided by the VWG, a regional, multistakeholder, multisectoral balanced group will add to existing information and work on target formulation for the targets identified by the VWG under Strategic Objective A- E, including a subgroup for specific work on indicators.

Option 2 proposed to establish two groups: i) a policy expert/negotiators group that will focus on draft targets and target formulation under strategic objectives and work iteratively with the technical expert subgroup working on the indicators ii) a technical expert subgroup to continue with the work on targets, indicators and milestones.

Participation

Participation will include VWG1 participants plus any other SAICM stakeholder interested in participating including experts with experience in statistics and data, indicator framework development, knowledge of data coverage and availability.

Reference documents for the group:

a) SAICM/IP/3/INF/2 presented at IP3 in Bangkok at the beginning of October 2019.

b) The papers prepared by the 2020 Technical Working Group (Geneva, Feb 2020) on proposed targets and reflections upon possible indicators (SAICM/IP/4/3) and Supplementary information on proposed targets (SAICM/IP/4/INF/15)

c) Outcome document of the Virtual Working Group 1 on Targets, Indicators and Milestones (VWG1) (forthcoming).

d) Any other documents as identified by the technical expert subgroup.

The mandate of the groups would include:

Policy experts group

1. Review of progress in terms of target formulation and based on the results of the:
   a) VWG2 on Governance and mechanisms to support implementation;
   b) VWG3 on Issues of concern;
   c) VWG4 on Financial considerations;

Propose refinements to targets and respective indicators where deemed necessary and taking into account the considerations provided by the group(s).

2. Review and provide feedback on work of technical subgroup and make recommendations to IP4 and/or ICCM5.

Technical expert subgroup (data experts/statisticians)
1. Development of a [draft indicator framework](#) (in particular with relevant indicators that already have an agreed methodology), and an initial/indicative proposed list of indicators relevant for the targets identified by VWG1.

2. Review and/or draft a process for developing an international standard methodology for those indicators that do not have a methodology.

3. Identification of potential institutions responsible for collection / validation of data, and reporting, and development of a methodology in case it does not exist.

4. Draft hosting options for a central open access database where all indicator data and the metadata will be available.

5. Revisit the targets and, if necessary, provide suggestions for adjustments in target wording needed to provide clarity in the indicator framework. Submit information to the policy group for review and finalization of recommendations to IP4 and/or ICCM5.

Option 3: No more work until IP4 and/or ICCM5

No more work conducted on targets, milestones and indicators before IP4 and/or ICCM5. Work on target and indicator formulation will resume at ICCM5 and beyond.