VIRTUAL WORKING GROUP ON TARGETS, INDICATORS AND MILESTONES

THIRD REQUEST FOR ELECTRONIC FEEDBACK

UNEP submission, 21 December 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 (i) General comments and proposed text edits to existing text on targets under Strategic Objective C.

Part (ii) General comments on co-facilitators proposal for a process to establish indicators and milestones.

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 21 December 2020.
PART (i) Provide  

**a) general comments and b) proposed text edits on existing text for targets under Strategic Objective C**  

*please try to insert comments in revisions mode below*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objective C: Issues of concern [that warrant [global][and][joint] action] are identified, prioritized and addressed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong> Intended to cover the need to effectively identify, select and address issues of concern that warrant global action. The intention is to cover topics similar in nature to those covered by the Strategic Approach, emerging policy issues and other issues of concern, as well as topics such as managing specific chemicals, the burden of disease and financing. There may be a need to develop and identify the criteria for issues of concern.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(extracted from SAICM/IP.4/3)

**Linking Issues of concerns, and the targets and indicators of the Framework.**

UNEP recommends that progress made on Issues of Concern, especially on the measures taken and related impacts, is tracked and reported, as well as embedded in the Framework indicators.

To avoid a multiplicity of indicators, and their methodology to be defined, it could help to reflect progress in all / most issues of concern, e.g. through (a) composite indicator(s). Therefore, the progress of the issues of concern could be embedded within the progress reported under the Targets and indicators of the Framework.

As mentioned in the electronic feedback to VWG3 submitted on behalf of OECD, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR, WHO, Strategic objective C is currently process oriented and does not allow measuring of impacts of actions addressing issues of concern or understanding if the vision is being achieved. The electronic feedback proposes two ways of accounting for impact-oriented indicators on issues of concern:

i. keep objective C and strengthen it by inserting substantive targets with a small number (2) of composite impact-oriented indicators / index approaches.

ii. embedded within the other strategic objectives. This would as well ensure that they are in line with the objective of the new instrument and contribute to the effective implementation of the new instrument.

These two ways are not mutually exclusive.

An illustration of point 2 could be: Legislation related to an issue of concern, being approved or implemented would fall under a target of strategic objective A.
**Target C.1:** Programmes of work including timelines are established, adopted and implemented for identified issues of concern. (original)

**Target ALT. C1:** As an ongoing process, stakeholders nominate, and the international conference adopts issues of concern with specific goals. (extracted from SAICM/IP.4/3)

**Target C.2:** Information on the properties and risk management of chemicals across the supply chain and the chemical contents of products is available to all to enable informed decisions. (original)

**Target ALT. C2:** As an ongoing process, stakeholders implement workplans for adopted issues of concern and report on progress achieving their goals, such that the use of sustainable solutions is maximized and significant negative impacts on human health and the environment are prevented or minimized. (extracted from SAICM/IP.4/3)

**PART (ii) General comments on co-facilitators proposal for a process to establish indicators and milestones**

**On the process:**

UNEP supports advancing on the work on indicators, and is willing to provide technical inputs, in collaboration with IOMC.

**WHAT:** Learning from the SDG indicator framework it is important to ensure that indicators will be identified and monitored efficiently and effectively. UNEP suggests therefore to look into

- the development of a draft indicator framework, (in particular with relevant indicators that already have an agreed methodology) as well as
- process for developing an international standard methodology for those indicators that do not have a methodology,
- identification of potential institutions responsible for collection / validation of data, and reporting, and development of a methodology in case it doesn’t exist
- hosting options for a central open access database where all indicator data and the metadata will be available.

**HOW:** UNEP agrees that a group of experts should be established to further identify relevant indicators, related methodology, data coverage and availability, responsible entities for reporting and custodians.

UNEP also agrees with proposals made during the virtual session, to already hold an expert workshop in the first half of 2021. Learning from the SDG indicator framework, a similar process to the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goals (IAEG-SDG) could be envisaged, with the establishment of an expert group for example made up of the SAICM stakeholders, National Statistical Offices (or statistical offices in relevant Ministries) and international data providers. This group could be mandated to:
1- review and adopt the metadata and approach for each suggested indicator (as described above), in order to ensure that the indicators can be feasibly compiled at both the national and global level and agree on the method for how to tailor the indicators to national circumstances.

2- explore existing resources and potential partners at global level, such as geo-referenced data, and needs/possibilities for disaggregation.

3- to help establish the mechanism for validation of data.

4- To propose qualitative descriptions of progress that will help inform on progress actions and successes that contribute to the strategic objective and vision.

Ideally, this group should be aligning/ linking / closely collaborating with the UN Statistical Commission, which is the body mandated with developing and implementing national methodologies for statistics and indicators. It would anchor the indicator framework in the statistical world and provide the possibility of access to statistical expert groups.

WHEN (Timeframe considerations) A long-lasting framework with flexible elements is required.

Considerations must be put into determining the aspects of the instrument need to have a long timeframe, and those that need to form as part of a living framework, with elements that can evolve. This could include the introduction of a rolling system for identifying and addressing issues of concern instead of restricting this to the cycle of the conferences, given the nature of scientific development, introducing and addressing IoCs may need to happen at intervals different from the conferences.

Applied to indicators, this flexibility can also benefit the long-term view. Additional indicators or parts of composite indicators may be added in the longer term, either because new issues of concern have emerged, or because the methodology has been developed.

On the Indicators:

Referring to SAICM/IP.4/INF/15, UNEP propose to provide, within the context of the expert group, further elaboration on a proposed a set of high-level indicators that would help to communicate with decision-makers high-level messaging and build political momentum. The indicators proposed included some of the “IOMC Indicators of Progress”1 and will follow up on the inclusion of proposed health and environmental impact indicators.

Indicators will also aim at linking with the SDGs in the 2030 Agenda on sustainable development and other agendas, through:

- some of the IOMC Indicators of Progress (eg number of countries that have implemented pesticide legislation based on the FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct, achievement of the chemical core capacities under the International Health Regulations (IHR (2005)), and the number of parties to the BRS and Minamata Conventions).

- Further assessment of existing indicators that could be part of the new instrument, considering that they are relevant already being monitored, that they have custodians and will be reported on under the 2030 Agenda.

---

1 https://www.who.int/iomc/indicators_saicm/en/
UNEP recommends that indicators cover the topic of “waste”: UNEP considers that a bracket on waste highlights a significant gap in the targets and indicators. UNEP suggests including placeholders for waste across the strategic objectives and targets, should stakeholders agree upon inclusion of waste. UNEP will submit a dedicated proposal related to waste, to include both the rationale for waste inclusion and concrete suggestions for how to include it and address waste in the instrument and particularly in targets under strategic objectives A-E). Relevant indicators and milestones will be provided accordingly as well.

**Benefits of using existing indicators, for the chemicals and waste beyond 2020 instrument, include:**

➢ **Harmonizing with, capitalizing on and creating links to existing frameworks, and instruments, indicators, data collection methods, e.g. Sustainable Development Goals, Aichi Target 8 (Annex 1), Chemical and waste conventions and agreements (BRS, Minamata, Montreal), Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management, ILO Conventions and the IHR (2005).**

➢ **Identifying pollutants/chemicals that are relevant in other frameworks and supporting a synergetic action.**

➢ **Taking advantage of available data sources and existing methodologies** - demonstrate what is available (& possible to measure), where there are baselines and existing methodologies, and where there are gaps, e.g., existing regional and global data sources, e.g., existing global data sources such as the Global Mercury Assessment (GMA). The IOMC indicators and chemicals and waste MEA indicators have the considerable advantage of having in most cases methodologies and data sources already defined, sometimes with data history.

➢ **Having a determined custodian** for each indicator or data source as well as a well-established methodology or the need for one to be able to track progress in a comparable manner, including by using the same concepts and terminologies.

➢ Starting to monitor progress from the moment the new instrument is adopted as baselines, methods, custodians are already identified. For example, the following indicators could be considered:

- **Indicator 12.4.1:** Number of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement (tier I)
- **Indicator 12.4.2:** (a) Hazardous waste generated per capita; and (b) proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment (tier II)
- **Indicator 12.6.1** Number of companies publishing sustainability reports (tier II)

---


**Tier 1:** Indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards are available, and data are regularly produced by countries for at least 50 per cent of countries and of the population in every region where the indicator is relevant.

**Tier 2:** Indicator is conceptually clear, has an internationally established methodology and standards are available, but data are not regularly produced by countries.