

POSSIBLE INDICATORS FOR REPORTING ON SAICM IMPLEMENTATION BY IGOS:

DRAFT FOR PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION
PREPARED FOR THE SAICM SECRETARIAT
APPRECIATIVE OF THE VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE
INTERNATIONAL PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS
GENEROUSLY FUNDED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

INTRODUCTION

1. Purpose of questionnaire

The SAICM indicator's questionnaire for International Government Organizations (IGOs) is designed to measure progress made by IGOs toward achievement of SAICM, initially as contrasted against a 2006 "baseline" year of SAICM's adoption and, subsequently, as realized in periods leading up to the first and subsequent SAICM reporting milestones (as determined by ICCM-2 participants).

The "performance" being assessed for IGOs differs significantly from that of other stakeholders, in particular countries and industry, which both bear a direct responsibility for chemicals management. Indicators for IGOs are based on the implicit assumption that the principle IGO role is one of "service delivery" relative to other stakeholders in support of achievement of SAICM. With respect to governments, IGOs work to promote and assist countries with their implementation of SMC. With respect to industry, IGOs seek to promote and advance industry engagement and to promote industry capacity for SMC, relative to industry's contribution to achievement of Strategic Approach objectives. With respect to NGOs, IGOs work both to enhance capacity of NGOs, as one type of delivery agent for achievement of SAICM (i.e., to assist NGOs to improve effectiveness of their services). IGOs also partner with these other stakeholder groups on service delivery, including capacity building for SMC.

As predicated upon the above-noted assumptions, the focus within the *risk management, knowledge and information* and *illegal international traffic* sections of IGO indicator questions is on IGO ability to provide *assistance to other stakeholders* in their respective efforts to achieve SAICM objectives for SMC. The focus of the *governance* and *capacity building and technical assistance* sections is on *internal IGO institutional and technical capacity* (e.g., internal governance and capacity as it pertains to delineation of SMC and SAICM -related priorities and programmes and capacity of the IGO to deliver on these priorities and programmes, whether services are provided by the IGO alone or working in cooperation and/or coordination with other stakeholders, including other IGOs).

IGOs that are secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) have a key administrative role, the execution of which typically involves service provision (e.g., guidance in support of risk management and Party capacity for implementation of the agreement) and a monitoring and reporting function. These functions are assumed to be addressed as part of IGO "governance" and "capacity building and technical assistance," as applicable to a secretariat's execution of its administrative role.

Indicator questions are designed so that the responses may be aggregated for IGOs, such that results can be used to gauge success over time and help to inform their decisions regarding where best to focus future IGO efforts toward assisting with achievement of SAICM. The indicators and related questions are developed to measure progress in achievement of provisions as set out in the SAICM Dubai Declaration and the Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS). Both the indicators and associated questions are results-based rather than process oriented. In a number of instances, questions seek follow-up responses that are qualitative. Follow-up consists of responses to (1) additional questions on the topic to ascertain the nature of implementation activities in more concrete detail (2) citing Global Plan of Action (GPA) activities (by their numbers within the GPA) as short-hand means of noting implementation activities undertaken during the reporting period, and (3) provision of brief narrative comment regarding activities. The follow-up responses are designed to reduce the potential for misinterpretation of responses, while also serving as a means of providing "quality assurance" i.e., to verify that responses provided have "rigor."

2. Who would respond to the indicator questionnaire?

The designated SAICM focal point for the IGO should coordinate its responses.

3. Aggregation of responses

IGO responses will be aggregated for this stakeholder group (global basis).

4. Provisos

Indicators, while designed to the extent feasible to be measureable and verifiable, must be interpreted with caution given the complexity of pressures, forces, and causes that come into play when assessing cause-effect relationships and the import of various activities undertaken in support of SAICM objectives.

Indicator questions should *not* be confused with SAICM provisions as such. An example is given below:

Chemical categories. Respondents are asked as follow-up to some indicators to indicate how their responses, such as application of pollution prevention and risk reduction tools, are applicable to *categories of chemicals*. This approach provides a general indication of the range and depth of achievement relative to the scope of the SAICM, as well as greater flexibility as regards potential for organizing results so as to inform progress made in implementation of SAICM. The categories listed are drawn from the OPS footnote 8 to Risk Reduction objectives 14(D)1, which reads "*Groups of chemicals that might be prioritized for assessment and related studies include: persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic substances (PBTs); very persistent and very bioaccumulative substances; chemicals that are carcinogens or mutagens or that adversely affect, inter alia, the reproductive, endocrine, immune, or nervous systems; persistent organic pollutants (POPs), mercury and other chemicals of global concern; chemicals produced or used in high volumes; those subject to wide dispersive uses; and other chemicals of concern at the national level.*" The footnote does not constitute a definition or agreement about categories but merely makes an observation. However, it was felt that use of these categories provides a pragmatic organizing approach that would supply quantifiable (albeit with "broad brush") informative results. That is, some countries will include certain chemicals, such as POPs in their legislation, while others will exclude that chemical from the category. Nevertheless, recognizing such differences, the responses should be sufficiently informative to provide a *general* indication of the number of countries that apply a particular management activity or strategy to a particular (general) category of chemicals, while also highlighting gaps in application of strategies (e.g., number of countries that apply legislation to agrochemicals but have no legislation for industrial chemicals). One exception to footnote 8 categories was made: rather than use "mercury and other chemicals of global concern" a decision was made to use "metals" given that cadmium and lead are referenced in the GPS and that metals would be more informative than information on a single substance. Conversely, it was felt that "chemicals of global concern" would be too vague for quantitative analysis.

5. Status of the questionnaire

The questionnaire, along with the others developed for other stakeholder groups, is presented to ICCM-2 as an informal "tool" that participants might use to assist them with their formal discussions of a reporting approach and mechanism for gauging success under SAICM, recognizing it is a voluntary agreement.

The assumption was made that the SAICM Secretariat would be the body distributing such a questionnaire, collating information and reporting back to participants regard the results and the subsequent ICCM or via interim communications (e.g., the UNEP SAICM website). The format of the questions would lend itself to web-based reporting, reporting via a CD and email file output, and a hardcopy option.

The particular set of indicator questions offered for consideration of ICCM 2 participants were prepared by a consultant for Environment Canada. Advice on indicators was provided to the consultant during their preparation by the SAICM International Project Steering Committee (IPSC). Members of the IPSC provided their personal professional opinions, which included experience from working in the different UNEP regions or for a particular stakeholder sector (e.g., industry, NGOs, IGOs). Hence, their status was *not* that of representatives of a particular region but that of senior expert advisor. Taken together, IPSC membership provided a broad range of expert insight and advice. All advice was taken into consideration and a number of iterations of the indicators and associated questions produced for IPSC review, of which this is one final product.

The indicator questions, while benefiting from IPSC advice, carry no endorsement or formal status. Rather, they are offered by as a potential path forward for use in ICCM-2 development of its official reporting mechanism(s) and indicators, recognizing that the first opportunity for reporting back to all participants on SAICM will be ICCM-3 in 2010 or four years after SAICM's adoption. Therefore, these draft indicators are provided in the hope that having a concrete example of indicator questions and approaches will save ICCM participants time, such that they can utilize, borrow from or otherwise benefit from the indicators proposed herein when developing formally negotiated indicators.

Finally, we would suggest, based on experience in development of this potential tool, that were it to be used as a starting point for development of ICCM-2's official indicator questionnaire (should it decide to use one), that any impulse toward inclusiveness be balanced against what a stakeholder can reasonably supply.

Accompanying the indicators is an SAICM Baseline Indicator Report, in which the consultants attempted to prepare a 2006 situational status of global and regional chemicals management utilizing secondary sources to extract information that could be quantitatively applied against the indicator questions. The baseline report provides some insight into areas for which little secondary source data is currently available, hence may suggest areas where more concentration of effort and perhaps resources will be required to gather sufficient data to be able to assess progress toward achievement of SAICM.

7. Other considerations

Potential additional chemical categories:

We note that several additional categories proposed by IPSC advisors included the following and could, at the discretion of ICCM participants, be added to this questionnaire (or other questionnaire as developed and approved by ICCM):

- *Nanomaterials*, since the concerns about their unknown hazard profile and properties have been raised within difference scientific and other for a, and also observing that the same chemical would be approached differently at the micro-level than otherwise given the potential for risk of exposure as a consequence or factor of particle size.
- *Production/import volume*.
- *Pharmaceuticals* as a category were suggested by some and are known to be important within some regions (e.g., Africa). One IPSC member opposed its inclusion based on footnote six of the Dubai Declaration which observes "*The Strategic Approach does not cover products to the extent that the health and environmental aspects of the safety of the chemicals and products are regulated by a domestic food or pharmaceutical authority or arrangement.*" In the interests of consistency of a global-level response, it was determined to omit this category.

IPSC members strongly urged that, were this questionnaire approach to reporting adopted, to apply chemical categories and other types of categories consistently within and among questionnaires to the extent practicable. ICCM participants have the option at ICCM 2 or at subsequent ICCM meetings of adding or removing, or otherwise adjusting and defining categories as is deemed appropriate. The same would apply to chemical management option categories or any other "menu" of options used within a questionnaire.

Global Plan of Action citations: We recommend that if ICCM-2 uses the approach of GPA citation, that once the questionnaire is finalized, prior to any field-testing, and subsequently, that the "menu" of relevant GPA actions be included with the instructions for each question (as applicable to the particular form). Should an electronic web-based approach be employed, this "menu" could appear when "clicked" upon, etc.

Field-testing: We recommend that any questionnaire(s) adopted by ICCM be field-tested prior to finalization. One approach could be to request stakeholders to volunteer and, out of this group, for the ICCM 2 to select a sample as representative as possible so as to represent each region in a balanced manner.

ABBREVIATIONS

CEIT	Countries With Economies in Transition
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
GHS	Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals
GPA	Global Plan of Action (SAICM)
GRULAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
IFI	International Funding Institution
IGO	International Governmental Organization
IPSC	International Project Steering Committee (SAICM advisory committee for indicators development)
LDC	Least Developed Country
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OPS	Overarching Policy Strategy (SAICM)
PBTs	Persistent Bioaccumulative Toxics
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PRTR	Pollutant Release and Transfer Register
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SMC	Sound Management of Chemicals
WEOG	Western Europe and Other (WEOG)

DEFINITIONS

Proviso: The following definitions define terms as used within the indicator questionnaires. They are *not* negotiated terms derived by the SAICM process or ICCM, nor are they reflective of legislated terms used within any country. Their sole purpose is to provide clarity (guidance) as applicable to the questionnaire so that respondents have a common understanding of its terminology; hence can provide responses based on this understanding.

Agrochemicals: Pesticides (see definition below) and synthetic fertilizers.

Baseline information: "Baseline" for purposes of this questionnaire refers to data gathered at a national scale (unless otherwise indicated) to provide a snapshot in a given year (the baseline year) so as to describe the existing situation or status of a particular chemical risk management activity or a range of chemical risk management activity(ies). Unless otherwise specified, baseline information would be information on those chemicals addressed under the SAICM scope (see Dubai Declaration, Art. II.3 (b). A national baseline may be broad (e.g., life-cycle management of industrial and agrochemicals) or it may be prepared for just one aspect of risk management and/or one stage in the life cycle, e.g., a national inventory on hazardous waste sites for POPs pesticides (one stage of life cycle; a subset of agricultural chemicals) in the country.

Environmentally sound management of wastes. "Environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes or other wastes" means taking all practicable steps to ensure that hazardous wastes or other wastes are managed in a manner which will protect human health and the environment against the adverse effects which may result from such wastes" (Art. 2.8, Basel Convention)

Hazardous materials: Items prior to their designation as "waste" such as packaging materials used for toxic materials, contaminated equipment such as in-use PCB electrical equipment manufacturing equipment that is used in production /formulation of toxic or hazardous substances, e.g., as such substances are defined in conventions to which the country is a Party and/or within national law. Some countries, for example EU nations, categorize hazardous materials as "wastes" when they are no longer in use. Some countries may not classify such items, such as copper tubing or used batteries, as wastes once the product or article's useful life is over and/or the product/article has been discarded.

Hazardous wastes: " 'Wastes' are substances or objects which are disposed of or are intended to be disposed of or are required to be disposed of by the provisions of national law." (Art. 2.1 Basel Convention). See also Art. 3 of the Basel Convention.

Illegal traffic:

As applicable to wastes: The definition used for "Illegal traffic" means any transboundary movement of hazardous wastes or other wastes as specified within Art 2.21 of the Basel Convention.

As applicable to banned/restricted products: Definitions as provided for within the Stockholm, Rotterdam conventions and country level legislation.

Industrial chemicals: The terms "industrial" and "agricultural" are not defined within the SAICM's Dubai Declaration, Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS). (Classification systems used for legislative, commercial and other various purposes vary among regions, and from country to country, including within country ministries and institutions.) For purposes of reporting on indicator progress, metals have been noted as a separate category within the indicator questions. However, industrial chemicals are generally understood to be those chemical categories used within standard industrial classification systems (SIC, NAIC, etc.) and as defined within national legislation, excepting metals and agrochemicals, which are noted as separate chemical categories within this questionnaire.

Industry: There is no definition of industry within the SAICM. For purposes of this questionnaire, industry is understood to consist of "large industrial enterprises and transnational corporations as well as domestic industries" (e.g., as noted in Agenda 21, Chapter 19.8), with the main emphasis being upon organic and inorganic chemicals producers. Industries that produce products that incorporate chemicals that may pose significant use and end-of-life risk management concerns (e.g., the electronics industry) are also included with the understanding of what constitutes "industry". The *performance* being assessed for industry is keyed to its responsibility for sound management of chemicals, inclusive of its participation in and promotion of sustainable consumption, chemical safety, product stewardship, green chemistry, technology transfer and information sharing. Another facet of industry participation consists of its concerted efforts toward implementation of SAICM via its participation in "partnerships and financial and technical participation in the implementation of Strategic Approach objectives" as per the SAICM OPS financial considerations within Art. V. 19(b). Additionally, indicator development took into consideration principles and approaches referenced with international agreements cited in VI. (20) of the OPS.

Intoxication is broadly understood to include injury of the cardiac, gastro-intestinal, haematopoietic, renal, pulmonary or neurological systems where the physician has determines or has reason to believe that the injury is the result of a chemical exposure of environmental or occupational origin. Examples of chemicals that might be associated with such exposure are:

- Alcohols (e.g. isopropyl alcohol, methanol)
- Aldehydes (e.g. formaldehyde)
- Ketones (e.g. acetone, methyl ethyl ketone)
- Corrosives (e.g. hydrofluoric acid, sodium hydroxide)
- Esters (e.g. ethoxylate fatty acid esters)
- Gases and asphyxiants (e.g. carbon monoxide, hydrogen sulphide, acetylene)
- Glycols (e.g. ethylene glycol)
- Hydrocarbons and other volatile organic compounds (e.g. aliphatic, aromatic, halogenated, polycyclic)
- Metals and metalloids (e.g. lead, mercury)

Pesticides: Insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, and rodenticides as defined within conventions to which the country is a Party and by the country within national legislation.

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. International Government Organization (Title):

2. Please supply information in the following fields:

Respondent name:

Organization:

Title:

Mailing address:

Tel:

Fax:

Email:

Instructions for filling in forms

Each indicator is presented within a form. Each numbered form header asks a question against which information is gathered within the form.

Implementation Status:

A number of forms include Implementation status (shading in blue). For each category in the left-hand column of the form, m, place an "X" in the appropriate box for the implementation status code. (If a country is updating or has updated an activity or output, two boxes would be checked: "C" completed and "U" updating.)

Implementation Code:

NP=Not Planned;

ID=In Development;

C=Completed (anytime up through 2009);

U=Updating now or updated since 2006.

Note: Some boxes are pre-filled with **NA** or "Not applicable". Leave these boxes blank.

Chemical and Sector Categories (orange shading): Check **each** of the applicable categories and leave the other boxes blank.

Description: Provide a brief (few lines) narrative description, to provide context for your response, e.g., to further clarify and/or qualify the answer. Examples include, as applicable:

- Title of an activity or output;
- Date the activity or output occurred ;
- If ongoing, frequency (e.g., an inventory might have been developed in 2000 and updated in 2006;
- Comments about the duration of the activity (e.g., a programme has been in place for 20 years)
- The activities are legislated, performed on a voluntary basis, or both;
- An IGO policy /programme exists, but its execution or implementation has occurred only in one region. Broader implement is dependent upon an increase in country and/or donor assistance financial support;
- The programme will end this year because it has achieved its goals; funds are lacking, etc.

Explanation: Where an "X" has been placed in the NP or Not Planned box for the implementation status, provide a short explanation for this decision. Examples might be:

- The IGO does not have adequate human and/or financial resources;
- The activity is not a priority for the IGO within its broader sustainable development context or within its chemicals management strategy/work plan, etc.

SECTION A: RISK REDUCTION

Note: Questions about assistance for capacity building for risk reduction refer to assistance that the IGO provides to other stakeholders (countries, etc.). Questions about capacity building for the IGO (internal capacity building) are posed in Section D (Governance) of this questionnaire.

Form 1. Strategy(ies) in place to assist governments, and/or other sectors of society with pollution prevention and risk reduction activities for the sound management of chemicals? <i>Place an "X" in the boxes that apply. Where narrative description/explanation is requested, along with narrative response, supply Global Plan of Action (GPA) numbers, as appropriate.</i>			
1. Does your IGO have a Strategy(ies) in place to assist governments and/or other sectors of society with pollution prevention and/or risk reduction activities for the sound management of chemicals?	Yes:		No:
	If Yes, list title of strategies: Brief Description/Explanation:		
2. If Yes, are Strategy(ies) that were in place prior to 2006 applicable to SAICM?	Yes:		No:
	Brief Description/Explanation:		
3. <u>If No, have strategy(ies) been reviewed to determine if they align with SAICM?</u>	Yes:		No:
	(Year)	Review Underway	A strategy will be developed in (Year)
Brief Description/Explanation:			

Form 2. Indicate the type of chemical management tools/instruments your organization uses to promote preventative measures to minimize risks (Pollution Prevention) in the matrix below.

Instructions: Place an "X" in any of the box(es) that apply.

Tool/Instrument	Implementation Status				Chemical Category to which Tool/Instrument Applies							
	NP	ID	C	U	Industrial Chemicals	Agro-Chemicals	PBT / POPs	Metals	Hazard Characteristics *	Toxic/Hazardous with Broad Dispersive Uses	High Volume	Other
1. Pollution Prevention/Cleaner Technology (e.g., technology transfer)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
2. Emergency Preparedness & Response Plans (e.g., assistance with design & training)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
3. Design for Environment/Research into chemical and non-chemical Substitutes/Alternatives												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
Other Tools/Instruments												
4. Tool/Instrument:												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
5. Tool/Instrument:												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												

*Carcinogens or mutagens or chemicals that adversely affect, inter alia, the reproductive, endocrine, immune, or nervous systems

Form 3. Indicate the types of assistance your organization provides to governments and other stakeholders with their development and application of chemical management tools/instruments to minimize risks to human health and the environment.

*Note: This section applies to IGO provision of **capacity building, technology transfer, project-oriented services** that the IGO provides to stakeholders, for example via training, outreach, joint projects, etc. Activities relating to information sharing (e.g., sharing results of efforts, development and provision of guidance; awareness raising) should be noted within Form 5 under Section B, Knowledge and Information Sharing.*

Instructions: Place an "X" in the boxes that apply. In the description section, in addition to narrative responses, you may cite Global Plan of Action (GPA) references, as appropriate.

Tool/Instrument	Implementation Status				Chemical Category to which Tool/Instrument Applies						
	NP	ID	C	U	Industrial Chemicals	Agro-Chemicals	PBT / POPs	Metals	Hazard Characteristics	Toxic/Hazardous with Broad Dispersive Uses	High Volume
1. Chemical screening & assessment											
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
2. New chemicals (testing, etc.)											
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
3. Existing chemicals (testing, etc.)											
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
4. Product use controls (e.g., product stewardship initiatives)										NA	
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
5. Globally harmonized System (GHS) of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (e.g., training)										NA	
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
6. Building Risk Reduction Capacity (training, etc.)											
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
7. Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) (e.g., assistance with design, reporting systems, training)					Not Applicable (NA)						
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
8. Safety standards to protect workers (Capacity building; training)					Not Applicable						
8a. Manufacturing sectors											
8b. Agricultural sector											
8c. Mining sector											
8d. Construction sector											
8e. Other											
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											
9. Economic incentives (compliance incentives; green chemistry) and/or compliance assistance (technical assistance)					Not Applicable						
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)											

Form 3. Indicate the types of assistance your organization provides to governments and other stakeholders with their development and application of chemical management tools/instruments to minimize risks to human health and the environment.					
<i>Continued from previous page</i>					
Tool/Instrument	Implementation Status				Not Applicable
	NP	ID	C	U	
10. Integrated Pest Management–IPM (e.g., training)					Not Applicable
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					
11. Hazardous waste treatment / minimization					
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					
12. Transport controls for hazardous chemicals (projects; training, etc.)					Not Applicable
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					
13. Compliance reporting (training)					Not Applicable
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					
14. Environmental Monitoring (training; projects)					Not Applicable
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					
15. Biomonitoring					Not Applicable
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					
Other Tools/Instruments					
16. Tool/instrument:					Not Applicable
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)					

Form 3a: Does your IGO participate in formal partnerships with other sectors of society to facilitate pollution prevention and/or risk reduction activities as supportive of SAICM implementation?

Yes:	No:
-------------	------------

If Yes, List by title; note partners; emphasis of partnership(s):

SECTION B: KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION

Form 4. IGO initiatives in place to promote and support knowledge and information on chemical health and safety and best practices for chemicals management.

Note: Examples of initiatives would be regional seminars/meetings for awareness-raising and outreach, production of guidance documents, production of special knowledge-based reports, such as regional situational reports and assessments, and distribution of information (guidance, reports, etc.), e.g., via IGO websites and distribution of print materials.

Instructions: For each initiative category, place an "X" in the appropriate box signifying Implementation Status.

If NP is checked, provide a brief explanation. For ID, C, U implementation status responses, you may elaborate on activities in the Description line for each initiative entry. Cite GPA item numbers as appropriate to your description of activities.

Initiative	Implementation Status				Chemical Category to which Tool/Instrument Applies							
	NP	ID	C	U	Industrial Chemicals	Agro-Chemicals	PBT / POPs	Metals	Hazard Characteristics	Toxic/Hazardous with Broad Dispersive Uses	High Volume	Other
1. Pollution prevention												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
2. Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
3. Chemical screening& assessment (how to guidance; results)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
4. Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (design guidance results reporting)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
5. Accident and spill (guidance, etc.)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
6. Health/food consumption (guidance, training)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
8. Access to information legislation (model legislation, etc.)												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
9. Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												

Form 4. IGO initiatives in place to promote and support information sharing on chemical health and safety and best practices for chemicals management.

Continued from previous page

Initiative	Implementation Status				Chemical Category to which Tool/Instrument Applies							
	NP	ID	C	U	Industrial Chemicals	Agro-Chemicals	PBT / POPs	Metals	Hazard Characteristic	Toxic/Hazardous	High Volume	Other
10. Chemicals best management practices in support of chemical safety												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
11. Cleaner Production												
Description/ Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
12. Chemical control technologies												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
13. Safer chemicals, chemical substitutes												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
14. Waste management												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												
Other Categories:												
15. Category:												
Description / Explanation (if not in place and NP)												

*Carcinogens or mutagens or chemicals that adversely affect, inter alia, the reproductive, endocrine, immune, or nervous systems

Form 4.1 What type of “service delivery” does the IGO use to provide knowledge information support to its members/stakeholders?		
Mode of service delivery	Place an “X” in the appropriate boxes	Description
16. Guidance documents		
17. Codes of Conduct		
18. Awareness raising and outreach (workshops, seminars, etc.)		
19. Test methods		
20. Indicator reporting on progress (as applicable to chemicals management)		
21. Financial (project support geared to information sharing)		
Other (list below)		
22.		
23.		

SECTION C: GOVERNANCE

Form 5. IGO strategic priorities and comparative value-added under SAICM	Implementation Status			
	NP	ID	C	U
1. Has your our IGO identified its strategic priorities and comparative value-added under SAICM?				
1a. If ID, or U in what Year/Month do you anticipate priorities will be finalized/ updated?				
1b. If NP, briefly explain.				

Form 6. Does your IGO have in place a public consultation mechanism(s) for consultation to inform the public and stakeholders about progress in your programmes that relate to chemical safety? <i>Place an "X" in the box that is appropriate for each category. Whether a single mechanism applies to more than one stakeholder group, or more than one mechanism is used, check each of the groups to which any of the IGO's mechanisms applies as the key information sought is whether stakeholder are consulted by the IGO on Sound Management of Chemicals.</i>			
Information category	Not Planned	Under Development	In Place
1. Industry			
Description/Explanation (If Not Planned indicated)			
2. Health Sector			
Description/Explanation (If Not Planned indicated)			
3. Workers (e.g., labour/trade organizations)			
Description/Explanation (If Not Planned indicated)			
4. Women's groups			
Description/Explanation (If Not Planned indicated)			
5. Indigenous			
Description/Explanation (If Not Planned indicated)			
6. Non Governmental Organizations			
Description/Explanation (If Not Planned indicated)			

Form 7. Have efforts been made by your IGO to incorporate or mainstream the sound management of chemicals into other programme areas of the IGO (e.g. MDGs programming, etc.)?

Category	Place an "X" in the boxes that apply	Leave this cell blank
1. Yes		Briefly describe
2. No		Briefly explain
3. Not Applicable		Briefly explain

Form 8. Does your IGO provide support for research in support of sound management of chemicals?

Place an "X" in the boxes that apply.

Research category	Place an "X" in the boxes that apply	Description/Explanation
1. Chemical control technologies		
2. Development of safer chemicals and non-chemical alternatives		
3. Cleaner technologies		
Other		
4. Category:		
5. Category:		
6. Category:		

SECTION D: CAPACITY BUILDING AND TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Note: This section refers to the IGO's internal capacity to deliver services and technical cooperation as distinct from services and activities performed by the IGO that assist stakeholders with their own capacity building efforts.

Form 7. Is Sound Management of Chemicals as articulated in SAICM a priority in your IGO's Business Plan or Strategy(ies)?

Place an "X" in the boxes that apply.

1. Yes:		Briefly describe
2. No:		Briefly explain
3. Not Applicable		Briefly explain

Form 8 IGO institutional capacity			
<i>Place an "X" in the boxes that apply.</i>			
Capacity building activity	Yes	No	Description
1. Has your IGO identified institutional capacity and/or technical barriers to implementation of its strategies for chemical management?			
2. Does your IGO have a resource mobilization plan for its work on chemicals management?			
3. Does your IGO have a training programme for its employees and/or volunteers that implement chemical strategies/activities?			
Other			
4.			

SECTION E: ILLEGAL INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC

Form 9. IGO programmes to assist countries to measure and control illegal international traffic <i>Place an "X" in the implementation box that applies and if ID, C or U, to the groups to whom the program typically applies</i>	Implementation Status				Groups to whom programme typically applies						
	NP	ID	C	U	Customs	Fireman	Police	Port Authorities	Transport	Inspectors *	Other
1. Does your IGO have a programme in place to assist countries to measure and control illegal international traffic?											
Description											
Explanation (if NP or Not Planned)											

*Environmental, occupational health and safety, etc.

SECTION F: FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS*

*corresponds to Section V. of the OPS

Form 10. How would you describe IGO budgets for development and implementation of chemical management strategies/activities since 2006 as compared to the previous five years?				
<i>Place an "X" in the appropriate box.</i>		Increased	Decreased	About the same
Briefly explain				

Form 11. For the year 2006, what were the sources and relative contributions of funding upon which the IGO drew for its administration and delivery on services as these pertain to development and implementation of chemical management strategies/activities?																
<i>Instructions: Place an "X" in the boxes as appropriate and provide percent where IGO has/can readily calculate the percentage.</i>																
Funding Sources: 2006	IGO core budget	%	Country donors (voluntary)	%	Bilateral donor	%	UN Agency	%	Multilateral fund	%	International Financial Institution	%	Regional Financial Institution	%	Industry	%
Application of funds																
1. IGO delivery of services on programmes & activities for risk reduction																
2. Mainstreaming SMC /SAICM within IGO																
3. Institutional Strengthening for national chemicals management																
Other																
4.																
5.																

Form 12. Has your IGO supported proposals to the SAICM Quick Start Programme Trust Fund?

Instructions. Place an "X" in Yes or No box (1-2), as applicable. If you answered "Yes", fill in the remaining rows 3-6 by placing an "X" in the boxes, as applicable, regarding assistance to countries provided.

1. Yes:			2. No:
Proposal Purpose	Year submitted	Amount provided (USD)	Brief Description <i>(cite GPA item numbers as appropriate regarding areas of assistance)</i>
3. Chemicals management capacity assessment			
4. Institutional Strengthening for national chemicals management			
5. Mainstreaming SMC			
6. Other			

SECTION G: INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Form 14: Institutional arrangements for SAICM implementation		
1. Has Your IGO designated a SAICM focal point		
Yes:	No:	If no, when is this expected to occur, or if not occurring, why?
2. Have actions been taken by your IGO to improve coordination with other IGOs for the implementation of SAICM?		
Yes:	No:	Briefly describe/ explain