

**DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISION OF THE PRTR
CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES MATRIX FOR ICCM REPORTING
BY INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (IGOS) ON
IMPLEMENTATION OF SAICM**

Prepared by the secretariat prepared for the third meeting of the International
PRTR Coordinating Group, Paris, France, 11 March 2008

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Reporting on SAICM implementation will be a key tool in assessing progress towards the achievement of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation's goal of sound management of chemicals by 2020.
2. In its draft project proposal, "Clarifying an Approach for Monitoring Progress to Implement SAICM and a Commensurate Reporting Format for Meetings of the ICCM", the Canadian Government thought it likely that

"the SAICM Secretariat's first report to the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) at its second meeting (ICCM-2) scheduled for 2009 will provide a "baseline snapshot" of current conditions relative to the strategic objectives of SAICM; such as a brief initial progress report focussing on easily described advances such as projects being undertaken under the QSP auspices. The baseline report will be used as one basis to assess progress for SAICM implementation in subsequent years."
3. At its initiation, the SAICM reporting project raised three outstanding questions:
 - (a) What indicators should be used to establish this baseline snapshot for ICCM 2?
 - (b) What indicators should be carried forward to measure subsequent progress under SAICM for future meetings of the ICCM heading towards 2020?
 - (c) How will the reporting function work under SAICM with respect to gathering information on the indicators adopted by the ICCM and other information that stakeholders might wish to provide within SAICM's voluntary framework, consistent with OPS Paragraphs VII-24, 26 and 28?

Thus, the Canadian proposal had countenanced two alternative means of reporting to ICCM. In the first, "easily described advances" would be captured to establish the baseline snapshot. Alternatively, "other information that stakeholders might wish to provide within SAICM's voluntary framework" could be reported.

II. BASELINE ESTIMATES REPORT

4. In 2006, SAICM stakeholders set out to provide an overview of

chemicals management at a set point in time preceding ICCM-2 (in this case 2002-2007). The baseline estimate allows for contrast of initial and subsequent SAICM reporting on progress toward achievement of SAICM against a pre-SAICM level of chemicals management.

5. Separate *SAICM Indicators Questionnaires* were circulated to Governments, IGOs, industry and non-governmental and civil society organizations. The questionnaires were designed to measure progress made globally and regionally by countries 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. It is intended that the questionnaire, along with the others developed for other stakeholder groups, would be 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 indicator questions, which benefited during their preparation by the advice of the SAICM International Project Steering Committee (IPSC), carry no endorsement or formal status.

6. On 28 February 2008, A "Draft Baselines Estimates Report for Selected Draft Indicators Proposed for Voluntary Reporting to the ICCM on SAICM Implementation" was released by Resource Futures International, a consultancy engaged by the Canadian Government. The report had been developed using secondary sources available on the Internet.

7. The period 2002-2007 was chosen as the baseline interval. Information used in the Draft Baseline had to meet two criteria:

- The information contained in secondary sources, to the extent practical, was collected by the sources (Secretariat, IGOS, etc.) on a systematic basis; and
- Information was collected on individual countries within each UN region, as opposed to a case-study basis.

8. Among the findings and conclusions of the RFI Report:

"There is for the period of 2002-2007 a lack of quantifiable comparable data that is systematically collected on a country basis, including for many key risk management and governance draft indicators. Therefore, it was not possible to establish a baseline for a number of key draft indicators against which future progress might be measured. Such quantifiable information as does exist is typically not particularly comprehensive."

The authors call for ICCM-based guidance from participants on "core" activities that countries might undertake to be able to report meaningfully on SAICM progress.

9. Question 7 in Form 3, and question 1 of Form 4 address PRTR implementation. The International PRTR Coordination Group may wish to consider whether the PRTR Capacity-building matrix be revised in line with the questionnaire developed for IGOs by the SAICM Secretariat.

III. DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISION OF THE PRTR CAPACITY-BUILDING ACTIVITIES MATRIX

10. The following are draft recommendations for revision of the matrix presented for consideration by the Coordinating Group at its third meeting:

Recommendation 1: Re-title "Project Status" column "Implementation Status" and apply SAICM Implementation Codes as follows

Implementation Codes:

NP=Not Planned;
ID=In Development;
C=Completed (anytime up through 2009);
U=Updating now or updated since 2006.

Where NP, provide a short explanation and indicate whether insufficient resources were available.

Recommendation 2: Report matrix activities of categories 2 through 7 and 9.

The activities of category 1 do not directly address PRTR capacity-building or development, and therefore are not relevant to ICCM-2 reporting on PRTRs per se. Although they may be relevant to other areas of SAICM implementation, there is a risk this relevancy could lead to duplicate reporting. The ICCM-2 PRTR capacity-building activities report should report uniquely on activities aimed to build national PRTR capacity.

Category 8 activities ("National PRTR implementation activities") are likely to be reported on a national basis, i.e. by those member States which have operational or nearly-operational PRTR systems. OECD's survey of international PRTR systems would also likely include reporting on these systems.

Recommendation 3: Revise Category 9 activities

Category 9 activities (Regional and International PRTR implementation activities) comprise too large a share of the total activities - 18 out of 59 activities reported in the 2007 matrix (ECE/MP.PP/AC.1/2007/L.8). They also in some instances fail to reflect their contribution to capacity-building activities at national level, i.e. regional PRTR awareness raising workshops held in the Russian Federation

Recommendation 4: Basis of activity

Indicate whether the activities are legislated, performed on a voluntary basis, or both.