



## 国际化学品管理战略方针 (化学品管理战略方针)

Distr.  
General

SAICM/PREPCOM.3/INF/2  
22 July 2005

Chinese  
Original: English

### 国际化学品管理战略方针

#### 制定工作筹备委员会

#### 第三届会议

2005 年 9 月 19-24 日，维也纳

#### 临时议程\*项目 3

#### 进一步制订国际化学品管理战略方针

### 关于国际化学品管理战略方针的财政考虑的 研究报告的执行摘要

#### 秘书处的说明

1. 在其第二届会议上，国际化学品管理战略方针（化管战略方针）制订工作筹备委员会同意，在现有资金范围内，秘书处应该参照鹿特丹公约秘书处正在展开的相关工作就执行拟议的国际化学品管理战略方针方面的财政考虑编制一份研究报告，因此秘书处与世界银行一起委托加拿大咨询公司—资源未来国际利用瑞典政府提供的资金编制该研究报告。
2. 秘书处谨在本说明的附件中分发资源未来国际编制的研究报告的执行摘要，供筹备委员会第三届会议审议。附件按原文照发，而没有经过秘书处的正式编辑。
3. 研究报告的全文将作为一份单独的参考文件（SAICM/PREPCOM.3/INF/28）分发，但只有英文。

\*

SAICM/PREPCOM.3/1。

K0582349 150805 160805

为节省开支，本文件仅作少量印发。请各位代表自带所发文件与会，勿再另行索要文件副本。



## **Executive Summary**

# **Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management: Financial Considerations Study**

**Prepared for:**

The 3<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
SAICM Preparatory Committee  
Vienna, Austria, 19-24 September 2005

Coordinated by the World Bank in cooperation with the  
SAICM Secretariat of UNEP Chemicals  
Generously funded by the Government of Sweden

**July 2005**

**Prepared By:**

Resource Futures International (RFI)  
458 Maclaren, 2nd Floor  
Ottawa, ON K1R 5K6  
Tel: (613) 235-4343  
Fax: (613) 235-9916  
Contact:  
Dr. Tom Conway  
tconway@rfigroup.com

## Table of Contents

<i>Acronyms</i> .....	v
<i>Executive Summary</i> .....	1
Approach to study .....	1
Regional consultation discussion of financial considerations .....	1
Financing considerations in light of the scope of SAICM and gaps in capacity for the sound management of chemicals .....	2
Overview of current financing options .....	2
Multilateral institutions and funds .....	3
Regional Development Banks .....	4
Bilateral aid agencies .....	4
Private sector .....	4
Foundations .....	4
Non-governmental organizations(NGOs) .....	4
Possible elements of financial arrangements for SAICM .....	4
Options for SAICM financial arrangements .....	5
Proposed options .....	6

## Acronyms

ADF	African Development Fund
ADF	Asian Development Fund
AfDB	African Development Bank
BCRCs	Basel Convention Regional Centers
CAI	Clean Air Initiative
CDM	Clean Development Mechanism
CEE	Central and Eastern Europe Region
CEITs	Countries with economies in transition
COP	Conference of the Parties (various MEAs)
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
EA	Executing Agency (of the GEF)
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
EHF	Environmental Health Fund
ENRM	Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GMEF	Global Ministerial Environment Forum (UNEP)
GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean region
IA	Implementing Agency (of the GEF)
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICCA	International Council of Chemical Associations
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
IDA	International Development Association (World Bank Group)
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IFI	International Financial Institution
IGO	Inter-governmental Organization
ILO	International Labour Organization
IFCS	Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety
IGO	International government organization
IOMC	Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals
IPEN	International POPs Elimination Network
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IW	International Waters (GEF focal area)
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MLF	Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol
NIP	National Implementation Plan (for the Stockholm Convention)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
N.d.	No Date (Bibliographic entries)
ODA	Official development assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OP	Operational Program (of the GEF)
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PrepCom	Preparatory Committee (SAICM development)
RDBs	Regional Development Banks
RMCs	Regional Members Countries (African Development Bank)
RMS	Resource Mobilization Strategy
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SBC	Secretariat of the Basel Convention
SMC	Sound Management of Chemicals
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industry Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development



## Executive Summary

### *Approach to study*

The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) emphasizes the expeditious implementation of existing multilateral and regional environmental agreements, while acknowledging the need for effective capacity-building and technical assistance to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition (CEITs) to implement these instruments and to meet future challenges in chemicals safety.

This study of financial considerations for implementation of SAICM responds to terms of reference adopted by the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) for SAICM at its second meeting held 4-8 October 2004 in Nairobi and also takes into account input on financial considerations raised during 2005 regional consultations on SAICM. The study is prepared as a reference document on financial considerations applicable to SAICM. It also provides a set of options that can be used for discussion on SAICM financial considerations at PrepCom3, to be held 19-24 September 2005 in Vienna, Austria, with a view to proposing recommendations for consideration by the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) that will be held in February 2006.

This study examines existing financing options (i.e., bilateral and multilateral agencies and funds) in terms of their applicability to and synergies/linkages with SAICM and also more broadly as they might be adapted to apply more directly to SAICM. The main emphasis of the study is on government sources of funding, but the study also suggests potential paths forward for private sector participation in financial support of SAICM.

Consistent with the terms of reference, this study does *not* address national budgetary processes, new and additional sources of funding or industry's internalization of costs to society associated with chemicals production and use. Nor does the study attempt to budget the projected costs of SAICM implementation. Rather the emphasis of this study is on how various multilateral and bilateral financing options might be used to support capacity building in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Capacity building as applicable to chemicals management is understood to encompass institutional, human and technical (including infrastructure) capacity to manage chemicals throughout their life cycle, from their design and production, through to their final disposition.

### *Regional consultation discussion of financial considerations*

During regional discussions of financial considerations, participants identified the following as major needs (with differing emphasis among meetings):

- The need for significant financial commitments to achieve the World Summit on Sustainable Development 2020 goal;
- The need for integration (mainstreaming) of sound management of chemicals/SAICM objectives in national policy frameworks;
- The need for international financial mechanisms for SAICM (with specific mention made of the Global Environment Facility);
- The need to reflect that government financing alone will never be enough and that the private sector must make significant financial commitments, e.g., via cost internalization, including a global mechanism (although as noted above, the examination of this option is outside the scope of this study); and
- The need for all governments to make financial commitments to SAICM implementation at the national level (a topic also outside the scope of this study).

***Financing considerations in light of the scope of SAICM and gaps in capacity for the sound management of chemicals***

PrepCom 2 defined a broad scope for SAICM, such that it aims to promote the sound management of chemicals (SMC) throughout their life cycles (including in products) for protection of human health and the environment as part of sustainable development. To this end it covers at least, but is not limited to, 1) environmental, economic, social, health and labour aspects of chemical safety; and 2) agricultural and industrial chemicals. The scope statement further notes, “SAICM should take due account of instruments and processes that have been developed to date and be flexible enough to deal with new ones without duplicating efforts, in particular the efforts of forums dealing with the military uses of chemicals.”

In the context of this scope, there are significant gaps in capacity for SMC globally at all levels, and in developing nations and countries with economies in transition (CEITs) in particular. The urgency for building capacity for SMC globally and among nations is exacerbated by global growth in the chemicals industry, as well as changes in global patterns of chemicals production, trade and consumption, including increased production by the more industrialized developing nations of high volume chemicals and increased consumption of chemicals by developing nations.

Seen in this context, SAICM financial considerations will need to be addressed through several options that are both timely and adequate.

Currently, prevalent gaps in financing include the following:

- International agreements and decisions encompassed by SAICM have limited access to funding from multilateral and bilateral funding sources (e.g. the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention etc);
- Multilateral financial mechanisms with chemicals-related mandates address only partially the broader SMC governance issues that are central to SAICM;
- Existing multilateral financial mechanisms with chemicals-related mandates are restricted to provision of support for work on a relatively limited, although important, number of chemicals;
- Integration or “mainstreaming” of SMC issues in multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming has seen slow progress with certain key exceptions; and
- Despite the wealth generated by and growth of the chemical industry on a global basis, there are no significant mechanisms for industry financial contributions to the global agenda for the sound management of chemicals.

***Overview of current financing options***

The study provides an overview of the following financing options that are or could be applicable to the implementation of SAICM:

- Multilateral institutions and funds
- Regional development banks
- Bilateral aid agencies
- Private sector
- Private foundations
- NGOs

In addition, the study provides a discussion of the following specific multilateral institutions and funds regarding their suitability for potentially assuming additional *multilateral* financing functions in support of the implementation of SAICM:

- Global Environment Facility (GEF);
- Multilateral Fund (MLF) for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol;
- The World Bank (as a financial institution in its own right and taking into account trust funds it administers/manages); and
- UNEP, inclusive of its Environment Fund and earmarked trust funds.



Criteria used in the study for assessing *multilateral* financial institutions and funds in the SAICM context are as follows:

- Compatibility of mandates with the SAICM scope and objectives;
- Compatibility of governance structures;
- Record of sustainability of the institution and associated fund(s);
- Multi-sectoral involvement;
- Engagement of the development assistance committee;
- Transparency/accountability;
- Participation/equity of access;
- Secretariat capabilities and capacities; and
- Legal transaction costs associated with potentially assuming a multilateral SAICM financing function.

### **Multilateral institutions and funds**

Currently, there are no multilateral institutions or funds that address the planned scope of SAICM. However, some multilateral institutions and funds address portions of the SAICM scope, consistent with their core mandates and/or policies.

The assessment criteria suggest that the World Bank and the GEF present the best multilateral financial support options, including with respect to a proposed SAICM specific trust fund. The study observes that the World Bank has the widest scope of activities of any international financial institution. Within a country-driven programming framework, it has considerable flexibility regarding the subject matter of its work, and, as such, potentially has high compatibility with the scope of the SAICM mandate. The World Bank has established and maintained a wide variety of trust funds that have governance structures accommodating diverse donor and recipient country needs (i.e., that appear in trust fund design and rules of operation). The World Bank is also a GEF Implementing Agency. This flexibility and experience could accommodate the needs of a SAICM financial function comparatively easily.

The GEF's current mandate as a financial mechanism for multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) related to chemicals (in particular, the Stockholm Convention, and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, and also its support for regional seas and other agreements via its international waters focal area) provides it with considerable compatibility with the subject matter of SAICM. The GEF would be in a position to take advantage of synergies with its current activities that support SMC, and to apply the knowledge base on chemicals that it has developed as a result of serving as a financial mechanism for MEAs. Thus, while there is no focus on general SMC issues at the GEF, the POPs focal area in support of the Stockholm Convention, for example, invites a comprehensive and integrated approach to POPs management that could be highly compatible (i.e., offer strong co-benefits) with the SAICM approach. However, the study also notes that the GEF's application of new and additional grant and concessional funding to "the agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve agreed global environmental benefits" could present a problem for SAICM, which does not differentiate its objectives in terms of global and local benefits. Additionally, many of the needs identified by SAICM would involve strengthening national SMC governance capabilities and capacities that often would not involve global benefits as these are currently defined for the GEF. This problem could potentially be overcome at the discretion of donor governments by assigning different criteria to the SAICM financing function, or by clarifying the concept of "global environmental benefits" as it applies to SAICM.

The UNEP trust fund option also has many positive aspects, although it would not score as high as the World Bank or the GEF on key criteria, such as compatibility of mandates, multisectoral engagement, and engagement of the development community. For example, while UNEP has quite a high degree of compatibility of mandate with SAICM, in particular via its UNEP Chemicals activities, its mandate with respect to SAICM's full scope (i.e., which is multisectoral) is somewhat circumscribed by the fact that its work on chemicals is necessarily linked to support of environmental aspects of chemicals initiatives (in contrast, to, for example, health, development, etc.) as these support its overall objectives and programmes. Similarly, while UNEP's compatibility of governance with SAICM is very high in terms of its experience with global environmental chemicals issues, its compatibility of governance relative to the scope of SAICM financing functions appears to be somewhat limited with regard to its ability to accommodate the roles of other Inter-Governmental Organizations (IGOs) working on chemicals in light of their different mandates. UNEP, on the other hand, has consistently demonstrated high levels of success associated with managing earmarked trust funds

dedicated to support international negotiation processes and secretariat functions, such as would be required for a SAICM secretariat function.

### **Regional Development Banks**

The regional development banks examined in this study include the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the African Development Bank. None of these banks, although their policies and/or programmes may have synergies with sound management of chemicals, have an explicit SMC component. Therefore, their support for activities on or involving chemicals occurs on an *ad hoc* basis and overall has been very limited. The absence of recognition by these institutions of an explicit SMC component is a major lost opportunity for the global SMC agenda.

### **Bilateral aid agencies**

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) developed guidance in 1993 for assistance in support of chemical activities. This guidance, while still valid, has generally not been explicitly recognized as part of financing objectives or programmes of bilateral aid agencies. Some bilateral aid agencies include the environment as one theme-based programme or initiative, but chemicals do not figure prominently or are addressed indirectly by targeting environmental and human health end-points that are negatively affected by unsound management of chemicals such as groundwater preservation, watershed management, air quality (most typically as affected by vehicular traffic and fuel type), sustainable agriculture, and cleaner production. A major challenge for SAICM is to integrate SMC issues into bilateral aid programming to a far greater extent than is currently the case.

### **Private sector**

There is no dedicated chemical fund or strategic initiative by industry for contributing to SMC activities, nor does the private sector make systematic contributions to chemical MEA funds. The private sector has been relatively more active in partnerships on an *ad hoc* basis and in voluntary initiatives such as Responsible Care®.

### **Foundations**

There appears to be very limited funding dedicated to SMC by private foundations although no study was found that systematically examines their SMC contributions or contributions in other areas that might have synergies with SMC (e.g., environment and health).

### **Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)**

Financial sustainability is an ongoing challenge for NGOs, which typically support themselves via a mix of sources, including international donor support, national or regional government co-financing, private sector grants (corporate and private sector foundations), fund raising campaigns, and membership fees. There appears to be limited evidence to suggest that donors are prepared to act together to set up, for example, joint capacity building funds with NGOs to advance global SMC.

### ***Possible elements of financial arrangements for SAICM***

The study considers five elements for SAICM financial arrangements:

1. Mainstreaming of sound management of chemicals in multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming.

A key challenge for SAICM is to bring SMC issues into the mainstream of multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming. Much more money than is currently devoted to SMC (and will be for the foreseeable future) is moving through multilateral and bilateral official development assistance. SMC, as an important issue for sustainable development, should directly or indirectly receive a larger share of those resources than is currently the case. This could be realized through integrating or mainstreaming SMC in national policy documents that define development assistance priorities within recipient countries. However, mainstreaming requires financial and technical assistance in its own right, and it is an interdependent process, requiring concerted mainstreaming also in the programming of bilateral assistance agencies within donor countries.

2. Benefiting from the current core mandates of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the Multilateral Fund (MLF) for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol.

With respect to chemicals, both the GEF and MLF for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol address specific chemicals as linked with conventions (e.g., POPs under the Stockholm Convention and ozone-depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol). Key synergies or linkages with these mandates could be exploited relative to issues that are common to other or all chemicals, such as capacity building to improve the overall governance for SMC within a country, while addressing POPs management/phase out. The GEF 4 programming document, Strategic Objective 2, speaks to these basic foundational capacities. Furthermore, governments could consider exploring opportunities for funding some SAICM initiatives (e.g. foundational capacity building for SMC) under Paragraph 3 of the Amended GEF instrument, which speaks to work on a broader range of chemicals issues within existing GEF focal areas providing the chemicals-related work serves to also advance the strategic objectives of the existing focal areas. However, ability to take advantage of potential opportunities associated with Paragraph 3 would be dependent on a strong GEF replenishment across all focal areas, and strong demand expressed through official channels for such work from eligible recipient countries. Additionally, governments could work towards a new GEF focal area for SAICM, which would perhaps be longer-term objective.

3. Establishing a voluntary fund in support of SAICM implementation.

The implementation of SAICM could substantially benefit from the establishment of a voluntary, partnership-based trust fund that supports the following purposes for SAICM in the short-term:

- A quick-start of SAICM enabling activities;
- Assisting activities of governments that declare an intent to mainstream SAICM objectives in national policy documents that direct multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming; and
- Providing co-financing to leverage resources for quick-start enabling activities and mainstreaming, and for GEF and MLF projects that have potential to build broader SMC capacities within a country (i.e., where incremental additional money is needed to attach national benefits of projects to the global benefits that are the focus of these existing mechanisms).

4. Advancing industry financial participation in implementation of SAICM.

For SAICM to succeed, industry's contributions toward the sound management of chemicals will need to be significant. One proposal led by the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN) is for "an appropriate globally harmonized system that internalises the costs of sound management of chemicals management within relevant industries".

Industry participation can also be viewed as a diverse process, which could include the following actions:

- Voluntary financial contributions (e.g., to a SAICM fund);
  - Strengthening current SMC voluntary initiatives (e.g., Responsible Care) and creating new ones;
  - Inviting action at the national level, including strengthened regulatory regimes and tax/cost recovery reform; and
  - Clarifying/developing policies, tools and approaches for new and innovative economic instruments.
5. Establishing capabilities and capacities to steward SAICM Resource Mobilization
- Overall, the implementation of SAICM will require a strong and sustained secretariat function. In addition, the various elements of SAICM resource mobilization will require stewarding by a SAICM secretariat, albeit with most of the intensive functions associated with the resource mobilization strategy being performed by governments, international financial institutions and organizations, non-government organizations, and other participants in the SAICM process.

#### *Options for SAICM financial arrangements*

The proposed options associated with SAICM financial arrangements are essentially of two types:

- Building upon the core mandates of existing financing options (e.g., mainstreaming SMC within development assistance programming, building upon foundational capacity building under the GEF, developing the modalities for Paragraph 3 of the amended GEF Instrument, etc); and
- Financing opportunities created to fill gaps in the current array of options (e.g., a voluntary partnership fund for SAICM implementation, advancing a GEF SAICM focal area, etc.).

It will be important for the International Conference on Chemicals Management, when considering financial arrangements for SAICM, to bear in mind that governance of SAICM financial arrangements will be a key issue, and one which can only be fully resolved upon finalization of 1) the institutional arrangements for SAICM implementation and 2) the elements of SAICM financial arrangements.

While governments will need to assume many lead responsibilities for SAICM financial arrangements, shared responsibilities and partnerships with industry and other SAICM participants will be critical.

#### **Proposed options**

**The SAICM PrepCom might consider recommending the following to the International Conference on Chemicals Management regarding SAICM financial arrangements:**

#### **1. With regard to mainstreaming SMC issues into multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming:**

- a. Developing countries and CEITs work towards integrating SMC issues in their national policy documents that directly or substantially influence development assistance programming within their countries;
- b. Donor countries make available adequate financial and technical assistance to assist developing countries and CEITs that declare their intentions to work towards mainstreaming SMC in national policy documents that directly or substantially influence development assistance programming;
- c. Donor countries work towards mainstreaming SMC as an important environmental sub-theme in bilateral aid agency programming;
- d. International financial institutions work towards mainstreaming SMC as an important environmental sub-theme in their programming; and
- e. SAICM, as part of its early work programme, develop a methodology based on the best available knowledge and information, and complete a broadly inclusive study to develop estimates of current and projected environmental and human health costs to sustainable development associated with the unsound management of chemicals on a global basis to inform ongoing actions to mainstream SMC as an environmental sub-theme in multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming.

#### **2. With regard to benefiting from the core mandates of the GEF and the MLF for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol:**

- a. The GEF and the MLF for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol identify and build upon potential synergies between their current core mandates and implementation of SAICM, including in the area of strengthening capacities for SMC governance more broadly as part of the programmes and projects that they finance;
- b. The GEF clarify the modalities for the use of Paragraph 3 of the Amended GEF Instrument to help advance implementation of SAICM, with a particular emphasis on foundational capacity building for improved governance of SMC issues at the national level as outlined in the Programming Document for GEF-4, Strategic objective 2: Strengthening capacity for NIP implementation;
- c. Donor countries support a strong replenishment of the GEF under GEF-4 with specific reference to maintaining adequate resources in support of the implementation of the Stockholm Convention and supplementing these resources, as appropriate, to advance opportunities for synergies between implementation of the Stockholm Convention and implementation of SAICM; and
- d. Donor countries to the Global Environment Facility work towards establishing a chemicals focal area and/or other additional programming activities that are targeted, adequate and sustainable with respect to funding of priority needs within recipient countries for the implementation of SAICM objectives.

#### **3. With regard to a voluntary partnership-based trust fund in support of SAICM implementation:**

- a. Governments declare their interest in such a fund, including by becoming lead sponsors for the fund subject to their financial capabilities;

- b. The GEF or the World Bank begin facilitating the design and establishment of a voluntary partnership-based trust fund in support of SAICM implementation, working in cooperation with lead sponsors and taking the characteristics of the SAICM process and implementation mechanisms fully into account;
- c. Lead sponsors, in cooperation with the GEF or the World Bank, be asked to expeditiously agree upon the fund's core programme activities and required resources over the first five years of SAICM implementation, taking the following potential programme purposes for the fund into consideration:
  - i. Support for a “quick-start” of SAICM enabling activities or SAICM national action planning activities as the PrepCom or appropriate SAICM implementing bodies define these;
  - ii. Financial and technical assistance for developing countries and CEITs that declare an intent to work towards mainstreaming SMC in national policy documents that directly or substantially influence multilateral and bilateral development assistance programming; and
  - iii. Provision of co-financing for:
    - Leveraging additional resources from other sources to support purposes i and ii immediately above; and
    - GEF and MLF projects that seek to, consistent with their core mandates strengthen the governance for SMC more broadly within a country or group of countries. In this case, co-financing would be used to support the national benefits portions of a project design as an extension of the global benefits that are the main target of these financial mechanisms;
- d. Inviting other international financial institutions, and intergovernmental organizations to support the fund.

**4. With regard to advancing industry financial support for the implementation of SAICM:**

- a. Industry be invited to become one of the lead sponsors in partnership with governments and other participants for a voluntary, partnership-based trust fund in support of SAICM implementation;
- b. Industry be invited to review and strengthen current voluntary initiatives to bring them into line with the considerable challenges of SAICM and to report to SAICM at general meetings on progress in this regard;
- c. Industry be invited to develop voluntary industry initiatives that might be meaningful and timely to the implementation of SAICM and to report to SAICM at general meetings on progress in this regard;
- d. Governments assess their current laws and policies, including tax systems, to determine whether practical actions could be taken at the national level to enhance private sector financial participation in the strengthening of national SMC regimes consistent with SAICM, and to report to SAICM at general meetings on progress in this regard; and
- e. Governments and other participants in the SAICM process clarify work programs that could be undertaken in SAICM participating organizations to develop guidance on the policies, approaches and tools that will be needed to put economic instruments in place in support of SAICM implementation.

**5. With regard to a SAICM Secretariat's stewardship of SAICM resource mobilization:**

- Governments contribute financial support to a SAICM Secretariat, including an adequately resourced unit tasked with stewarding SAICM resource mobilization in cooperation with governments, international financial institutions and organizations, industry, non-government organizations, and other SAICM participants.