



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/6
11 August 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

进一步制定国际化学品管理战略方针

国际化学品管理战略方针通过以后化学品管理的 国际方面：跟踪进展、推动执行和后续行动

秘书处的说明

秘书处谨在本说明的附件中分发政府间化学品安全论坛（化安论坛）常设委员会提交的一份启迪文件，题为“化管战略方针通过以后化学品管理的国际方面—跟踪进展、推动执行和后续行动”供筹备委员会第三届会议参考。启迪文件的原文英文本及其译文按原文照发，而秘书处没有作任何正式的编辑或修改。

* SAICM/PREPCOM.3/1

* SAICM/PREPCOM.3/1。
K0582513 180805 180805

Annex



Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety

**International Aspects of Chemicals Management post-SAICM
adoption – tracking progress, promoting implementation, and
follow-up**

**IFSC Forum Standing Committee Thought Starter for SAICM
PrepCom 3**

Preface

The SAICM Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meetings have thus far largely focused on the content and structure of a "Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management".

At PrepCom1, delegates provided initial comments on potential issues to be addressed during the development of a SAICM, examined ways to structure discussions on the SAICM, and considered possible outcomes of the SAICM process. At PrepCom2, participants discussed elements for an overarching policy strategy for international chemicals management, prepared a draft matrix of possible concrete measures to promote chemical safety, and provided comments on an initial list of elements to be included in a high-level political declaration.

A key question to be addressed at PrepCom3 is who, at the international level, will take stock of progress of and encourage SAICM implementation, and how this oversight mechanism will function. There are many existing organizations and entities with distinct roles in the sound management of chemicals. The challenge for the Preparatory Committee is to identify the best international arrangement for chemical safety once the development of SAICM is complete.

PrepCom3 provides the opportunity to ask whether changes in international institutional arrangements are necessary. Are there any gaps in the international institutional framework or any areas of duplication? Where could the current international architecture be strengthened?

Introduction

At SAICM PrepCom 2, it was proposed that the IFCS develop a paper for PrepCom3. Paragraph 161 of the PrepCom report states:

A majority of participants expressed the view that the task of choosing an organization to take on the responsibility for tracking progress was too complex to resolve at the current session of the committee, and suggested that intersessional work be undertaken to examine the various options.[I]t was further proposed that a paper should be developed by IFCS in advance of the third session of the Preparatory Committee. One proposal for the paper was that it would identify drivers to meet targets, propose incentives for stakeholders to meet targets early and identify challenges that might keep targets from being met.

This paper¹ responds to that set of issues by examining the possible international institutional arrangements for chemical safety once SAICM is complete. The paper:

- sets out the current arrangements and the roles that each entity² takes in chemical safety;
- outlines the additional roles that will need to be filled once SAICM has been adopted;
- discusses some of the drivers for chemical safety, possible incentives for implementation of SAICM outcomes, and possible obstacles to implementation;
- in that context, identifies some of the attributes of international institutional arrangements likely to promote implementation of SAICM; and
- identifies options for institutional change.

Implementation of the outcomes of the SAICM development process will occur first and foremost at the national level, through actions by governments to give effect to the conclusions and recommendations the process arrives at. Those outside national governments – industry, public interest groups, the science community and its institutions, workers and their organisations, and intergovernmental organizations - will also have a role to play. This paper focuses only on some specific international aspects of the post-SAICM adoption environment, namely those relating to tracking progress, promoting implementation, and follow-up.

It is important to recall that even for those matters that are carried out internationally – overall tracking of progress, organising of international meetings to address particular issues, and so on - it is governments (and sometimes other stakeholders) who empower international institutions and entrust tasks to them.

¹ Other intersessional work will be done on these issues. In particular, the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) will develop a paper on ways to monitor progress in implementing SAICM.

² The IFCS and IOMC are "non-institutional arrangements", one set up by governments, the other by the Executive Heads of organizations. The term "entity" is used to include these arrangements and other non-institutional bodies such as CSD.

Current arrangements³

Ten global intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) have a major role in chemical safety; none of them has chemical safety as its only, or even major, responsibility. There are in addition two intersectoral mechanisms for chemical safety, namely the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS), and the Inter-organisation Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC), having distinct but interrelated roles and responsibilities.

The SAICM process is led by UNEP, in cooperation with the IFCS and the IOMC. In the SAICM process a further advisory body has been established, in the form of the SAICM Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is a facilitative mechanism to deal with practical aspects of the SAICM development process. The membership of the Steering Committee comprises a representative of each of the IOMC Participating Organizations and Observers, a representative of the IFCS, and the GEF Secretariat

Another entity in the international system that has a role in chemical safety, is the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), especially through some of its sub-committees and functional commissions. Further, there are regional bodies that have taken up aspects of chemical safety in their work programme, and several specialised conventions have been developed on chemical safety.

The IGOs

The global IGOs with substantive chemical safety roles are: FAO, ILO, OECD, UNIDO, UNEP, UNITAR, WHO, UNDP, the GEF and the World Bank. This group of IGOs is quite varied: some are UN specialised agencies; others are UN programmes, one is a UN institute, one an international financial institution, one a financial mechanism, one a grouping with limited membership. A more complete description of each and its chemical safety interests (along with some of the other entities discussed below) is included in Attachment A. The first seven of the listed organisations cooperate to form the IOMC, and UNDP and the World Bank attend IOMC meetings as observers.

Each of these organisations has a governing body that sets policy and priorities, and formalized operational rules and procedures. The sources for financial resources for chemical safety programmes and activities vary between and within each organization (e.g. contributions based on a scale of assessment such as the U.N. scale, or voluntary funding contributions). Chemical safety is usually only one of many issues or policy areas vying for attention and resources in these organizations. The level and kind of activity that each undertakes or supports is based on the funding it receives and reflects that policy and priority setting process.

³ For additional information see "International Activities Related to Chemicals, Overview of international agreements/instruments, organizations and programmes concerning chemicals management (3rd edition) 2001 (Note: revised edition is in preparation).
<http://portalserver.unepchemicals.ch/Publications/IntActRelChem2001.pdf>

Some of the listed bodies are also the home for international agreements in chemical safety, e.g. ILO, FAO and UNEP. Some of these agreements involve a separate and legally autonomous body (typically a Conference of the Parties) that takes decisions in respect of the agreement. This means that the secretariats of those agreements (e.g. of the Rotterdam, Stockholm and Basel Conventions and of the Montreal Protocol) are also global players in chemical safety. There are also other treaties related to chemicals, e.g. the Chemical Weapons Convention, whose secretariat is the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW).

United Nations Economic and Social Council

The UN Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals is a committee of the UN Economic and Social Commission (ECOSOC). It deals with the classification, hazard communication (labels, SDS) and packaging of hazardous chemicals. The Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD) is a functional commission of ECOSOC responsible for promoting sustainable development through technical cooperation and capacity building at international, regional and national levels, and especially through the implementation of Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation and the Barbados Programme of Action for Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States. It currently manages its work by means of a rolling cycle of two-year discussions focused on selected themes. Chemicals are scheduled for discussion (as part of a broader consideration of sustainable consumption and production) in 2010-2011.

Regional Bodies

Of the major regional organisations, that with the longest and strongest record on chemicals issues is the UN Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). UNECE is the home of the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (LRTAP), which has subsidiary agreements covering persistent organic pollutants and heavy metals, among others. It also provides the Secretariat for, and supports the work of, the UN Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals.

Intersectoral Mechanisms

IFCS

In response to a recommendation of the United Nations Conference on Environment in Development (UNCED), the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) was established in 1994 to improve international coordination and cooperation on chemical safety issues. The purpose of the Forum is to provide policy guidance with particular emphasis on regional and sub-regional cooperation. It aims to develop strategies in a coordinated and integrated manner and foster an understanding of the issues.

The IFCS is a non-institutional arrangement whereby representatives of governments meet, together with intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, to consider all aspects of the assessment and management of chemicals, and to establish priority areas for action. The Forum makes every effort to reach agreement on all matters by consensus of all participants.

The IFCS has neither the mandate nor the resources to implement recommendations; rather that is a task for governments and other participants (IGOs and NGOs). More information on the Forum is at Attachment A.

IOMC

The IOMC was created in parallel with the IFCS to promote coordination of the policies and activities pursued by the participating organizations. It is not a separate organization, but a coordination mechanism of the IGO secretariats to reach mutual agreement on how to take forward their chemical safety scientific and technical work (as noted earlier, authority ultimately rests with the IGOs' governing bodies). The IOMC aims to ensure that the IGOs cooperate to deliver programmes and to ensure that there is no duplication or overlap in chemical safety activities. More detail is at Attachment A.

IOMC's roles in chemical safety can be described as:

- coordinating implementation of the participating organizations' policies on chemical safety;
- cooperating to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in chemicals programmes undertaken in the participating organizations.

The international environment post-SAICM adoption

In considering international aspects of SAICM implementation, governments and other participants of the PrepCom should consider the current roles filled by various responsible parties in the international arena in chemical safety, in light of future needs, i.e.:

- policy leadership and guidance (currently through governing bodies of intergovernmental organizations, convention conferences of the parties and the IFCS)
- programme delivery in each subject area (currently through national governments, IGO secretariats, convention secretariats, NGOs etc);
- cooperation and coherence in programme delivery (currently through IOMC for the work of its participating organizations)
- identification of priorities for cooperation on chemical safety (currently through IFCS).

Following the adoption of SAICM, national governments and other sectors or entities that use or handle chemicals (e.g. industry, agriculture), supported by international organizations and NGOs, will have the primary responsibility for implementation, i.e. putting into place the agreed policies, principles and approaches from the Overarching Policy Strategy, and giving effect to Concrete Measures.

In addition, an entity (or entities) will need to be identified to take responsibility for SAICM oversight. There are several aspects to this work:

- Encouraging overall accountability – whose job is it, at the international level, to encourage implementation of SAICM?

- Monitoring of progress⁴ – covers the collection, collation, and assessment of information on implementation, against benchmarks set during the SAICM development process. This would lead to reports which would be submitted to a SAICM oversight mechanism.
- Oversight and Follow-up – consists of consideration by national governments and others of the reports from the monitoring process, and any additional problem identification or analysis, to allow conclusions to be drawn about progress. Also covers action that might be agreed on to remedy deficiencies or to address new issues.

The international institutional framework will need the following attributes if SAICM is to be successfully implemented:

- ownership – implementation of SAICM is unlikely to be a success unless all the entities in the international system have an appropriate level of ‘buy-in’;
- efficiency – cooperation and careful coordination is needed to ensure that resources are used efficiently and that duplication and overlap of activity are avoided;
- effectiveness – some arrangements are more likely to see progress than others, for example, chemical safety may be more central to the mission of some entities than others, while some entities may be more able to command resources to apply to chemical safety;
- accountability - implementation of SAICM is most likely to be successful if some entity (or entities) is responsible for facilitating implementation;
 - transparency of process and operation is a part of accountability;
- inclusiveness – the SAICM process and the operations of the IFCS have benefited from their inclusive approach to participation of all sectors and interests and of non-government as well as government and intergovernmental representatives; the same concept could be applied to participatory decision-making;
- adequate resourcing – it goes without saying that no matter how good the institutional framework, without adequate and sustained resourcing it is unlikely to be effective; on the other hand, additional resources are always difficult to find and subject to competing priorities; and
- effective reporting by the various entities on implementation of the outcomes of SAICM.

⁴ The definitions of monitoring and oversight used in this paper are based on definitions provided by the IOMC in the initial draft of its PrepCom3 document, "IOMC Paper on Ways of Monitoring Progress with the Implementation of SAICM, Including Proposed Criteria for the SAICM Oversight Body", but have been expanded on by the FSC for the purposes of this Thought Starter.

Drivers, incentives and obstacles to implementation of SAICM

Section V of the Thought-Starter⁵ prepared by the IFCS Forum IV for SAICM PrepCom 1 identified gaps in chemical safety at present, and Section V.E identified ‘obstacles and enablers’ of chemical safety. Among the obstacles (or enablers) identified were different aspects of political will, resources, skills and capacities, and institutional structures (“infrastructure”) at national level. That paper (a compilation of views of IFCS participants) has already been considered in the SAICM process.

If the question is asked: “What will determine if SAICM recommendations are followed, if targets are met or exceeded?” most of the answers would relate to the drivers, incentives and obstacles at national level; as already noted, that is where the major responsibility for implementation essentially rests. But at international level, similar considerations, suitably adjusted, illustrate the incentives and obstacles to implementation of SAICM. The way each of these aspects plays out will determine whether SAICM will be promoted or obstructed. For each of these issues strengths and weaknesses are apparent.

Political will – will the high-level international endorsement and support SAICM needs be forthcoming? What will bring the IGO governing bodies to focus on SAICM? Is there a role for public awareness and support in motivating political will?

Strengths of the current situation include:

- many IGOs and other entities representing different aspects of chemicals management now have an interest in and defined role in international chemicals matters.

Weaknesses include:

- at present only three IGO governing bodies have considered SAICM⁶;
- for most of the IGOs and other entities chemicals management is only a small part of their responsibilities.

Resources – will the resource flows for the concrete actions in SAICM match the needs⁷?

Skills and capacities – are international bodies equipped with the right mix of people and skills to deliver on expectations as well as the needed numbers - the latter being dependent on adequate resources?

Institutional structure – the way the international architecture is put together and operates in part determines how effective chemicals management will be in the future.

Strengths of the current system include:

- established coordination systems;

⁵ Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)

Forum IV Thought Starter Report to *SAICM PrepCom1*, 9-13 November 2003 (SAICM/PREPCOM.1/INF3) http://www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/meeting/prepcom1/prepcom1_inf3/K0320466en.pdf

⁶ UNEP Governing Council, WHO World Health Assembly, ILO International Labour Conference

⁷ A financial considerations report being prepared for PrepCom3 will identify potential resources.

- established channels for communications among organisation secretariats with otherwise separate sectoral interests;
- inclusiveness of processes in at least some parts of the system.

Weaknesses include:

- resourcing for chemical safety is uncertain and uneven;
- intersectoral deliberative bodies like the IFCS can identify priorities or make recommendations that:
 - cut across or are inconsistent with the established priorities or resource allocations of sectoral organisations to which they are directed;
 - are not always taken forward by national representatives to the relevant governing bodies of IGOs for consideration;
- national delegations do not always take the same positions at bodies like the IFCS and in the governing bodies of the IGOs, so that priorities, decisions or recommendations are not consistent;
 - similarly, IGO governing body decisions on the work programme of the organization do not necessarily include allocation of resources for implementation of chemicals-related recommendations from cross-sectoral entities like the IFCS;
- intersectoral cooperative bodies like the IOMC are made up of IGOs and therefore provide no direct means for governments and others to bring forward items and issues for consideration; this can make them appear non-transparent or unresponsive to governments (despite their best efforts);
- the system is complex, with a large number of players, each having part of the picture;
- accountability is fragmented and relies on good coordination at national level (which may not be universal);
- participation, information provision and transparency are uneven.

Options for international arrangements post-SAICM

An essential issue to be addressed is where responsibility for monitoring and encouraging SAICM implementation should rest. These functions could be assigned to:

- UNEP, which has convened the SAICM development process
- one of the other IOMC organisations (ILO, FAO, WHO, UNIDO, UNITAR, OECD)
- another IGO (e.g. World Bank, UNDP)
- the IOMC
- the IFCS
- the IFCS and IOMC in cooperation (or the existing steering committee, ie the IOMC, IFCS, World Bank, UNDP and GEF)
- an organisation outside those canvassed above (eg the CSD or its parent body, ECOSOC)
- a new entity/arrangement or organisation established for the purpose.

The above approach assumes that there are no other reasons for change within the international architecture for chemical safety – no other opportunities for greater efficiency or effectiveness, or for improving the other attributes identified above. The SAICM process, however, offers an excellent opportunity to ask whether other changes are necessary or would be advantageous.

In considering the possibilities, it is important to recall that some aspects of the international institutional framework are unlikely to change significantly as a result of SAICM, e.g. the IGOs will remain involved in chemical safety matters and, as noted earlier, each is responsible to its own governing body. The list of interested IGOs may grow (e.g. the regional development banks may take a stronger interest), but if so they are likely to join existing networks. The major entities where SAICM itself can engender change are the IFCS and the IOMC and other alternatives to coordination, as these relate directly and solely to chemical safety.

A number of options are listed below. It is important to remember that these options cannot be given effect in the SAICM process itself; most would require decisions by the IFCS (e.g. to amend its Terms of Reference), by the Executive Heads (IOMC) or governing bodies of the IGOs. The SAICM process itself could, however, make recommendations on what decisions ought to be taken and subsequently governments could then, through participation in the relevant governing bodies, provide a mandate to incorporate the outcomes of SAICM in their work programmes.

The decision on monitoring, encouragement and follow-up of SAICM could be made in conjunction with the choice among the options below. These options are not exhaustive; many different combinations are possible. This is a time to ask whether there are any gaps in international work on chemical safety that need to be filled, or any areas of duplication or overlap that need to be eliminated.

1. Retain the status quo

Present arrangements could be retained in recognition of their current functionality.

2. Amend the functions of the IFCS⁸

There may be advantage in defining the respective roles of the IFCS and/or the IOMC more closely, so that interfaces are more clearly set out and the efficiencies of the system can be improved. One option is that the IFCS could play a stronger role in the future, e.g. by taking on new roles or meeting more frequently and being given official recognition by the Governing Bodies of the IGOs; or, it could abandon some of its current roles.

3. Amend the functions of the IOMC

As with the IFCS, there may be improvements in reach by expanding or contracting the role of the IOMC, or perhaps in changing the way it operates being given official recognition by the Governing Bodies of the IGOs on matters of reporting.

4. Combine the IFCS and IOMC

The IFCS and the IOMC have common interests in coordination. The combined organisation would need to work out how the broader IFCS functions would be delivered and the implementation

⁸ An evaluation of the Terms of Reference and adopted Guidelines for the IFCS, comparing these to the draft criteria/qualifications for SAICM institutional arrangements, as outlined by the SAICM regional meetings, is included in Annex A of the Thought Starter entitled, "SAICM International Arrangements: Considerations for SAICM PrepCom3, based on the experience of the IFCS".

coordination mandate of the IOMC operate. Particular attention would need to be given to how the intergovernmental roles of the IFCS and the active participation of NGOs could be delivered. An alternative but related version of this option would be to build on the existing SAICM steering committee structure.

5. Allocate a lead role to an existing organisation outside the chemicals system

A body with other, perhaps related, roles could be asked to take responsibility for leading on taking stock of progress of SAICM and promoting implementation. An example would be a body in the UN system, such as the CSD (although to adopt that example would not sit comfortably with the CSD's current practice of a rolling programme of interests).

6. Create a new entity responsible for taking stock of progress of SAICM and promoting its implementation

The completion of SAICM raises the obvious possibility that a new entity be created to be responsible for implementation and monitoring of progress. This entity could be either an addition to current entities or a replacement for one of them. An advantage of this option is that a new entity could be designed and situated in the international system so as to overcome some of the drawback of the existing arrangement. A number of entities exist in the UN system, for example, that share the characteristics of chemical safety organisations in that they coordinate activity in several sectors, with involvement of several IGOs. UN bodies on forests and oceans illustrate this point, and could provide models for chemical safety.

Attachment A

Background on current chemical safety entities

IGOs

The IGOs with strong chemical safety roles are (with the major focus for each):

- Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) - (pesticides used in agriculture, fisheries and forestry);
- International Labour Organisation (ILO) - (worker health and safety);
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) - (wide range of chemical safety outputs from developed countries, including test guidelines, international hazard assessments, aspects of classification and labelling);
- United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - (environmental aspects of chemical use)
- United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) - (the chemical industry and use of chemicals in industry and industrial products);
- United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) - (training in chemical safety);
- World Health Organisation (WHO) - (health aspects of chemical use);
- World Bank - (financing for chemical safety);
- Global Environment Facility (GEF) - (funding for activities related to POPs and other hazardous chemical issues, as set out in the GEF Instrument); and
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - (developmental aspects of chemical safety).

International Programme on Chemical Safety (IPCS)

IPCS was established as a follow-up action to the 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment which called for programmes to be established for the early warning and prevention of harmful effects of chemicals and for the assessment of the potential risks to human health. As a result the Executive Heads of WHO, ILO and UNEP agreed to cooperate in IPCS, within the framework of their respective mandates to strengthen international cooperation. IPCS was formally launched in 1980 with a Memorandum of Understanding among the three organizations.

IFCS

Representation in the IFCS is from governments, the IGOs listed above and others active in the area of chemicals safety, and a wide range of interest groups representing industry, public interest NGOs, workers and science. Intersessionally the IFCS's work is taken forward by a small Secretariat, a President and regional Vice Presidents elected at each Forum session, and a Standing Committee of representatives of the interests listed above.

The functions of the IFCS include

- identify priorities for cooperative action on chemical safety, advise and, where appropriate, recommend concerted international strategies;
- assist in securing the collaboration, through governments, of national, regional and international bodies active in the field of chemical safety, and avoid any duplication of effort in this area;

- promote the strengthening of national coordinating mechanisms and of national capabilities and capacities for chemicals management;
- assist in identifying gaps in scientific knowledge and promote information exchange and scientific and technical cooperation;
- review periodically the effectiveness of relevant ongoing activities to implement recommended international strategies concerning chemical safety and make recommendations for further activities and, where necessary, advise on the strengthening or establishing the necessary follow-up mechanisms;
- advise governments in their work on chemical safety with particular reference to legislative aspects, promote cooperation among governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and encourage the appropriate distribution of work among organizations and other bodies within and outside the United Nations system in as clear and consistent a way as possible;

Among the major activities of the IFCS since it was established in 1994 are:

- Forums in 1994, 1997, 2000 and 2003 which adopted a large number of recommendations aimed at providing policy guidance, setting priorities and coordinating and building partnerships in chemical safety activity at the global level; of particular note are:
 - Forum I - Priorities for Action
 - Forum III - Bahia Declaration and Priorities for Action Beyond 2000
- President's Progress Reports 1997 (CSD and Rio+5), 2000, 2003 on the progress in the implementation of the Priorities for Action and other matters concerning relevant chemical safety issues based on the established national reporting process;
- large intersessional meetings in 1995, 1996 and 1998;
- the POPs Assessment Reports for UNEP in 1996, which provided the basis for international negotiations that led to the Stockholm Convention
- inputs to the SAICM process for PrepComs 1, 2 and 3;
- programme style activities, on an interim basis, such as INFOCAP and the Widening Gap initiative.

IOMC

The IOMC was created in 1995 following recommendations made by the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development. It brings together nine international organizations actively involved in chemical safety, the seven Participating Organizations (POs) (FAO, ILO, OECD, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO), and two observer organizations (UNDP and the World Bank).

The objective of the IOMC is to strengthen international cooperation in the field of chemicals and to increase the effectiveness of the individual organisations international chemicals programmes. It promotes coordination of policies and activities, pursued jointly or separately, to achieve the sound management of chemicals in relation to human health and the environment. The IOMC vision (adopted in June 2004) is:

The Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) is the pre-eminent mechanism for initiating, facilitating and coordinating international action to achieve the WSSD 2020 goal for sound management of chemicals.

The IOMC works on subjects related to chemical safety. For example, the IOMC addresses the areas elaborated in Chapter 19 of Agenda 21. The IOCC coordinates the planning, programming, funding, implementation and monitoring of activities undertaken jointly or individually by the IOMC organizations. In full consultation among all those involved, it helps identify gaps or overlaps in international activities, and makes recommendations on common policies. It fosters information exchange and joint planning with the aim to ensure effective implementation without duplication. Because intergovernmental organisations are mandated by their respective governing bodies and funded by governments, the latter benefit directly from the IOMC through efficiencies which can be obtained through optimal co-ordination of the work of the IOMC participants.

The IOMC organizations coordinate their activities on chemicals management through the IOCC (Inter-Organization Coordinating Committee), which meets twice a year and comprises the POs and observers. The IOCC Chair rotates amongst the POs. WHO is the current administering organization for the IOMC and provides secretariat services to the IOCC.

The IOMC maintains a website, containing a calendar of events, inventory activities, summaries of meetings, and other information. Examples of key successful joint activities include:

- establishing the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) and associated training and capacity building programme for its implementation;
- addressing the problems of obsolete/unwanted pesticides in Africa (“African Stockpiles Project”), by raising awareness of African countries regarding the risks posed to human health and the environment, developing inventories and planning for disposal;
- implementing the voluntary Prior Informed Consent (PIC) procedure;
- assessing Existing Chemicals, through sharing the burden of information gathering, testing, assessment of High Production Volume Chemicals among OECD countries;
- developing guidance on, and promotion of, Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) and Release Estimation Techniques (RETs); and
- helping countries develop their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) under the Stockholm Convention on POPs (Persistent Organic Pollutants).

Other entities

United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UN ECE) provides the Secretariat for the UN Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and on the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals. classification, hazard communication (labels, SDS) and transportation of hazardous chemicals.