



White paper for a global minimum transparency standard

This white paper presents the case for a global standard requiring disclosure of hazardous chemicals used in a product in international trade. Intended as a thought starter, it explains why a transparency standard is necessary to protect human and environmental health, and how it would form an essential foundation for a safe circular economy and assist countries in adding information to their national health registries. The paper identifies some of the issues that might arise in designing and implementing a global transparency standard, and it makes suggestions for how to address those issues.

The UN Environment Assembly (UNEA) and the 5th International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) are two opportunities where the global community could start taking the measures for setting in place such a standard.

Background

Chemicals in Products (CiP) became an Emerging Policy Issue in the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), following a decision by the SAICM decision making body ICCM in 2012¹. It promotes sharing of information on the identity of chemicals in products inside and outside supply chains. In 2015, a CiP Programme was created, to boost the CiP work, among other things by better defining the conditions and formats for information sharing². However, the expected boost in the work largely did not occur. Now the CiP work needs to be revived with new and strong commitments in the successor to SAICM. The adoption of the CiP Programme in 2015 coincided with the publication of the first European Union (EU) action plan for a circular economy, which has further been updated and revised³. The EU is in the process of adjusting all chemicals and waste legislation to support the circular economy.

Discussions are also picking up worldwide indicating circular economy as a key strategy to advance the work with a number of the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets. Among other things, this is attested by the resolutions that call for circular economy and to keep hazardous substances out of the material cycles, adopted by UNEA4⁴.

Circular economy illustrates how the life cycle of chemicals and wastes crosscuts many environmental, health and societal priorities and thematic areas, including the work of several global policy clusters, like biodiversity and climate change. It holds the potential for the narrative that will promote the understanding of why synergies between several policy clusters must be enhanced in the post 2020 framework and why the political priority for chemicals and waste is necessary to increase.

In its recently released Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability, the EU Commission points to the need for mainstreaming the transition to a toxic-free and circular economy, as “essential cross-cutting elements for sustainable development and taking into account policy coherence for development”⁵.

Knowing what chemicals are in products throughout product life cycle is crucial for a safe non-toxic circular economy. This underlines the importance of fulfilment of the CiP

¹ Emerging policy issues

(<http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/ICCM2/doc/ICCM2%2010%20emerging%20issues%20E.pdf>)

² Chemicals in Products Programme

(<http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/ICCM4/doc/K1502319%20SAICM-ICCM4-10-e.pdf>)

³ EU revised action plan for circular economy (https://ec.europa.eu/environment/circular-economy/pdf/new_circular_economy_action_plan.pdf).

⁴ UNEP/EA.4/Res.6

(<http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/28471/English.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>), UNEP/EA.4/Res.7

(<http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/28472/English.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>), UNEP/EA.4/Res.8

(<http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/28518/English.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>), and UNEP/EA.4/Res.19

(<http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/28501/English.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>)

⁵ Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability – towards a toxic-free environment

(<https://ec.europa.eu/environment/pdf/chemicals/2020/10/Strategy.pdf>)

Programme information objectives that calls for disclose of chemicals in products within and outside the product supply chain.

Noting that consumer products are recognized as a source of toxic chemicals exposure, disclosing information on their presence in products will also enable countries to assess direct exposure from the products, as well as leakage of these chemicals from the products to the environment and secondary exposure from air, water, and food, and then link this data with public health impacts through national health registries. This would support national information collection and handling systems for environmental toxicants, risk assessments, and assist in identifying toxicants that need to be reassessed, depending on degree of risk.

Thus, while the work with voluntary disclosure of chemicals in products should continue and intensify, obligations for the work on chemicals in products as SAICM issue of concern should also increase. This inter alia was highlighted by the recent United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) assessment report on SAICM Issues of Concern (IoCs)^{6,7} This report responds to Resolution 4/8 by the UNEA and aims to inform the international community about the current situation of specific IoCs, based on a review of evidence published within the past decade. The assessment identified an urgent need to step up the work with the existing IoCs, including through binding instruments. It pointed out that progress in the IoC work has been uneven between countries, and that policy inconsistencies across countries hamper progress. It also stressed that with the increasing interest globally to put in place circular economies, information about chemical contents must be available at all stages of the life of a product. It, furthermore, called for holistic approaches to address the IoCs. Where possible, it suggests that actions should build on existing regulatory initiatives.

Rationale

Consumer products are recognized as an important source of toxic chemicals exposure throughout product lifecycle. Transparency and traceability that contribute to preventing the presence of chemicals of concern in products and the associated material flows are at the core of a circular economy that should be safe to human health and the environment. However, the lack of globally agreed requirements to ensure the availability and accessibility of information on hazardous chemicals in products⁸ throughout the product life cycle leads to continued contamination of the supply chain. Noting that supply chains for many materials and products nowadays are multi-national, the spread of chemicals of concern in them is hard to address until harmonized global actions are adopted. It is particularly difficult for low-income countries to get access to information. Many of them are net importers of products, and companies there lack the resources and sometimes knowledge to systematically request information from suppliers, particularly beyond their national jurisdictions. Global information requirements would eliminate this obstacle, could improve progress in the CiP work between

⁶ Issues of Concern is the proposed collective term for what was earlier called Emerging Policy Issues and Other Issues of Concern.

⁷ Retrieved 25-10-2020 from the UNEP webpage (<https://wedocs.unep.org/handle/20.500.11822/33807>)

⁸ From now on, “product” is considered a collective name for materials/products that are constituent components of more complex products, as well as complex products.

countries, and, consequently, address one of the concerns in the UNEP assessment of SAICM IoCs⁹.

Furthermore, suppliers in multi-national supply chains for products often have to deal with multiple parallel company or country/region specific standards, which requires resources that are sometimes hard to leverage for small and medium-sized companies, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. Globally harmonized standards level the playing field for all companies, facilitate information exchange within and outside the supply chain and throughout product lifecycle, and eliminate potential double standards while ensuring equality before the law in all countries and regions. Globally harmonized standards will be especially beneficial to the safety of workers, consumers, and the environment in countries where regulation is missing or weak.

The EU Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability highlights the need for helping countries to meet obligations in relation to international agreements on chemicals and waste, including through putting in place common standards that offer high protection to human health and the environment, and level playing fields¹⁰.

The UNEP assessment on CiP work called for holistic approaches to address the IoCs. Depending upon the chosen chemical scope of the standard, a global minimum transparency standard (GMTS) for Chemicals of Concern holds the potential to be an example of a holistic tool for simultaneously improving access to information for several IoCs, and not just CiP, including hazardous substances within the life-cycle of electrical and electronic products (HSLEEPS), per- and perfluoroalkyl substances (PFASs), endocrine disrupting chemicals (EDCs), as well as the suggested candidate IoCs in the UNEP report, such as arsenic, bisphenol A (BpA), cadmium, organotins, and phthalates. These arguments are the rationale for establishing a global minimum transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern across sectors.

Models and scope of products and chemicals

In the real world, data on exposures and risks associated with chemicals are very scarce and incomplete. Therefore, the most practical way to identify chemicals for the list is based on their intrinsic hazard properties, which is also in line with the precautionary principle¹¹. For example, Chemicals of Global Concern are identified for the Stockholm

⁹ The UNEP Assessment of SAICM IoCs highlights the following challenges and opportunities for the work on chemicals in products” (1) Foster communication of chemicals present in products throughout the supply chain, versus the current common practice of communicating what should not be present. (2) Extend CiP communication to actors outside supply chains, e.g., by exploring instruments such as fiscal policies, extended producer responsibility, corporate sustainability reporting, and new public-private partnerships. (3) Ensure CiP information is relevant, accurate, current and accessible through strong regulatory and voluntary actions on effective monitoring and enforcement.

¹⁰ Chemicals Strategy for Sustainability – Towards a Toxic-free Environment (<https://ec.europa.eu/environment/pdf/chemicals/2020/10/Strategy.pdf>)

¹¹ The precautionary principle first emerged during the 1970s and has since been enshrined in a number of international treaties on the environment, such as Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration, in the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU and the national legislation of a number of Member States. It enables decision-makers to adopt precautionary measures when scientific evidence about an environmental or human health hazard is uncertain and the stakes are high.

Convention based on their intrinsic hazard characteristics¹². Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) for the Candidate List of the EU chemicals legislation, the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) Regulation, are also identified using hazard-based criteria¹³. Furthermore, the definition of the scope of chemicals for the SAICM CiP Programme refers to hazard properties¹⁴.

We suggest that the global minimum transparency standard is a negative list, i.e. that it contains chemicals that are recognized as having intrinsically unacceptable hazardous qualities to human health and the environment. Regulatory lists are usually negative lists, such as the Stockholm Convention list, and the EU Candidate List. From the point of view of confidential business information, a negative list is also less complicated than a positive, as it should be non-controversial for a company to disclose information on hazardous chemicals, also to stakeholders outside the supply chain, in line with the CiP Programme¹⁵. That the information provided by the global minimum transparency standard is available to all stakeholders along the life cycle of a product is critical.

There are several possibilities for how the global minimum transparency standard can be constructed. It should apply to the scope of products, and their constituent components, defined in the CiP Programme¹⁶.

To ensure that a global minimum transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern is quickly agreed upon, we suggest to include the chemicals regulated in the Basel¹⁷, Minamata¹⁸, and Stockholm Conventions¹⁹, the Montreal Protocol of the Vienna Convention²⁰, the IARC list of carcinogens²¹, as well as the chemicals in the EU Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoHs) Directive²² and Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) as defined in article 59 of the EU REACH

¹² Annex D, Stockholm Convention (<http://www.pops.int/Portals/0/download.aspx?d=UNEP-POPS-COP-CONVTEXT-2017.English.pdf>).

¹³ Article 57, REACH Regulation (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32006R1907&from=EN>).

¹⁴ Chemicals in Products Programme (http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/Documents/EPI/CiP%20programme%20October2015_Final.pdf).

¹⁵ SAICM CiP programme inter alia states that “Information on chemicals relating to the health and safety of humans and the environment should not be regarded as confidential”.

¹⁶ See page 9 of the CiP Programme document (<http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/ICCM4/doc/K1502319%20SAICM-ICCM4-10-e.pdf>).

¹⁷ Basel Convention (<http://www.basel.int/TheConvention/Overview/TextoftheConvention/tabid/1275/Default.aspx>). Annex I chemicals in plastic waste, e waste, textile waste, and other waste intended for recycling.

¹⁸ Minamata Convention (<http://www.mercuryconvention.org/Portals/11/documents/Booklets/COP3-version/Minamata-Convention-booklet-Sep2019-EN.pdf>)

¹⁹ Stockholm Convention (<http://www.pops.int/Portals/0/download.aspx?d=UNEP-POPS-COP-CONVTEXT-2017.English.pdf>), non-pesticide/biocide chemicals.

²⁰ Montreal Protocol (https://ozone.unep.org/sites/default/files/2019-12/The%20Ozone%20Treaties%20EN%20-%20WEB_final.pdf)

²¹ Agents classified by the IARC Monographs, volumes 1-127 (<https://monographs.iarc.fr/list-of-classifications>).

²² EU RoHs Directive (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32011L0065&from=EN>)

regulation²³. This is in line with the recommendation in the UNEP assessment of the IoC work to build actions based on existing regulation.

The rationale for including chemicals listed in the Basel and Stockholm Conventions is that they are relevant for waste that potentially is destined for recycled materials, such as plastics, e-waste, and textile waste. Recycling of waste containing toxic chemicals could result in the contamination of new products made out of recycled materials²⁴. In January 2020 the EU withdrew its specific exemption under the Stockholm Convention that allowed materials containing toxic flame retardants known as PBDEs to be recycled²⁵. That was an important step forward towards cleaning up the recycling and minimizing the contamination of new products. In addition, implementation of the conventions could be facilitated by disclosing information about the presence of the regulated chemicals in materials, as there in general are no obligation for disclosure under these conventions.

It should be non-controversial to build the global minimum transparency standard based on the Conventions.

The EU RoHs directive has been used as model or more or less identical regulations in a number of countries²⁶. Consequently, it should be non-controversial to also use it as one component for the global minimum transparency standard.

The SVHC, on the other hand are specific to the EU. However, the criteria underlying their identification capture the hazard properties in the definition of the scope of chemicals for the SAICM CiP Programme, and the SVHC list is arguably the most comprehensive listing of Chemicals of Global Concern that we to date have in any jurisdiction. The SVHC chemicals are already associated with a mandatory disclosure requirement, and soon a public database for SVHC in all products produced in, or imported to the EU, will be launched²⁷. This database builds on the principle of fulfilling all CiP Programme information objectives and could become a role model for a similar database at the global level.

In case chemicals overlap in the mentioned regulations, the strictest regulatory limits should apply for information disclosure to the global minimum transparency standard.

If any of the underlying conventions and regulations are updated, the global minimum transparency standard should reflect the updates.

The concentration thresholds for reporting to the transparency standard need to be carefully considered²⁸. They must also be low enough to provide sufficient protection to

²³ Substances of Very High Concern (<https://echa.europa.eu/candidate-list-table>),

²⁴ Toxic Loophole – recycling hazardous waste into new products (https://ipen.org/sites/default/files/documents/TL_brochure_web_final.pdf).

²⁵ Stockholm Convention Exemption (<http://chm.pops.int/Implementation/Exemptions/SpecificExemptions/TetraBDEandPentaBDERoSE/tabid/5039/Default.aspx>).

²⁶ RoHs as a model for similar regulations in many countries (<https://www.rohsguide.com/rohs-future.htm>).

²⁷ EU SCIP database (<https://echa.europa.eu/sv/scip-database>).

²⁸ Guidance for stakeholders on exchanging chemicals in products information (<http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/ICCM4/doc/K1502355%20SAICM-ICCM4-11-e.pdf>).

human health and the environment. For example, the threshold for SVHC disclosure in the EU REACH regulation is 0.1%, which may be insufficient for EDCs that may be biologically active at very low concentrations. In the EU RoHs Directive, the threshold for disclosure is 0.01%, which is more appropriate and give a better safety level. If an industry already has a stricter reporting requirement, it is encouraged to proceed with its already established stricter standard, thus supporting a higher level of ambition for reporting.

While the approach outlined above is reasonable and important to begin with, the current chemical conventions are insufficient for capturing the trans-boundary distribution of Chemicals of Global Concern via anthropogenic modes, such as international supply chains for products and waste, and do not capture neither trans-generational effects²⁹ nor cocktail effects³⁰. There are certainly hazardous chemicals that fulfil several of the Stockholm Convention criteria, but fail the criterion on long-range geographical transport, because the Stockholm Convention criteria only takes transport in air, water and biota into consideration, not material flows. **Thus, we also see the need for the development of complementary criteria for Chemicals of Global Concern to address the existing gaps.** The Swedish Chemicals Agency (KemI), the Center for Future Chemical Risk Analysis and Management Strategies of Gothenburg University, and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) have recently developed a proposal for hazard-based criteria to identify Chemicals of Global Concern and presented it in connection with a technical expert workshop in support of the Intersessional Process³¹. This proposal could potentially serve as the starting point for developing complementary criteria for Chemicals of Global Concern.

Not to forget, companies could, and should be encouraged, to have more ambitious transparency schemes in addition to the global minimum transparency standard.

Development and management

There are different approaches to how the criteria and global minimum transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern could be developed and managed.

A multi-stakeholder committee free from influence of commercial interests and coordinated by the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) could be tasked with developing the global minimum transparency standard and complementary criteria for Chemicals of Global Concern, following a decision at the upcoming ICCM5.

Once the criteria and list are established, the list can be managed and kept a living list by a multi-stakeholder committee coordinated by IOMC, possibly with additional regular input from SAICM stakeholders. Any stakeholder in the multi-stakeholder committee

²⁹ Trans-generational effects: Effects of chemical exposure manifesting in offsprings to individuals who were exposed, sometimes several generations back, and long after exposure has terminated. This can happen because chemicals may interfere with how genes are regulated, by changing the regulation in hereditary ways.

³⁰ Cocktail effects: Toxicity combination effects between mixtures of chemicals. They may jointly increase toxicity to larger degrees than the individual toxicities of the chemicals in the mixture, or cancel out any added toxicity effects.

³¹ Documents from the technical expert workshop, including the suggested criteria (<https://unitar.org/technical-expert-workshop-criteria-substances-international-concern-beyond-2020>).

should be allowed to nominate chemicals to the list, together with a written motivation with reference to the criteria.

Ideally, the global minimum transparency standard should be part of a binding agreement. It could become part of an existing treaty, where a treaty allows for amendments or additions of protocols. This option should be investigated for the already mentioned chemical conventions or the Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, an instrument developed through the UN Economic Commission for Europe, and that serves as an “open” global treaty³².

Another approach would be a standard like the Globally Harmonized System (GHS)³³. Implementation of the GHS has three stages: formal adoption by countries; incorporation into national legislation, i.e. to make it binding; and facilitation and enforcement of the uptake and use of GHS by companies and any other relevant actors. A disadvantage of this approach is that different countries may adopt different versions of the standard, just like we see for GHS, which is an obstacle to reap the benefits from full harmonization.

In any kind of committee, it is very important to ensure strong participation from low- and middle-income countries, so that their perspectives and needs are duly taken into consideration. Many low- and middle-income countries are net importers of materials/products and generally have poor analytical capacity and test resources, and, consequently, are dependent upon getting information about hazardous chemicals in them from their upstream suppliers. In the GHS sub-committee, hosted by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), for example, representatives from member states of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) have a disproportionate strong influence. This kind of situation must be avoided if a committee to manage a global minimum transparency standard is established.

We envision two steps: first there is a mandatory disclosure requirement for the chemicals in the transparency list; then restrictions at the global level of the chemicals in the list that are not yet regulated by conventions.

Compliance to the standard will have to be ensured by appropriate national systems, for example regular spot checks with analytical verification of Chemicals of Global Concern in the materials/products. On borders, custom service can be responsible, and in other cases national Chemicals Agencies or police.

Use of a global minimum transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern in the successor to SAICM

We urgently need to elevate commitment to, and the ambition level in the CiP work and the successor to SAICM.

³² Aarhus Convention (<https://www.unece.org/env/pp/introduction.html>).

³³ A Guide to The Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labeling of Chemicals (GHS) (<https://www.osha.gov/dsg/hazcom/ghsguideoct05.pdf>).

A very concrete way to strengthen mechanisms for taking stock of progress is the inclusion of a global minimum transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern as a milestone in the framework of targets, indicators and milestones for a CiP workplan.

An example of what this could look like in practice is in Annex A. Besides establishing the global minimum transparency standard into the successor to SAICM, it also outlines a logical sequence of actions that builds on the global minimum transparency standard starting with the existing chemical agreements and over time would step up the ambition level in the CiP work considerably. The initial step will be to develop the global minimum transparency standard for already regulated chemicals and ensure they are disclosed in products. Moving forward the list of chemicals could be expanded based on the developments within the agreements as well as complementary information addressing the gaps. A global publicly accessible database will further be developed to ensure obligatory information disclosure within and outside the supply chain on chemicals of global concern in products, following the ECHA database example. Eventually the disclosed chemicals of global concern could be regulated as suggested in Target Y, Milestone 1, Annex A.

While we see the adoption of the global minimum transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern as a keystone for a global circular economy that is safe to human health and the environment, it must not be forgotten to continue the CiP work for eventual full ingredient disclosure. Chemicals that are considered harmless at present may be viewed as harmful in the future. The best way we can track in which products the chemicals are, should the hazard classification change, is full ingredient disclosure.

Suggested ways forward

ICCM can adopt decisions on developing complementary criteria for Chemicals of Global Concern, and a global minimum transparency standard based on the criteria, as long as they are purely voluntary. This could be done within the framework of the successor to SAICM. It should also be able to issue resolutions calling for other fora to develop the criteria and standard and investigate if it could be connected to increased obligations.

Ideally, the criteria and standard should be developed under IOMC, to ensure solid commitment and ownership by all inter-governmental organizations of relevance to the sound management of chemicals and waste. Then a resolution of higher political weight than an ICCM resolution would be preferable.

Resolutions by UNEA, or even the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA), would have that political weight. A decision by the UNGA to establish an Enabling Framework³⁴, as envisioned by several SAICM stakeholders, would be most helpful to revive and improve the function of IOMC, so that it, among other things, could be tasked with creating the committee for criteria and standard development.

As mentioned in the background section, a number of resolutions adopted by the UNEA4 called for circular economy and improved transparency and information sharing

³⁴ Enabling Framework

(http://www.saicm.org/Portals/12/documents/meetings/IP3/INF/SAICM_IP3_INF4_EnhancingGovernanceSMCW.pdf)

on chemicals in the supply chain of products, in particular resolution UNEP/EA.4/Res.8³⁵.

We strongly encourage countries and regions to consider suggesting a new chemicals and waste resolution for the UNEA5, building upon UNEP/EA.4/Res.8, but taking it a step ahead by calling for the establishment of a committee to develop complementary criteria for Chemicals of Global Concern, a global minimum transparency standard, and to investigate if the standard could eventually be added as a protocol to an existing treaty. This would be a logical and concrete step ahead that would lay the foundation for a global circular economy safe to human health and the environment. Such a resolution prior to ICCM5, would also give a clear mandate for including criteria for Chemicals of Global Concern, and a global minimum transparency standard, into the targets, indicators, and milestones for the CiP workplan in the successor to SAICM.

³⁵ UNEP/EA.4/Res.8
(<http://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/28518/English.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y>).

Annex A – Example of how a global minimum transparency standard can be operationalized in SAICM

Key targets, indicators, and milestones in a SAICM CiP workplan that would considerably increase the ambition level in the work, centered around a global transparency standard

<p>Target X: Information on the properties of chemicals across the supply chain and their sound management including alternatives, and chemical contents of products is available to all to enable informed decisions and actions.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: A committee³⁶ for the development of criteria to disclose and identify Chemicals of Global Concern based on intrinsic hazard properties in place and operational.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Chemicals of Global Concern based on the developed criteria identified for the global transparency standard.</p>	<p>Milestone 1 for Indicator 1, 2: By year A, a global transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern is in place, ready to be adopted into national action plans for the successor to SAICM.</p>
---	---	---

³⁶ The Terms of Reference for the committee will be to define criteria for disclosing information on chemicals of concern in products, including complimentary criteria for chemicals of global concern to address the gaps in existing chemical conventions and agreements.

	<p>Indicator 3: Dedicated funding in place for the creation of a global database for Chemicals of Global Concern.</p> <p>Indicator 4: A consultant for the creation of the global database for Chemicals of Global Concern procured and operational with no conflict of interest.</p>	<p>Milestone 2 for Indicator 3 and 4: By year B, a publicly available global database administrated by UNEP for Chemicals of Global Concern is in place to support informed decision-making, and it will expand over time as needed, when increasingly more countries report to it, and if new chemicals are added to the transparency standard or more product categories become prioritized.</p>
	<p>Indicator 5: Number of countries that have adopted the global transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern into national action plans and report to ICCM to feed in data to the global database.</p>	<p>Milestone 3 for Indicator 5: By year C, 25% of the UN countries report to ICCM on chemicals in products according to the global transparency standard for Chemicals of Global Concern, and the data is added to the database; by year D 50%; by year E 75%; and by year F 100%.</p>

<p>Target Y: Chemicals or groups of Chemicals of Global Concern, have been identified and phased out or are effectively restricted at the national level, throughout the entire life cycle, including the waste stages, so that exposure of humans and the environment is prevented or restricted.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: X Chemicals of Global Concern from the global transparency standard can no longer be legally marketed in Y countries.</p> <p>Indicator 2: X Chemicals of Global Concern from the global transparency standard are restricted in Y countries.</p>	<p>Milestone 1 for Indicator 1 and 2: By year A, 25% of the UN countries have legislation and enforcement mechanisms in place and operation that ban, include a phase out plan with sunset dates, or restrict at least B Chemicals of Global Concern from the global transparency standard; by year C 50%; by year D 75%; and by year E 100%.</p>
---	--	--

<p>Target Z: All non-essential* uses of chemicals or groups of chemicals of concern have been identified, phased out or effectively restricted.</p>	<p>Indicator 1: A committee in place to map non-essential uses*, in line with the Montreal Protocol definition, for the Chemicals of Global Concern in the global transparency standard.</p> <p>Indicator 2: Non-essential essential uses*, in line with the Montreal Protocol definition, mapped for the Chemicals of Global concern in the global transparency standard.</p> <p>Indicator 3: Procurement policies of national and local governments, manufacturers and retailers do not permit purchasing of products where Chemicals of Global Concern from the global transparency list have been used in ways considered non-essential in line with the Montreal Protocol definition.</p>	<p>Milestone 1 for Indicator 1, 2 and 3: By year A, 25% of the UN countries have legislation and enforcement mechanisms in place and operation that ban, include a phase out plan with sunset dates, or restrict at least B Chemicals of Global Concern from the global transparency standard with reference to the Montreal principle of non-essential use*; by year C 50%; by year D 75%; and by year E 100%.</p> <p>*Non-essential uses: See concept of "essential use" in Decision IV/25 for the Montreal Protocol. The two elements of an essential use are that a use is "necessary for health or safety or for the functioning of society" and that "there are no available technically and economically feasible alternatives". All other uses are considered to be non-essential.</p>
--	---	---

For more information, please contact:

Health and Environment Justice Support (HEJSupport)
 Olga Speranskaya, olga.speranskaya@hej-support.org
 Alexandra Caterbow, alexandra.caterbow@hej-support.org

Swedish Society for Nature Conservation (SSNS)
 Andreas Prevodnik, andreas.prevodnik@naturskyddsforeningen.se

Groundwork/Friends of the Earth South Africa
Rico Euripidou, rico@groundwork.org.za

Canadian Environmental Law Association
Fe de Leon, deleonf@cela.ca

European Environmental Bureau
Dolores Romano, dolores.romano@eeb.org

BUND/Friends of the Earth, Germany
Manuel Fernández, Manuel.Fernandez@bund.net

Forum Umwelt und Entwicklung
Wolfgang Obenland, obenland@forumue.de

The Lung Association- New Brunswick
Barb MacKinnon, barb.mackinnon@nb.lung.ca

Women's Healthy Environments Network
Cassie Barker, cassie@womenshealthyenvironments.ca

RightOnCanada
Kathleen Ruff, kruff@starlynx.ca

Pestizid Aktions-Netzwerk e.V. (PAN Germany)
Susan Haffmans, susan.haffmans@pan-germany.org

PAN North America
Kristin S. Schafer, kristins@panna.org

PAN Aotearoa New Zealand
Meriel Watts, meriel@merielwatts.net

PAN UK
Keith Tyrell, keith@pan-uk.org

Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE)
Gohar Khojayan, gohar.khojayan@gmail.com

Eco-Accord, Russia
Olga Ponizova, ecoaccord@gmail.com

Women Engage for a Common Future (WECF)
Johanna Hausmann, johanna.hausmann@wecf-consultant.org

TOXISPHERA, Brazil
Zuleica Nycz, zuleica.nycz@gmail.com

Greenwomen, Kazakhstan
Lidia Astanina, lidia.astanina@gmail.com

Chemical Safety Agency, Ukraine
Denis Pavlovsky, dpavlovskyi88@gmail.com