UNITED NATIONS

UNEP

UNEP/GFC/IC.1/INF/3

Distr.: General
9 October 2026

English only

Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste

International Conference
Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste
First session
Geneva, 16–20 November 2026
Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda*

Global Framework on Chemicals – tracking progress: overview of progress towards the strategic objectives and targets and of gaps in progress

Tracking progress: indicative overview of progress under the Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste - supplementary information

Note by the secretariat**

1. The annexes to the present note provide supplementary information in support of document UNEP/GFC/IC.1/3 entitled "Tracking progress: indicative overview of progress under the Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste" with respect to the data sources used. The measurability structure of the Global Framework on Chemicals, including its indicators, has not yet been finalized; therefore the assessment conducted is indicative only and is not intended to provide a comprehensive analysis. It is informed by data from the following sources: (a) existing indicators developed and maintained by the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) and its participating organizations; (b) a baseline survey conducted by the secretariat; and (c) online sources of information.

2. Information on data obtained from IOMC participating organizations, online data sources and, where applicable, responses received through the stakeholder survey can be found in Annex I. For each target, it indicates the indicator(s) considered for the indicative assessment and provides a snapshot of the associated methodology, available evidence, data availability and other relevant considerations for interpreting the results presented in the scorecards (UNEP/GFC/IC.1/3).

3. A stakeholder survey was made available online from 11 March to 30 April 2026 and can be found in Annex II. The survey responses received are reflected, as applicable, in the results presented in the scorecards (UNEP/GFC/IC.1/3).

* UNEP/GFC/IC.1/1.

** This document has not been formally edited

Annex I

Information used to assess progress under each target

Strategic objective A

Legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms and capacities are in place to support and achieve the safe and sustainable management of chemicals throughout their life cycle

Target A1: By 2030, Governments have adopted and are implementing and enforcing legal frameworks, and have established appropriate institutional capacity to prevent or, where prevention is not feasible, minimize adverse effects from chemicals and waste as appropriate for their national circumstances

- Number of countries with controls for lead in paint (World Health Organization)

  Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries with controls on the production, import, sale and use of lead paints, as reported by WHO, using the latest data available year for each country. Countries were assigned one of three statuses: Yes, No or No data. The assessment covers 195 countries: the 194 WHO Member States and Liechtenstein, which is included in the WHO dataset and retained to ensure consistency with the source data.
  Available evidence (based on information retrieved on 3 June 2026): Of the 195 countries assessed, 94 countries (48%) were classified as having legal controls for lead in paint, while 70 countries (36%) did not have such controls, and data were unavailable for 31 countries (16%).
  Data availability: Data were available for 163 (84%) WHO member states

- Number of countries that have achieved core capacities for chemical events under the International Health Regulations (World Health Organization)

  Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries that have achieved core capacities for chemical events under the International Health Regulations (2005). The assessment uses the latest available data in the 2025 WHO core capacity score for chemical events (C14) for each country or territory. Those with a score of 80 or 100 were considered under the indicator, while entries without a reported score were categorized as "No data". The assessment covers 197 countries and territories: the 194 WHO Member States, Liechtenstein, the occupied Palestinian territory, including east Jerusalem, and the Holy See. These were retained for consistency with the WHO dataset.
  Available evidence (based on information retrieved on 2 July 2026)**:** Of the 197 countries and territories assessed, 58 (30%) had a C14 core capacity score of 80 or 100, while 138 (70%) had a score below 80.
  The breakdown was as follows: 47 (24%) recorded a score of 20, 59 (30%) a score of 40, 32 (16%) a score of 60, 33 (17%) a score of 80, and 25 (13%) a score of 100.
  Data availability: Data were available for 193 (99%) WHO Member States.

- Number of countries that have partially or fully implemented the GHS (UNITAR)

  Methodology: This indicator monitors full (all sectors: agrochemicals, workplace and consumer products) or partial (one or two sectors) implementation of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS). Using the latest available GHS implementation data, countries assigned a key of 1 were considered to have partial legal implementation, while those assigned a key of 2 were considered to have full legal implementation. A key of 0 indicated no legal implementation. The assessment covers the 193 UN Member States.
  Available evidence (based on information retrieved on 6 March 2026)**:** Of the 193 countries assessed, 76 countries (39%) had partially or fully implemented GHS. This included 19 countries (10%) with legal implementation in one or two sectors and 57 countries (30%) with legal implementation in all sectors. The remaining 117 countries (61%) had not legally implemented the GHS.
  Data availability: Data were available for 193 (100%) UN Member States.

- Number of countries with legislation in place to manage industrial and consumer chemicals (OECD)

  Methodology: This indicator tracks the number of countries that have legislation in place to regulate industrial and consumer chemicals, i.e. chemicals which are not covered by specific legislation such as pesticides or pharmaceuticals. Using the latest available information in the OECD database, each country was categorized as follows: legislation "exists", is "in development", "no legislation", or "no data". Countries without information in the OECD database were categorized as "no data", rather than having "no legislation". The results were calculated against the 193 UN Member States.
  Available evidence (based on information retrieved on 2 July 2026)**:** Of the 193 UN Member States, 50 countries (26%) were reported as having legislation in place to manage industrial and consumer chemicals. Legislation was in development in 18 countries (9%), while 23 countries (12%) were reported as having no such legislation. Data were unavailable for the remaining 102 countries (53%).
  Data availability: Data were available for 91 (47%) UN Member States.

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants) with regulatory and assessment schemes for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on the number of countries that have established legal frameworks to assess new industrial chemicals and pesticides as provided under question 6 of Part B, Section II of the Stockholm Convention national reports. Using the latest available national reporting data under the Stockholm Convention, each country was categorized under "yes", "no", "currently being developed", or" no data", based on whether a regulatory and assessment scheme for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals was reported. The assessment covers 197 countries, comprising 185 Parties to the Stockholm Convention (excluding the European Union), and 12 non-Parties. Non-Parties could provide information through the Global Framework on Chemicals Secretariat.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 19 May 2026)**:** Of the 197 countries assessed, 82 countries (42%) reported having a regulatory and assessment scheme in place, while 18 countries (9%) reported that such a scheme was under development, and 25 countries (13%) reported that no scheme was in place. Data were unavailable for 72 countries (37%), comprising 60 Parties with no reported information and 12 non-Parties that did not provide data through the GFC survey.
  Data availability: Assessed against the 197 countries included in the baseline (185 Parties, 12 non-Parties). Data were available for 125 (63%) countries assessed.

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal) that adopted legislation to implement provisions for the control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and other wastes and their environmentally sound management (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

  Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries with legislation adopted to implement the provisions of the Convention. Countries were assessed using cumulative national reporting data submitted under the Basel Convention for the period 2016–2024. Each country was categorized as Yes, No, or No data, based on whether it reported having adopted legislation to implement the relevant provisions of the Convention. Parties recorded as No report or No reporting were categorized as No data. The assessment covers 194 countries, comprising 191 Parties to the Basel Convention and 3 non-Parties.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 24 July 2026)**:** Of the 194 countries assessed, 150 countries (77%) reported having adopted the relevant legislation, while 27 countries (14%) reported that they had not. Data were unavailable for 17 countries (9%), comprising 14 Parties with no reported information and 3 non-Parties that did not provide data.
  Data availability: Assessed against the 194 countries included in the baseline (191 Parties, 3 non-Parties). Data were available for 177 (91%) countries assessed.

Target A2: By 2030, intergovernmental stakeholders develop guidelines to support the needs of interested Governments and relevant stakeholders to implement effective chemicals and waste management strategies, building on, among other things, updates of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals toolbox for decision-making in chemicals management.

- Number of users and views to the IOMC Toolbox for decision-making in chemicals management (IOMC)

  Methodology: Website analytics for the IOMC Toolbox were compiled for the period from 1 March 2022 to 31 March 2026. The analysis assessed the total number of users, new users and sessions, together with the average number of views per session and average session duration. A session represents an individual visit to the Toolbox, while views per session indicate the average number of pages or resources accessed during each visit. As this is a website-use indicator, the results are reported as aggregate figures and are not assessed by country.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 16 April 2026)**:** Between 1 March 2022 and 31 March 2026, 12,655 users accessed the IOMC Toolbox through 16,762 sessions. This included 12,584 new users, with an average of 1.7 views per session and an average session duration of 114.6 seconds.
  Data availability: Website analytics were available for the full reporting period, representing 100% data availability.

- Number of new or updated guidelines developed by Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) that support identified needs of Governments and stakeholders to implement effective chemicals and waste management strategies

  No consolidated data are available to capture new or updated international guidelines issued by intergovernmental organizations.

Target A3: By 2030, companies implement measures identified to prevent or, where prevention is not feasible, minimize adverse effects from chemicals throughout their life cycle.

- Number of companies reporting on dependencies, impacts, risks, opportunities, and the environment.

  Methodology: Data from three sources were combined: SDG Indicator 12.6.1 on companies publishing sustainability reports, TNFD data on companies committed to reporting on nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities, and responses to the GFC survey. Five companies appearing in both the TNFD and survey datasets were identified and removed to avoid double counting.
  The sources capture different aspects of the indicator: TNFD directly addresses nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities, while SDG 12.6.1 provides broader evidence of sustainability reporting. A company may represent a parent company or a subsidiary/franchise; where both publish separate sustainability reports, they are counted separately. Potential overlap with the SDG data could not be removed because company-level information was not available.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 9 April 2026 and responses to the GFC survey): Based on the combined evidence, 8,914 companies were categorized as reporting against the indicator, while 16 survey responses were categorized as "no" and 11 as "partially". Potential overlap with the SDG data could not be removed because company-level information was not available.
  Data availability: Not assessable, as there is no defined global denominator for the total number of companies potentially covered by the indicator, and potential overlap with the aggregated SDG data cannot be fully identified.

- Number of financial institutions that include chemicals and waste in risk assessment, decision-making, policies, practices or disclosures.

  No reported data for financial institutions on chemicals and waste in decision-making, policies, practices or disclosures.

Target A4: By 2030, stakeholders have effectively prevented all illegal trade and traffic of chemicals and waste.

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Basel Convention) that have adopted legislation to prevent illegal traffic of hazardous waste and other wastes and criminalize illegal traffic (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on the number of countries that have established national legislation to prevent and penalise illegal traffic of hazardous waste and other wastes, including measures such as fines, prison, and others. Available evidence has been received from the BRS Secretariat.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 24 July 2026): Between 2016 and 2024, 177 Parties submitted at least one national report over the period. Of these, 150 Parties indicated in their latest report submitted that they have adopted a legislation to implement the provisions of the Basel Convention. Among these, 140 Parties (73%) reported that their legislation includes provisions to prevent illegal traffic of hazardous waste and other wastes, while 128 Parties (67%) indicated that their legislation provides that illegal traffic is criminal. None of the non-parties had reported through the survey.
  Data availability: Assessed against the 194 countries included in the baseline (191 Parties, 3 non-Parties). Data were available for 177 (91%) countries assessed.

- Number of closed cases of illegal traffic of hazardous waste and other wastes reported by countries (Parties to the Basel Convention) (BRS Secretariat)

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on the cases of illegal traffic of hazardous and other wastes reported to the Basel Convention, as reported under Table 9 of the Basel Convention national reports. Available evidence has been presented as received from the BRS Secretariat.
  Information on illegal trade in chemicals is available through treaty-specific reporting and international enforcement operations; however, no consolidated reporting mechanism allows for a comprehensive global assessment across all chemical groups.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 24 July 2026): Over the period 2018 – 2023, an average of 30 Parties annually reported cases of illegal traffic under table 9 of their national reports, amounting to the following total numbers of closed cases of illegal traffic every year: 914 cases in 2018; 1,098 in 2019; 1,259 in 2020; 1,714 in 2021; 1,573 in 2022 and 1,393 in 2023.
  As shown by the figures above, the number of reported closed cases of illegal traffic varied over the years, increasing from 2018 to 2021, and decreasing thereafter.
  The number of Parties reporting cases of illegal traffic appears to be stable, at around 30 Parties each year.
  The vast majority of cases of illegal traffic, amounting for more than 90% of all cases, concern three main waste streams: waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) and their parts; end-of-life vehicles (ELC) and their parts, and plastic wastes.
  Data availability: Data availability cannot be reliably determined, as missing data may reflect either the absence of the relevant measure or the absence of reporting for various reasons.

Target A5: By 2030, Governments work towards notifying, regulating or prohibiting the export of chemicals they have prohibited nationally, in line with their international obligations

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade) sharing information on export notifications provided for banned or severely restricted chemicals (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on export notifications made by Parties under Article 12 of the Rotterdam Convention. Available evidence has been presented as received from the BRS Secretariat.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 4 August 2026): In 2026, 33 Parties that responded to the voluntary questions on implementation of the Rotterdam Convention shared information that they either sent or received export notifications for chemicals that have been banned or severely restricted in the territory of the exporting Party. None of the non-Parties had reported through the survey.
  Data availability: Data availability cannot be reliably determined as missing data may reflect either the absence of the relevant measure or the absence of reporting for various reasons.

- Number of countries prohibiting the export of chemicals prohibited nationally

  Methodology: Available information, including the EU Prior Informed Consent (PIC) Regulation and several other accessible national sources, was used to identify countries with measures prohibiting the export of certain chemicals prohibited or severely restricted nationally. The result represents an indicative minimum and should not be considered a comprehensive global assessment.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 28 July 2026)**:** At least 40 countries were identified as having relevant export prohibitions.
  Data availability: Not assessable, as the available information is fragmented and may not capture measures in all countries.

- Number of countries regulating the export of chemicals prohibited nationally

  Methodology: Available information from the EU Prior Informed Consent (PIC) Regulation and several other accessible national sources was used to identify countries regulating exports of chemicals prohibited or severely restricted for domestic use. The result represents an indicative minimum and not a comprehensive global assessment.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 28 July 2026)**:** At least 30 countries regulate the export of chemicals prohibited or severely restricted for domestic use through prior consent, authorization, permit or other export-control requirements.
  Data availability: Not assessable, as no globally harmonized dataset is available, and relevant measures in other countries may not have been captured.

Target A6: By 2030, all countries have access to poison centers equipped with essential capabilities to prevent and respond to poisonings, as well as access to training in chemical risk prevention and clinical toxicology

- Number of countries with poison centres (World Health Organization)

  Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries with poison centres. Countries were assessed using the WHO Environment, Climate Change and Health (ECH) World Directory of Poison Centres, 2023. A country was counted where at least one poison centre was listed in the directory. Countries with multiple centres were counted only once. Entries specifically identified as not functional were not counted unless another functioning centre was listed for the same country. Countries not included in the directory were treated as not identified, rather than as having no poison centre, as their absence may indicate either that no centre exists or that information was not reported to WHO. WHO defines a poison centre as a specialized unit that advises and assists with the prevention, diagnosis and management of poisoning.
  Available evidence (based on information accessed on 3 June 2026)**:** According to WHO's directory of poison centres, 47% of WHO Member States had a poison centre as of January 2023, equivalent to approximately 91 of the 194 Member States.
  Data availability: Not assessable. The directory identifies countries with reported poison centres but does not distinguish between countries that do not have a centre and countries that have not provided information. Therefore, countries not listed cannot reliably be classified as having no poison centre.

- Number of countries with access to poison centres established in line with internationally recognized guidance for essential capabilities and training

  No data on access to poison centres are available.

Target A7: By 2035, stakeholders have taken effective measures to phase out highly hazardous pesticides in agriculture where the risks have not been managed and where safer and affordable alternatives are available, and to promote transition to and make available those alternatives.

- Number of countries that have made publicly available [including to the secretariat] a list of pesticides determined by regulatory authorities to meet the criteria established by the FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management on highly hazardous pesticides.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of countries that have made publicly available [use and exposure] information related to pesticides, including any that have been determined/identified by national regulatory authorities in that country to be highly hazardous pesticides.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of countries that have made accessible and promoted safer and affordable alternatives to pesticides that have been determined by national regulatory authorities in that country to be highly hazardous pesticides.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Use and trade of registered or authorized biopesticides.

  No consolidated data is available.

- Number and volumes of HHP active ingredients and formulations sales in portfolios of industry, by country.

  No consolidated data is available.

- Number of countries that have implemented a regulation or a risk reduction plan that encompasses phasing out highly hazardous pesticides.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Total Applied Toxicity (TAT) of highly hazardous pesticides.

  No consolidated data is available.

- Number of countries [where risks have not been managed and] where safer and affordable alternatives are available and that have taken administrative, legal, or regulatory measures to phase out pesticides that have been identified or determined by [the national regulatory authorities in] that country to be highly hazardous pesticides.

  No consolidated data is available.

Strategic objective B

Comprehensive and sufficient knowledge, data and information are generated, available and accessible to all to enable informed decisions and actions

Target B1: By 2035, comprehensive data and information on the properties of chemicals are generated and made available and accessible.

- Number of chemical substances with publicly accessible data and information (physico-chemical, hazard, exposure data) from recognized chemical information platforms

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on the public accessibility of chemical property information. Publicly available chemical inventories, recognized chemical information platforms, and related documentation were reviewed to assess the availability of such information. A peer-reviewed assessment of national and regional inventories was used to identify the number of listed industrial chemicals and mixtures, while an online review identified publicly accessible chemical information platforms. Quantitative information on substance and endpoint coverage was compiled for key platforms, including the OECD eChemPortal, the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) database, and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) Computational Toxicology (CompTox) Chemicals Dashboard. Figures from different sources were reported separately and not aggregated, as the same substances may be represented across multiple inventories and platforms.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed as of July 2026): More than 350,000 industrial chemicals and mixtures were listed across 22 chemical inventories from 19 countries and regions, and more than 50 recognized public platforms were identified as providing publicly accessible chemical information. The OECD eChemPortal provided access to more than 1.6 million substance records from 34 public sources, including more than 1.3 million endpoints from the ECHA database covering approximately 26,500 registered substances. The US EPA CompTox Chemicals Dashboard contained approximately 1.38 million substances, of which around 258,000 were mapped to the PubChem chemical information repository, enabling access to information on chemical properties.
  Data availability: The available sources differ in geographical coverage, scope, and the types of chemicals and information included, and substances may overlap across inventories and platforms. No common global denominator is available against which the overall availability of publicly accessible chemical property information can be assessed.

Target B2: By 2030, stakeholders make available, to the extent possible, reliable information on chemicals in materials and products throughout the value chain.

- Number of countries with measures on [globally] harmonized digital products and materials information systems across sectors

  Methodology: Data from the ECHA SCIP database and responses to the GFC survey were used to assess this indicator. The SCIP was used as a proxy for an operational harmonized digital system covering the 27 EU Member States and the three EEA countries (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway), with information on articles placed on the market that contain Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) above the applicable reporting threshold. Survey responses were reviewed to identify additional countries reporting relevant measures. Other identified initiatives were not included because they mainly represented frameworks, standards, protocols, or emerging regulations rather than operational country-level digital systems.
  The assessment provides proxy evidence only. SCIP has regional coverage and is limited to specific substances in articles rather than all chemicals, materials, and sectors. Countries not identified through SCIP, or the survey, may have other relevant systems that were not captured.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 19 March 2026 and responses to the GFC survey): Of the 193 UN Member States, 48 countries (25%) reported or were identified as having relevant measures; 30 countries (16%) through the SCIP database and further 18 countries (9%) through the GFC survey.
  Data availability: Data were available for 88 (46%) UN Member States, based on countries covered by the SCIP system or providing information through the GFC survey. The absence of information should not be interpreted as confirmation that a country has no relevant measures.

- Number of stakeholders, including in industry and the private sector, that use/implement a [globally] harmonised standard/tool/platform for sharing information about chemicals in materials and products along the full value chain (e.g., Digital Products and Materials Information System)

  Methodology: Online proxy sources were combined with GFC survey responses to assess this indicator; these included the SCIP database, International Material Data System (IMDS), Global Battery Alliance Battery Passport, and CIRPASS Digital Product Passport initiative. Where possible, each identified stakeholder or company was counted once.
  The sources vary in scope and level of implementation: SCIP and IMDS are operational systems, while the Battery Passport and CIRPASS include pilot or development activities. The results provide an indicative proxy rather than a comprehensive global assessment.

An additional online proxy was included to broaden the indicator's coverage to the building sector. It draws on the Health Product Declaration (HDP) Open Standard, which supports the reporting and disclosure of building product contents and related health information.
Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 6 March 2026 and responses to the GFC survey): A total of 38 countries were identified; 30 through online sources and 8 through the GFC survey. In addition, 211 companies were identified: 181 from online sources and 30 through the survey.
Additionally, since its first introduction in 2012, adoption of the HPD Open Standard has steadily increased with over 11,000 HPDs published covering 40,000+ building products from more than 800 manufacturers.
Data availability: Not assessable as no consolidated global dataset exists covering all stakeholders using such systems, and available information varies considerably across platforms and initiatives.

Target B3: By 2035, stakeholders generate data on the production of chemicals, including the use of chemicals in materials and products, in addition to data on emissions and releases of chemicals and waste to the environment, making these data available and publicly accessible.

- Number of countries with a PRTR (implementing international standards for PRTRs, including Parties to the Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers, countries implementing OECD standards for PRTRs or equivalent standards) (UNITAR, UNECE, OECD)

Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries with a Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) and the number of countries that are Parties to the Protocol on PRTRs. Countries were assessed based on whether they had made an international commitment to develop or implement a PRTR. This included countries that had ratified or acceded to the Aarhus Convention, the Protocol on PRTRs or the Escazú Agreement, or that adhered to the OECD Recommendation on establishing and implementing PRTRs. Country lists were combined, and duplicates were removed so that each country was counted once.
For this baseline, international commitment was used as a measurable proxy for having a PRTR.
Available evidence (based on information received on 8 July 2026): A total of 77 countries had made an international commitment to develop or implement a PRTR, representing approximately 40% of the countries assessed. However, an operational PRTR system may not yet be in place in these countries.
Data availability: Information on international commitments was available for approximately 99.4% of the countries assessed, based on official treaty-status information and OECD records.

- (a)Hazardous waste generated per capita; and (b)proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment (UNSD, UNEP)

Methodology: This indicator measures the national production of hazardous chemicals and waste in kilograms, per capita per year by type. It also demonstrates the proportion of hazardous waste treated by type of treatment. The indicator includes hazardous generated, hazardous waste generated by type (including e-waste as a sub-indicator) and the proportion of hazardous waste treated. Country-level data reported under SDG Indicator 12.4.2 were assessed for the period 2015–2023. For component (a), reported country level hazardous waste generation per capita values were aggregated across countries with available data for each year, and the resulting annual totals were averaged over the reporting period. Brunei Darussalam and Suriname were excluded from the calculation because their reported values were identified as outliers. As the number of reporting countries varied by year, the resulting figure reflects the combined reported per capita values of countries with available data and should not be interpreted as a global average or global per capita estimate.
For component (b), country-level data for the series "Proportion of hazardous waste treated or disposed (%)" were assessed. For each year, the average percentage was calculated across countries with available data, and these annual averages were subsequently averaged over the reporting period. Missing values were excluded from the calculations. As reporting coverage across countries varied over the years, the resulting estimate should not be considered representative of all countries.
Available evidence (based on information accessed on 29 June 2026)**:** The annual sum of reported country-level hazardous waste generation per capita values averaged 84 tonnes over the reporting period, based on data from an average of 54 UN Member States per year. The average proportion of hazardous waste treated or disposed was 78%, based on data from an average of 37 UN Member States per year.
Data availability: For component (a), data were available from an average of 54 (28%) UN Member States per year. For component (b), data were available from an average of 37 (19%) UN Member States per year. Reporting coverage varied across the reporting period.

- Number of Parties to the Aarhus Convention or the Escazú Agreement (UNECE)

Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries that are Parties to the Aarhus Convention or the Escazú Agreement. Official treaty status information was used to identify Parties as of the data retrieval date. The two agreements were assessed separately because they apply to different regional groups. The Aarhus Convention

assessment covered the 56 UNECE Member States eligible to become Parties, while the Escazú Agreement assessment covered the 33 eligible countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.
Available evidence (based on information accessed on 29 June 2026)**:** Of the 56 UNECE Member States, 46 (82%) were Parties to the Aarhus Convention. In addition, the European Union and Guinea-Bissau are Parties, bringing the total number of Parties to 48. Of the 33 countries eligible to become Parties in the Escazú Agreement, 19 (58%) were Parties. In total, 67 countries were Parties to one of the two agreements.
Data availability: Official treaty status information was available for all 89 eligible countries covered by the two agreements, representing 100% data availability.

- Number of countries that make [globally] harmonized data on chemicals in materials and products publicly accessible

Methodology: The ECHA SCIP database was used as a proxy to identify countries applying a harmonized system for reporting and publicly disseminating information on substances of very high concern in articles and complex products. The assessment covered the 27 European Union Member States and Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. As SCIP is a regional system, the assessment does not provide a complete global baseline. Countries not covered by SCIP may have other national or regional systems and were therefore not classified as lacking publicly accessible data.
Available evidence (based on information accessed on 19 March 2026)**:** A total of 30 countries, representing approximately 16% of UN Member States, were identified as applying a harmonized reporting system and making information on substances of very high concern in articles and products publicly accessible through the SCIP database.
Data availability: Data were available for 30 (16%) UN member states. As SCIP is limited to the European Union and European Economic Area, the available evidence should be interpreted as partial coverage rather than a global assessment.

Target B4: By 2035, stakeholders apply appropriate guidelines, best available practices and standardized tools for hazard and risk assessment and chemical and waste management.

- Number of countries adhering to the Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) system. (OECD)

Methodology: This indicator counts the number of countries that are adherent to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) system of Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD). Countries were assessed using the latest available OECD information in the MAD system. All OECD Member countries and non-OECD countries identified as adherents to the MAD system were counted. The result was calculated against the 193 UN Member States. The MAD system enables participating countries to accept non-clinical chemical safety data generated in accordance with OECD Test Guidelines and Principles of Good Laboratory Practice.
Available evidence (based on information accessed on 10 April 2026)**:** Of the 193 UN Member States, 45 countries representing approximately 23% participated in the MAD system, comprising 38 OECD Member countries and seven non-OECD adherents.
Data availability: The OECD source covered 45 (23%) UN Member States. Countries not included in the source were not classified as non-adherents, as they may either not participate in the MAD system or not be covered by the available information.

- Number of final regulatory actions for which the Chemical Review Committee has established that they have been taken as a consequence of a risk evaluation (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

Methodology: This indicator provides information on the capacity of countries to take final regulatory actions as a consequence of a risk evaluation by measuring the number of notifications of final regulatory action on chemicals for which the CRC has established that the actions were taken as a consequence of a risk evaluation, in accordance with criterion (b) of Annex II to the Convention. Available evidence has been presented as received from the BRS Secretariat.
Available evidence (based on data received on 24 July 2026)**:** Between 2024 and 2025, the Chemical Review Committee determined that 8 notifications of final regulatory action, covering 8 different chemicals, were supported by a risk evaluation meeting the Convention's requirements, while 34 notifications for 21 different chemicals were found not to have been taken as a consequence of a risk evaluation.
Data availability: Data availability cannot be reliably determined as missing data may reflect either the absence of the relevant measure or the absence of reporting for various reasons.

- Number of new or updated guidelines developed by Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) that support identified needs of Governments and stakeholders to implement effective chemicals and waste management strategies

No consolidated data are available to capture new or updated international guidelines by IGOs.

Target B5: By 2030, educational, training and public awareness programmes on chemical safety, sustainability, safer alternatives and the benefits of reducing chemicals and waste risks have been developed and implemented, taking into consideration a gender-responsive approach.

- Number and diversity of the people trained in support of the GFC objectives and targets on chemical safety, sustainability, safer alternatives, and benefits of reducing chemical and waste risks, disaggregated by gender, region, and GFC stakeholder type.

  Methodology: The number of people attending training events delivered by UNITAR's Chemicals and Waste Management Programme was assessed for the period from 1 January 2023 to 31 December 2025. The training events include online meetings, webinars, workshops, and online courses. The assessment covers participants from all 193 UN Member States and 12 stakeholder categories, including academia, NGOs, government (local, national, and state), regional organizations, intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) other than the UN, the UN/UN System (locally and internationally recruited), the private sector, other stakeholders, and unreported categories. The analysis was further disaggregated by participants' gender.
  Available evidence (based on data received on 6 August 2026)**:** UNITAR's Chemicals and Waste Management Programme delivered 81 training events, including online meetings, webinars, workshops, and online courses, with a combined attendance of 6,913 participants, of whom 47% were female and 49% male. The remaining 4% were non-binary (0.5%), preferred not to disclose (1%), or had no recorded response (2.5%).
  Data availability: Not assessable, as there is no defined global denominator representing the total number of people potentially covered by the indicator who could have received relevant training.

- Number of training materials on chemical safety, sustainability, safer alternatives, and benefits of reducing chemical and waste risks developed that are relevant to the GFC

  No consolidated data is available to track these globally.

Target B6: By 2030, all Governments have implemented the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) in all relevant sectors as appropriate for their national circumstances.

- Number of countries that have partially or fully implemented the Globally Harmonized System (GHS) (UNITAR)

  Methodology: This indicator monitors full (all sectors: agrochemicals, workplace and consumer products) or partial (one or two sectors) implementation of the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS). Using the latest available GHS implementation data, countries assigned a key of 1 were considered to have partial legal implementation, while those assigned a key of 2 were considered to have full legal implementation. A key of 0 indicated no legal implementation. The assessment covers the 193 UN Member States.
  Available evidence (based on information retrieved on 6 March 2026)**:** Of the 193 countries assessed, 76 countries (39%) had partially or fully implemented GHS. This included 19 countries (10%) with legal implementation in one or two sectors and 57 countries (30%) with legal implementation in all sectors. The remaining 117 countries (61%) had not legally implemented the GHS.
  Data availability: Data were available for 193 (100%) UN Member States.

Target B7: By 2030, stakeholders generate, to the extent possible, and make available comprehensive and accessible monitoring and surveillance data and information on concentrations and potential exposure sources of chemicals in humans (disaggregated by sex, age, region, other demographic factors, and other relevant health determinants as feasible), other biota and environmental media.

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Stockholm Convention) providing information on levels and trends of persistent organic pollutants in humans and the environment (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on the number of countries providing information to the Global Monitoring Plan (GMP) on levels of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in humans and the environment. Countries were assessed using the latest available information reported under the Stockholm Convention. Parties with relevant information were categorized as Yes, while blank records were categorized as No data, rather than as No, as the absence of reported information does not confirm that monitoring data does not exist. The assessment covers 197 countries, comprising 185 Parties to the Stockholm Convention (excluding the European Union), and 12 non-Parties. Non-Parties could provide information through the Global Framework on Chemicals Secretariat.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 19 May 2026)**:** Of the 197 countries assessed, 116 countries (59%) provided information on levels and trends of persistent organic pollutants in humans and the environment. All 116 were Parties to the Stockholm Convention, representing approximately 63% of the 185 Parties assessed. Data were unavailable for 81 countries (41%), comprising 69 Parties with blank records and 12 non-Parties that did not provide information.
  Data availability: Assessed against the 197 countries included in the baseline (185 Parties, 12 non-Parties). Data were available for 116 (59%) countries assessed.

- Number of stakeholders generating accessible data and information on human biomonitoring and/or surveillance of chemical exposures and health impacts

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of countries undertaking environmental monitoring levels of chemicals and waste releases and/or impacts

  Methodology: This assessment combined data from the existing IOMC indicator on countries with international commitments related to Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) with online monitoring data available through UNEP GEMStat for water and the WHO Ambient Air Quality Database for air. Country lists from the different sources were combined and deduplicated, with each country counted once where evidence was identified in at least one environmental medium (air, water or land). As the sources cover different pollutants, environmental media and monitoring systems, and only a limited range of chemicals is covered; the result provides an indicative assessment rather than a comprehensive measure of national environmental monitoring.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 20 April 2026 and responses to the GFC survey)**:** A total of 161 countries (83% of UN Member States) were identified as undertaking relevant environmental monitoring in at least one environmental medium, comprising evidence from IOMC data (39%), online sources (45%), and the GFC survey (2%).
  Data availability: Not assessable as countries not identified through the available sources may still undertake relevant monitoring that was not captured in the datasets reviewed.

- Mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning (WHO)

  Methodology: This indicator demonstrates the mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning and is attributed to the deaths from unintentional poisonings in a year per 100,000 population. For countries and territories with data available for both 2016 and 2021, mortality rates for the two years were compared. A country or territory was considered to show progress where the mortality rate was lower in 2021 than in 2016. Entries without data for both years were excluded from the comparison.
  The analysis included the occupied Palestinian territory, including east Jerusalem, and Puerto Rico to maintain consistency with the WHO dataset.
  Available evidence (based on information accessed on 6 March 2026)**:** Of the 185 countries and territories with data available for both 2016 and 2021, 130 (70%) reported a lower mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning in 2021 than in 2016. The remaining 55 (30%) recorded either no change or a higher mortality rate.
  Data availability: Assessed against the 194 WHO Member States. Data for both 2016 and 2021 were available for 183 (94%) WHO Member States.

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Basel Convention) compiling available statistics (e.g. studies, reports) on the effects of hazardous wastes and other wastes on human health and the environment. (BRS Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

  Methodology: This indicator provides information on countries compiling and making available information on qualified statistics on the effects of the generation, transportation and disposal of hazardous wastes or other wastes on human health and the environment, as reported annually under the Basel Convention. In accordance with Article 13 on the transmission of information, Parties should provide such information, consistent with national laws and regulations, through their national reports. Available evidence has been presented as received from the BRS Secretariat.
  Available evidence (based on information received on 24 July 2026)**:** Between 2016 and 2024, 177 Parties submitted at least one national report. From this, 116 (65%) Parties reported that they had compiled statistics on the effects of hazardous and other wastes on human health and the environment, including monitoring programmes, scientific studies and research, national reports, waste inventories, national strategies or policies, national action plans, risk assessments, and statistical databases and information systems.
  None of the non-Parties had reported through the survey.
  Data availability: Data availability cannot be reliably determined as missing data may reflect either the absence of the relevant measure or the absence of reporting for various reasons.

Strategic objective D

Safer alternatives and innovative and sustainable solutions in product value chains are in place so that benefits to human health and the environment are maximized and risks are prevented or, where prevention is not feasible, minimized

Target D1: By 2030, companies consistently invest in and achieve innovations towards advancing sustainable chemistry and resource efficiency throughout the life cycle of chemicals.

- Percentage of revenue or Research and Development expenditure that contributes to advancing sustainable chemistry

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

Target D2: By 2035, Governments implement policies that encourage production using safer alternatives and sustainable approaches throughout the life cycle, including best available techniques, green procurement and circular economy approaches.

- Number of countries with policies to encourage production using safer alternatives and sustainable approaches throughout the life cycle, including best available techniques, green procurement and circular economy approaches

  Methodology: Two SDG indicators were used as proxies to assess the indicator. SDG 12.1.1 was used to identify countries with policy instruments supporting sustainable consumption and production, while SDG 12.7.1 was used to identify countries implementing sustainable public procurement policies and action plans. These sources provide evidence on sustainable consumption and production and green public procurement but do not fully assess all elements of the indicator, including safer alternatives, best available techniques and circular economy approaches. Countries not included in the SDG datasets may either not have such policies or may not have reported; they were therefore not classified as having no policy.
  Available evidence (based on accessed on 23 March 2026)**:** Of the 193 UN Member States, 61 countries (32%) had policy instruments supporting sustainable consumption and production, while 53 countries (27%) were implementing sustainable public procurement policies and action plans.
  Data availability: Not assessable as the SDG datasets record countries with reported policies but do not distinguish between countries without such policies and countries for which information was not reported.

- Number of countries that have taxonomies for activities recognized under the GFC

  No consolidated data are available to capture taxonomies for activities recognized under the GFC.

Target D3: By 2030, the private sector, including the finance sector, incorporates strategies and policies to implement the sound management of chemicals and waste in its finance approaches and business models and applies internationally recognized or equivalent reporting standards.

- Number of companies reporting on dependencies, impacts, risks, opportunities, and the environment.

  Methodology: Data from three sources were combined: SDG Indicator 12.6.1 on companies publishing sustainability reports, Task Force on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) data on companies committed to reporting on nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities, and responses to the GFC survey. Five companies appearing in both the TNFD and survey datasets were identified and removed to avoid double counting.
  The sources capture different aspects of the indicator: TNFD directly addresses nature-related dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities, while SDG 12.6.1 provides broader evidence of sustainability reporting. A company may represent a parent company or a subsidiary/franchise; where both publish separate sustainability reports, they are counted separately. Potential overlap with the SDG data could not be removed because company-level information was not available.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 9 April 2026 and responses to the GFC survey): Based on the combined evidence, 8,914 companies were categorized as reporting against the indicator, while 16 responses from survey were categorized as No and 11 as Partially. Potential overlap with the SDG data could not be removed because company-level information was not available.
  Data availability: Not assessable, as there is no defined global denominator for the total number of companies potentially covered by the indicator, and potential overlap with the aggregated SDG data cannot be fully identified.

- Number of financial institutions that include chemicals and waste in risk assessment, decision-making, policies, practices or disclosures.

No data were reported for financial institutions incorporating chemical and waste risks.

Target D4: By 2030, relevant stakeholders give priority to sustainable solutions and safer alternatives to harmful substances in products and mixtures, including in consumer products, in their research and innovation programmes.

- Number of companies that have formal methods to identify, assess, and introduce safer and more sustainable alternatives to [harmful substances] used in their products or processes, including through their research and innovation programmes

  Methodology: GFC survey responses were combined with available online sources from Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC), ChemScore and the ChemSec Marketplace. ZDHC and ChemScore were used as proxies for companies applying structured chemicals management and substitution approaches, while ChemSec Marketplace suppliers were used as evidence of companies offering or promoting safer alternatives. Duplicate records identified across the sources were removed where possible. As the online sources differ in scope and do not all directly confirm the existence of formal company-wide assessment or research and innovation programmes, the results provide proxy evidence and should not be interpreted as a comprehensive global assessment of companies.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 22 April 2026 and responses to the GFC survey): Of the 749 companies identified across the available sources, 718 were categorized as having relevant methods or activities in place, 7 as under development, 19 as not having such methods, and 5 as unknown.
  Data availability: Not assessable, as there is no defined global denominator for companies covered by the indicator, and the available sources represent different sectors, initiatives and levels of implementation.

- Number of companies (and, where relevant, industrial sectors, or cluster of companies) that have formally committed to and implemented the substitution of at least one priority [harmful substance] in major product lines or high volume uses, with safer and more sustainable alternatives, documented through corporate policies, reporting, or regulatory submissions.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of stakeholders that are implementing green and sustainable procurement programmes that explicitly prioritize safer and more sustainable chemical alternatives in products

  Methodology: Available company and country-level information through online proxy sources and responses to the GFC survey were combined to identify stakeholders implementing green and sustainable procurement programmes. Membership in Together for Sustainability (TfS) was used as a proxy for companies implementing structured sustainable procurement and supplier sustainability practices, while SDG 12.7.1 was used as a proxy for countries implementing sustainable public procurement policies and action plans. These proxies do not specifically confirm that safer and more sustainable chemical alternatives are explicitly prioritized and in place in all cases. Company and country results were therefore assessed separately.
  Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 22 April 2026 and responses to the GFC survey): Among 115 companies with available information, 78 were identified as implementing relevant procurement approaches (including proxy data), 30 as not implementing them, and 7 as under development. Among 99 countries with available information, 77 were identified as implementing relevant measures, 16 as not implementing them, 4 as under development, and 2 as unknown.
  Data availability: Country-level information was available for 99 (51%) UN Member States. A comparable global denominator is not available for companies.

- The procurement expenditure that is covered by green and sustainable procurement programmes with explicit criteria to avoid or minimize [harmful substances] and favor safer and more sustainable alternatives.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

Target D5: By 2030, Governments implement policies and programmes to increase support to safer and more sustainable agricultural practices, including agroecology, integrated pest management and the use of non-chemical alternatives, as appropriate.

- Number of governments providing information describing the policies and programmes they are implementing to increase support for agroecology, integrated pest management, [and] [/or] non-chemical alternatives in agriculture, including any financial support.

  Methodology: The FAO Agri-Environmental Policies Database was used as a proxy source. A keyword-based analysis of policy metadata (including titles, abstracts, keywords, policy types and descriptor) was conducted to identify policies related to agroecology, integrated pest management, and non-chemical alternatives in agriculture including any financial support. Other policies focused mainly on forestry, fisheries, marine issues, air pollution, or water quality were excluded.

Identified policies were grouped into three tiers:

- Tier 1 – Comprehensive support: financial and programme support;
- Tier 2 – Policy support: explicit policy and/or programme support;
- Tier 3 – Policy presence**:** a relevant policy was identified, but there was insufficient evidence of programme or financial support.

Countries could appear in more than one tier where different policies reflect different levels of support. However, each country was counted only once in the overall total. As the assessment was based on policy metadata, countries without an identified policy may still have relevant measures that were not captured or sufficiently described in the database. In addition, as the assessment reflects metadata available at a single point in time, it identifies the presence and level of support but does not establish whether such support has increased over time.

Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 27 March 2026)**:** A total of 83 (43%) of the 193 UN Member States had at least one relevant policy identified. Among these 83 countries, 28 countries (34%) had evidence of comprehensive support, 70 countries (84%) had evidence of policy or programme support, and 30 countries (36%) had a relevant policy identified without sufficient evidence for further classification.

Data availability: Not assessable as the absence of an identified policy does not necessarily mean that no relevant policy or programme exists, as database coverage and the level of detail in policy metadata vary by country

- Extent of organic agriculture by area, percentage of total farming area and, where available, the number of farms.

Methodology: The latest available country-level data from Research Institute of Organic Agriculture (FiBL) were used to assess organic agricultural area, the share of organic agriculture in total farmland, and the number of organic producers. Organic area and producer figures were aggregated across countries with available data, while the average share of organic agriculture in total farmland was calculated based on countries with available percentage values. FiBL compiles these data from official national statistics

Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 16 April 2026): Based on the latest available data (2024), approximately 98.8 million hectares of farmland were under organic agriculture. The unweighted average of national share, among 147 UN Member States with data[1], was 4.1%, and approximately 4.8 million[2] organic producers were reported.

Data availability: Data were available for 154 (80%) UN member states for organic agricultural area, 147 (76%) for the share of organic agriculture in total farmland, and 156 (81%) for the number of organic producers.

- Number of countries* (Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity) integrating increased support for agroecology, integrated pest management and the use of non-chemical alternatives, as appropriate, into their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) (CBD Secretariat for Parties, and GFC Secretariat for non-Parties)

Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

Target D6: By 2030, sustainable chemical and waste management strategies have been developed and implemented for major economic and industry sectors that identify priority chemicals of concern and standards and measures, such as the chemical footprint approach, to reduce their impact and, where feasible, their input along the value chain.

- Number of companies and their percentage share of major economic and industry sectors implementing sustainable chemistry and waste management strategies aligned with GFC Implementation Programmes, including the adoption of approaches such as Chemical Footprint.

Methodology: Publicly available information from voluntary industry initiatives and independent third-party assessments was compiled to provide an overview of company-level action relevant to the indicator intended as a proxy and temporary estimate. Sources included the Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC) programme, the Chemical Footprint Project (CFP), the ICCA Responsible Care Global Charter, the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) portfolio sustainability assessment (PSA) framework, and the 2025 ChemScore ranking. Figures were reported as published by each initiative and were not aggregated into a single total, because the initiatives differ in sectoral scope, membership criteria, reporting requirements and verification practices, and because the same company may participate in more than one.

The available information provides evidence that a growing number of companies participate in initiatives relevant to the sustainable management of chemicals. However, participation could not be treated as evidence of sustainable management itself. Membership of an industry association or signature of a charter commits a company to managing health, safety and environmental risk in general terms; it does not commit it to reducing or substituting any specific

[1] Countries reporting an organic area greater than 0 ha, but a 0% share of total farmland were excluded due to inconsistent reported values, which may reflect a data quality or rounding issue.

[2] The result presented here includes India's figure of 2.36 million organic producers, following reconciliation of the underlying data.

hazardous chemical, and performance is self-reported rather than independently verified[3].Where companies do quantify their use of chemicals of concern, as under the CFP; it could not be determined from the available data whether those companies translate their findings into management strategies, or whether such strategies reflect guidance developed under the Global Framework on Chemicals, most of these initiatives predate the Framework. Disclosure is also confined to companies that volunteered to be measured, so the share of any sector represented is unknown[4]. Independent assessments such as ChemScore offer external benchmarking that does not depend on self-declaration, but their coverage is partial[5].

Available evidence (based on online information accessed on 15 July 2026):

- Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC): approximately 13,000 supplier facilities and more than 350 signatories participating in the textiles programme
- Chemical Footprint Project (CFP): reporting companies representing USD 1.2 trillion in annual sales reported reducing hazardous chemical use across products, factories and packaging by 132.9 million pounds (60.3 million kilograms) in one year
- ICCA Responsible Care Global Charter: more than 90 per cent of the world's 100 largest petrochemical and chemical manufacturers have committed to the Charter1
- WBCSD portfolio sustainability assessment: more than 20 chemical companies apply the WBCSD-based methodology or aligned in-house approaches; no public list of applying companies was identified
- ChemScore 2025: the assessment of the world's 40 largest chemical producers finds that all continue to rely on the production of chemicals known to be hazardous to health or the environment

Data availability: Not assessable as a single percentage. The indicator is based on participation figures and assessment results from voluntary initiatives with differing scopes and no common denominator of companies, and the reported figures measure participation or disclosure rather than the adoption of sustainable chemicals management practices.

Target D7: By 2030, stakeholders implement measures and strive to ensure effective occupational health and safety practices as well as environmental protection measures in all relevant sectors and throughout the supply chain.

- Number of ratifications of up-to-date International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions related to chemical risks (ILO)

Methodology: This indicator counts the number of ratifications of up-to-date ILO conventions related to chemical risks. Ratification data were obtained from the ILO NORMLEX database for the Chemicals Convention, 1990 (No. 170) and the Prevention of Major Industrial Accidents Convention, 1993 (No. 174). Ratifications were counted separately for each Convention against the 187 ILO Member States. Ratification reflects a formal commitment to align national legislation and practices with the relevant Convention. However, the results do not provide a complete assessment of implementation, as some countries may implement equivalent or stronger measures without having formally ratified the Convention.

Available evidence (based on information accessed on 2 July 2026)**:** Of the 187 ILO Member States, 24 countries (13%) had ratified Convention No. 170, which promotes the safe use of chemicals at work, and 19 countries (10%) had ratified Convention No. 174, which aims to prevent major industrial accidents and limit their consequences.

Data availability: Ratification status was available for 187 (100%) ILO Member States.

- Number of member States with national Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) profiles (ILO)

Methodology: This indicator counts the number of member states with national Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) profiles and was assessed as listed on the ILO website. A country was counted where at least one national OSH profile was publicly accessible. Six member states had profile links that were inaccessible or invalid at the time of data collection. These countries were treated as having no available data rather than not having a national OSH profile. A national profile summarizes the existing situation on occupational safety and health, and the progress made towards achieving a safe and healthy working environment.

Available evidence (based on information accessed on 2 July 2026): Of the 187 ILO Member States, 87 countries (47%) were identified as having a publicly accessible national OSH profile.

Data availability: Profile information could be assessed for 181 (97%) ILO Member States. Data could not be confirmed for six Member States because the links provided on the ILO website were inaccessible or invalid.

[3] Signing commits a company to managing health, safety and environmental risk in general; it does not commit it to reducing or replacing any specific hazardous chemical, and performance is self-reported rather than independently checked.

[4] These are real reductions, but they come only from companies that volunteered to be measured, and there is no way to tell what share of any industry they represent.

Strategic objective E

Enhanced implementation occurs through increased and effective resource mobilization, partnerships, cooperation, capacity-building, and integration into all relevant decision-making processes

Target E1: Mainstreaming: By 2035, Governments have mainstreamed the sound management of chemicals and waste through implementation in all relevant sectoral plans, budgets and development plans and development assistance policies and programmes.

- Budget integration: number of countries with annual budget allocated for programmes, projects and activities aiming for the sound management of chemicals and waste [Yes/No + funding amount]

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Institutional coordination: number of countries with operational mechanisms in place to facilitate coordination for the development of inter-ministerial, multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral development assistance policies and programmes.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

Target E2: Partnerships & Networks: By 2030, partnerships and networks among sectors and stakeholders are strengthened to achieve the sound management of chemicals and waste.

- Number of countries with multistakeholder/multi-sectoral partnerships, networks or arrangements integrated in national chemicals management systems. [Yes/No]

  Methodology: To assess this indicator, WHO e-SPAR data under Indicator C14: Chemical events were used as a proxy. Countries with a C14 score of 80 or 100 were considered to demonstrate advanced national capacities for managing chemical events, which generally require coordination across multiple sectors and institutions. This is a proxy measure, as C14 does not directly assess whether formal multistakeholder partnerships, networks, or arrangements are integrated into national chemicals management systems.
  Available evidence (based on information accessed on 2 July 2026): 58 countries were identified as demonstrating the level of multisectoral coordination used as a proxy for this indicator.
  Data availability: Data were available for 192 (99%) UN Member States.

- Number of partnerships and networks, their members and outcomes developed under the Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) jointly with other partners and stakeholders aimed at the sound management of chemicals and waste.

  No consolidated data is available to capture partnerships and networks across IGOs.

Target E3: Financial Resources: Adequate, predictable and sustainable financial resources from all sources needed to support achieving the sound management of chemicals and waste are identified and mobilized in alignment with the vision, strategic objectives and targets of the Framework in all sectors by and for all stakeholders, including by leveraging private finance and promoting innovative and blended-finance schemes.

- Number of countries with national budget allocated to chemicals-related international assistance

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of countries that have taxonomies for activities recognized under the GFC

  No consolidated data are available to capture taxonomies for activities recognized under the GFC.

- Amount of finance mobilized for the sound management of chemicals and waste

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

Target E4: Funding Gaps: Funding gaps for the implementation of sound management of chemicals and waste are identified and considered for capacity-building, including through the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund.

- Number of capacity-building projects funded by the GFC Fund and/or other funding mechanisms which explicitly address identified gaps

  Methodology: Available project information from major chemicals and waste funding mechanisms was compiled to provide an overview of capacity-building projects relevant to the indicator. This included projects funded through the

GFC Fund, the Special Programme, the Specific International Programme (SIP) under the Minamata Convention, and the GEF Chemicals and Waste focal area. Project numbers were reported as provided by each funding mechanism and were not aggregated into a single total because the programmes differ in scope, funding cycles, and project definitions. The available information provides evidence of projects relevant to capacity-building and chemicals and waste management; however, the extent to which each project constitutes capacity-building and explicitly addresses an identified gap could not be consistently determined from the available data.

Available evidence (based on information received by 2 July 2026)**:**

- GFC Fund: 4 regional or multi-country projects across 11 countries
- Special Programme: 91 approved projects across 75 countries
- Specific International Programme (SIP): 34 approved projects
- Global Environment Facility (GEF): 92 active projects under the Chemicals and Waste focal area

Data availability: Not assessable as a single percentage, as the indicator is based on project-level information from different funding mechanisms rather than a common country-level denominator.

Target E5: Internalizing Costs: By 2030, Governments have taken measures to put in place policies to internalize the costs of the sound management of chemicals and waste through different approaches

- Number of countries with systems, approaches and/or instruments in place such as Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), for the private sector addressing the health, remediation and/or other costs associated with chemicals throughout the life cycle.

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

Target E6: Synergies & Linkages: By 2030, stakeholders identify and strengthen, as appropriate, synergies and linkages between chemicals and waste management and other key environmental, health and labour policies, such as those related to climate change solutions, biodiversity conservation, human rights protection, universal health coverage or primary health care.

- Number of countries that integrate chemicals risk prevention and environmental health considerations in strategies, policies and programs to advance universal health coverage or primary health care

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of stakeholders that integrate human rights considerations in chemicals and waste management approaches

  Available evidence is based on the responses received through the GFC stakeholder survey.

- Number of stakeholders integrating chemicals and waste management into key environmental, health and labour policies

  Methodology: UNITAR National Profiles were used as a proxy to identify countries demonstrating broader integration of chemicals and waste management into national policy systems. The profiles document national legal and institutional frameworks, responsibilities of relevant ministries and agencies, and coordination across sectors, including environmental, health and labour-related areas. Each country with a National Profile identified through the UNITAR programme was counted once. The measure is a proxy because the source provides country-level evidence of policy and institutional integration, rather than directly counting the number of individual stakeholders integrating chemicals and waste management into relevant policies. Countries without an identified National Profile may either not have prepared one or may not have reported or published it through the UNITAR webpage.
  Available evidence (based on information received by 9 July 2026):118 countries were identified as demonstrating broader policy and institutional integration of chemicals and waste management through the development of a UNITAR National Profile.
  Data availability: Not assessable, as there is insufficient information to distinguish between countries without a National Profile and those for which a profile has not been reported or published.

Annex II

Global Framework on Chemicals baseline data collection survey

The present annex reproduces the questions that stakeholders were invited to complete as part of the global baseline survey conducted by the secretariat from the 11 March 2026 to 30 April 2026 to inform the International Conference about progress towards the targets of the Framework. All information collected through this survey has been used solely for the purpose of establishing an initial, indicative baseline and tracking progress under the Global Framework on Chemicals. The draft indicators covered in this survey are intended to provide indicative measures of progress.

LEGEND

*** Required**	Mandatory fields are marked with an asterisk
Skip logic	Conditional questions - shown only when stated condition is met

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT | *Sections below shown only to National Government respondents*

Strategic Objective A

Q1 | Access to training in chemical risk prevention and clinical toxicology

* Does your country have access to training in chemical risk prevention and clinical toxicology? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Unknown

Q2 | Availability of HHPs to national regulatory authorities

* Has your country made publicly available a list of pesticides that have been determined by national regulatory authorities to be Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs), including information on their use and exposure? *[select one]*

- □ Yes, the list is publicly available and includes use and exposure information
- □ Yes, the list is publicly available but does not include use and exposure information
- □ The list exists but has not been made publicly available
- □ No, such a list has not been developed
- □ Don't know / Not applicable

Q3 | Publicity on safer and affordable alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides

* Has your country made safer and affordable alternatives to Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) accessible and actively promoted them to relevant stakeholders? *[select one]*

- □ Yes, alternatives are both affordable and actively promoted
- □ Yes, alternatives are affordable but not actively promoted
- □ Alternatives are being developed but are not yet accessible
- □ No, alternatives have not been made accessible or promoted
- □ Don't know / Not applicable

Q4 | Regulation or a risk reduction plan that encompasses the phasing out of HHPs

* Has your country developed and implemented a regulation or a risk reduction plan that encompasses the phasing out of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs)? *[select one]*

- □ Yes, a regulation has been developed and implemented
- □ Yes, a risk reduction plan has been developed and implemented
- □ Yes, both a regulation and a risk reduction plan have been developed and implemented
- □ A regulation or plan is currently under development
- □ No, neither a regulation nor a risk reduction plan has been implemented
- □ Don't know / Not applicable

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 answer is NOT 'No' and NOT 'Don't know / Not applicable'*

Strategic Objective B

Q1 | Regulatory framework on harmonized digital chemical information systems

* Does your country have measures in place that requires disclosure of chemical information in materials and products through a digital or harmonized information system? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Q2 | Use of a harmonised standard/tool/platform for sharing chemical information along the value chain

* Does your government use a harmonized standard, tool, or platform for sharing information about chemicals in materials and products along the value chain (e.g. Digital Products and Materials Information System)? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes, which platform or standard is used? *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Q3 | Biomonitoring and/or surveillance systems with accessible, disaggregated data for health partners

* Does your country have an active national biomonitoring and/or surveillance system in place? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes, is the data made available and accessible to health partners and stakeholders (e.g. for poison centres, WHO observatory, burden of disease estimates)? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes, is the data collected possible to be disaggregated by sex? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

Strategic Objective D

Q1 | Public procurement programmes prioritizing safer chemical alternatives

* Is your government implementing public procurement standards in its procurement decisions that explicitly prioritize safer and more sustainable chemical alternatives in products? *[select one]*

Hint: *e.g. through technical specifications, ecolabels, restricted substance lists, or award criteria in public tenders*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes, which procurement instruments are used? *[select multiple]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

- □ Technical specifications requiring safer chemical alternatives
- □ Use of ecolabels or certification schemes
- □ Restricted substance lists
- □ Supplier qualification requirements
- □ Contract performance clauses
- □ Other

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Q2 | Sustainable agricultural practices integrated into current National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)

* Has your Country integrated support for any of the following sustainable agricultural practices into its current National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)? (Please select all that apply) *[select multiple]*

- □ Agroecology (e.g., diversified farming systems, soil health management, ecological restoration in farmlands)
- □ Integrated Pest Management (IPM) (e.g., biological controls, habitat manipulation, modification of cultural practices)
- □ Use of non-chemical alternatives (e.g., biopesticides, physical barriers, traditional farming knowledge)
- □ None of the above

Please provide a brief description or a link to the specific section/policy within your NBSAP where these practices are addressed *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 is not 'None of the above'*

Strategic Objective E

Q1 | Annual budget allocated for safe and sustainable management of chemicals and waste

* Does your country have a dedicated annual budget for programmes, projects and/or activities related to the safe and sustainable management of chemicals and waste? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Unknown

If yes, please specify the scope of the programmes, projects and/or activities *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

If yes, what is the approximate total amount allocated (USD)? Please provide information on the last year available. *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Year of the data provided *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Q2 | Inter-ministerial / multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms for chemicals and waste management

* Does your country have operational mechanisms in place to facilitate coordination for the development of inter-ministerial, multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral development assistance policies and programmes? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No

- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Q3 | Annual budget allocated to chemicals-related international assistance

* Does your country have a dedicated annual budget related to chemicals-related international assistance? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Unknown

If yes, what is the approximate total amount allocated (USD)? Please provide information on the last year available. *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Year of the data provided *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

Q4 | Systems, approaches and/or instruments for private sector cost recovery on chemicals

* Does your country have systems, approaches and/or instruments in place, such as Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR), that require the private sector to bear health, remediation, and/or other costs associated with chemicals across the lifecycle? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes, which instrument types are in place? (Select all that apply) *[select multiple]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes'*

- □ Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) scheme
- □ Liability framework
- □ Environmental taxes or fees
- □ Deposit-refund systems
- □ Other, please specify

If Other, please specify *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if 'Other' is selected in Q2*

Q5 | Chemicals risk prevention integrated in universal health coverage / primary health care strategies

* Does your country's universal health coverage strategy or primary health care plan explicitly include chemical risk prevention and environmental health considerations? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

Q6 | Human rights considerations integrated in chemicals and waste management approaches

* Does your country's chemicals and waste management framework explicitly reference or align with human rights obligations? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Partially

- □ Unknown

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm Conventions

This section collects information on NON-PARTIES to the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm Conventions. Please skip if you are a party to the BRS Conventions.

If you are NOT a Party to the Stockholm Convention, does your country have regulatory and assessment schemes for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No

If you are NOT a Party to the Basel Convention, does your country have adopted legislation to implement the provisions of the Basel Convention? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No

If you are NOT a Party to the Basel Convention, does your country have adopted legislation to prevent illegal traffic of hazardous and other wastes and provide that illegal traffic is criminal? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No

If you are NOT a Party to the Rotterdam Convention, is your country sharing information on export notifications provided for banned or severely restricted chemicals? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No

If you are NOT a Party to the Basel Convention, does your country compile available statistics (e.g. studies, reports) on the effects of hazardous wastes and other wastes on human health and the environment? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No

High-level Indicator of the Global Environmental Burden (GEB)

Q1. Please indicate which categories of chemicals or pollutants your country currently monitors in the following environmental media.

For each medium, select all applicable categories and list the main substances monitored by either typing them directly, inserting a link, or uploading a file containing the substance list.

Q1.1 Soil

Select categories monitored in Soil:

(Select all that apply)

- □ Metals and metalloids
- □ Pesticides
- □ Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
- □ Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)
- □ Industrial chemicals and solvents
- □ Pharmaceuticals and personal care products
- □ Plastic-related pollutants / microplastics
- □ Other
- □ No monitoring undertaken

Please specify which substances are monitored under each category:

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Q1.2 Water (Freshwater)

Select categories monitored in Water (Freshwater): *[select multiple]*

- □ Metals and metalloids
- □ Pesticides
- □ Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
- □ Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)
- □ Industrial chemicals and solvents
- □ Pharmaceuticals and personal care products
- □ Nutrients
- □ Plastic-related pollutants / microplastics
- □ Other
- □ No monitoring undertaken

Please specify which substances are monitored under each category: *[text]*

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Q1.3 Water (Marine water, if applicable)

Select categories monitored in Water (Marine water, if applicable): *[select multiple]*

- □ Metals and metalloids
- □ Pesticides
- □ Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
- □ Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)
- □ Industrial chemicals and solvents
- □ Pharmaceuticals and personal care products
- □ Nutrients
- □ Plastic-related pollutants / microplastics
- □ Other
- □ No monitoring undertaken

Please specify which substances are monitored under each category: *[text]*

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Q1.4 Air

Select categories monitored in Air: *[select multiple]*

- □ Metals and metalloids
- □ Pesticides
- □ Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
- □ Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)
- □ Particulate matter and particles
- □ Other
- □ No monitoring undertaken

Please specify which substances are monitored under each category: *[text]*

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Q1.5 Biota

Select categories monitored in Biota: *[select multiple]*

- □ Metals and metalloids
- □ Pesticides
- □ Persistent organic pollutants (POPs)
- □ Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)
- □ Industrial chemicals and solvents
- □ Pharmaceuticals and personal care products
- □ Plastic-related pollutants / microplastics
- □ Other
- □ No monitoring undertaken

Please specify which substances are monitored under each category: *[text]*

Please provide a weblink in support of your answer and attach relevant documentation *[text] [file upload]*

Does your country plan to implement monitoring strategies for any of these chemicals? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes or under development, please specify which substances and environmental media. *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q2 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

PRIVATE SECTOR & OTHER STAKEHOLDERS

THE FOLLOWING MODULE IS SHOWN ONLY TO PRIVATE SECTOR RESPONDENTS, UNLESS THE SKIP LOGIC SPECIFIES THAT IT SHOULD ALSO BE SHOWN TO OTHER STAKEHOLDERS.

Strategic Objective B

Q1 | Use of a harmonised standard/tool/platform for sharing chemical information along the value chain

* Does your organization use a harmonized standard, tool, or platform for sharing information about chemicals in materials and products along the value chain (e.g. Digital Product and Material Information System)? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes, which platform or standard does your organization use? *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Skip logic: *Q2 is shown only when Organisation Type = Private Sector, NGO, IGO, Trade Union, Health, or Other*

Q2 | Compiling of available statistics on the effects of hazardous wastes and other wastes on human health and the environment

* Does your organization compile available statistics (e.g. studies, reports) on the effects of hazardous wastes and other wastes on human health and the environment? *[select one]*

- □ Yes

- □ No

Strategic Objective D

Q1 | Percentage of revenue or R&D expenditure contributing to advancing sustainable chemistry

* Does your organization separately track expenditure that contributes to advancing sustainable chemistry? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Partially

If yes or partially, what was your organization's total Annual revenue (USD) on green and sustainable chemistry in the most recent available year? *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

If yes or partially, what was your organization's total R&D budget (USD) on green and sustainable chemistry in the most recent available year? *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Reference year *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Of that amount, how much was directed towards gender empowerment and integration (USD)? (Estimates accepted) *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Q2 | Companies reporting on chemical risks, dependencies and impacts on human health and the environment

* Does your organization report publicly on its chemical-related risks, dependencies, and impacts on human health and the environment? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Partially

If yes or partially, is sex-disaggregated data available? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

- □ Yes
- □ No

Q3 | Internal capacity and formal methods to identify and introduce safer chemical alternatives

* Has your organization established formal internal capacity and formal methods to identify, assess, and introduce safer and more sustainable alternatives to harmful substances in your products or processes, including through their research and innovation programmes? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

Are the processes or methods gender-responsive? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Hint: *i.e., differentiated exposure risks between women and men; ensure balanced participation of women and men in decision-making and research teams; collect and analyse sex-disaggregated data; and assess potential gender-differentiated impacts of chemical substitutes*

(Select one)

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

Q4 | Share of R&D budget / projects whose primary objective is developing safer chemical alternatives

* Does your organization track the share of its R&D budget or projects whose primary objective is to develop, test or scale up safer and more sustainable alternatives to hazardous chemicals in products? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Partially

If yes or partially, what was your organization's total R&D budget (USD) in the most recent available year? *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Reference year *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Of that R&D budget, how much was specifically allocated to developing safer or more sustainable chemical alternatives? (USD, estimates accepted) *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'.*

Were gender-responsive criteria integrated in your R&D and projects to ensure alternatives are safer for diverse biological profiles? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Hint: *e.g., considering reproductive health, hormonal systems, or body mass differences; sex-disaggregated data in safety testing and risk assessments*

(Select one)

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Partially

If yes or partially, how much was explicitly used on gender-responsive safer alternatives in the most recent available year (USD)? *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q4 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Reference year *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q4 = 'Yes' or 'Partially'*

Q5 | Formal commitment to substitution of at least one priority hazardous chemical

* Has your organization formally committed to or substituted at least one priority harmful substances and/or group of substances in a major product line or high-volume use with a safer and more sustainable alternative? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development

If yes, please provide a weblink in support of your answer. If not available, please add a description of your efforts. *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Attach relevant documentation in support of your answer *[file upload]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Does your organization's substitution policy or process specifically require a gender impact assessment to ensure that new alternatives do not pose disproportionate risks to women or men? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Hint: *i.e., considering reproductive health or gender-segregated occupational exposure*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Partially

Skip logic: *Q6 is shown only when Organisation Type = Private Sector, NGO, IGO, Trade Union, Health, or Other*

Q6 | Procurement policy or programme prioritizing safer chemical alternatives

* Has your organization established and actively implemented a procurement policy or programme that prioritizes safer and more sustainable chemical alternatives in purchased products? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes or partially, what was your organization's total procurement expenditure (USD) in the most recent available year? *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Reference year *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Of that amount, how much was specifically allocated (USD) to procurement policy or programme with explicit criteria to avoid or minimize harmful substances and favour safer and more sustainable alternatives? (Estimates accepted) *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Is your organization's procurement policy or programme gender responsive? *[select one]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Hint: *i.e. Does it integrate gender analysis into procurement criteria; consider sex- and gender-differentiated exposure risks; use sex-disaggregated data; address needs of groups in situations of vulnerability; promote equal participation and benefit-sharing*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Unknown

Strategic Objective E

Skip logic: *Q1 is shown only when Organisation Type = Private Sector, NGO, IGO, Trade Union, Health, or Other*

Q1 | Amount of finance mobilized for the safe and sustainable management of chemicals and waste

* Has your organization mobilized financial resources in support of the safe and sustainable management of chemicals and waste? *[select one]*

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Under development
- □ Unknown

If yes or partially, what was your organization's total amount (USD) mobilised in the most recent available year? *[decimal]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development'*

Reference year *[text]*

Skip logic: *Shown only if Q1 = 'Yes' or 'Under development*