Comments received on the thought starter on proposed factsheet template for indicators

Thought starter on proposed factsheet template for indicators			
Author	**Comment**	**Action**	**status**
Norway	1. There should be an opening to adjust the templates if needed when we start developing the sheets for the different indicators. 2. Adding a field for which target the indicator belongs to at the top would be preferable. 3. The 'Methodology' section is a very important part of the factsheets, and we would thus recommend moving this section further up in the fact sheet template. 4. In accordance with the factsheets from the indicator workshop in Cambridge in 2019 we suggest adding a field called 'Limitations'.	1. Add intro with text as indicated by Norway. Add cover page with intro on GFC and what is the purpose of the factsheets for indicators. 2. Add text as suggested Add text "List the target(s) that the indicator responds to." to field "Description". 3. ~~Consider moving the section as requested~~. Add field "Methodology" that gives a brief summary of the methodology used to develop the indicator, while a more exhaustive explanation of the Methodology for indicator calculation is in given a dedicated section below. 4. Consider adding the Field "Limitations"– Add field "Limitations" under Section "Assessment"	1.done 2. done 3. done 4. done
EU	1. Suggest checking the interoperability status of the data necessary for each indicator, in addition to their availability. 2. (Assessment) It may be useful to add e.g. under "Assessment" an interpretation of the development of the indicator that can be understood by non-experts. 3. "Policy context": We suggest also mentioning the target under the 2030 Agenda, to which an indicator relates and thus provides useful information on progress. 4. "Sustainability of the data collection": Please specify which costs are meant here 5. "Data availability and accessibility": We suggest providing the baseline in the factsheet. 6. "Methodology", " If applicable, this may include criteria for assessing risk, and how changes in risk are measured and reported.": This seems rather challenging and it is not clear what kind of risk assessment would be done and on which basis.	1. – Add text: "ensure compatibility of the IT systems and databases" in field "Data availability, and accessibility and compatibility" 2. Consider adding text as suggested under "Assessment" – add field "Methodology" with summary on the development of the indicator 3. Add text "SDG indicators" under "Policy context" now called "Linkages with development agendas". 4. Replace "Costs aspects" with "resources needed". 5. Add text: "Add baseline (link to baseline where available)." 6. Already addressed in answer to Norway comment 4.	1. done 2.done 3. done 4. done 5.done 6. done
HejSupport	1. On "Robustness": See our comments to the "robustness criteron" in the document GFC_OEAHGMI.2_2.	1. No action required in the factsheet but the comment is more on the thought starter on	1. done 2. done 3. done

	We agree that and indicator should be robust to time changed, but are concerned about the strictness of the "robustness criterion", which will impede adressing gaps in the chemicals management. 2. On “Data availability and accessibility”: “this is an obstacle for developing new indicators to address gaps in the chemicals management. 3. On “Sustainability of the data collection”: This is a problematic requirement for indicators on chemicals in products as there is no system in place yet. 4. On “Reporting mechanism”: This is a problematic requirement for indicators on chemicals in products as there is no system in place yet. 5. On” Data disaggregation / aggregation”: Data should be collected based on the globally harmonized requirements. It does not mean whether data is collected nationally, globally or sectorally, etc. Globally harmonized approach to data collections is what is needed.	criteria and the definition of Robustness. This is considered in the criteria 2. Consider adding “where applicable” and add “requirements for new indicators”. Change text 3. Non sure if action is needed here, again could be added “where applicable”. Add “where applicable”. 4. Non sure if action is needed here. To be further discussed, it is to be addressed on a case-to-case for each proposed indicator. 5. To be further discussed, it is to be addressed on a case-to-case for each proposed indicator.	4.n/a yet 5.n/a yet
IPEN	1. it might be less onerous to focus on fact sheets for each of the targets and/or objectives, including the relevant indicators. 2. an example sheet is available, more detailed input will be easier to provide. 3. At this stage, we would also propose including deadlines to the fact sheet.	1. It is proposed to have factsheets for targets and/or objectives instead for indicators to reduce the amount of work. This is a next, step after the identifying feasible indicators. 2. Consider preparation of a sample-factsheet. Needs clarification on who is tasked to do this. The secretariat will make a proposal of sample factsheet. 3. Consider proposing a deadline to complete factsheets? It is too early to put a deadline for factsheets	1.n/a yet 2.to do 3.n/a yet
PAN Germany and PAN UK	1. Propose to contribute to the completion of the factsheets	1. No action required	
US	1. Proposed a few textual changes throughout the factsheet template 2. Section “Policy context”: proposed to call it “Existing uses” US proposes to change the text of this section:	1. Proposed changes added to the revised document. Changes to text accepted 2. For consideration, suggested text may change the meaning/purpose of the section and then the following section would become redundant.	1. done 2. done 3. done

	"Information, if applicable, on existing uses of the indicator at the global, regional, or national level." 3. Section Methodology: text selected: "If applicable, this may include criteria for assessing risk, and how changes in risk are measured and reported. It includes formulas and the categorization process." Comment: "Assume this is related to potential risks or downsides of relying on certain indicators, not chemical risk assessment, but this is not clear. It does not seem like the latter would be relevant to indicator calculation methodology."	Comment addressed with a different proposal for the field's name Rephrase "Policy context" changed with "Linkages with development agendas". 3. For consideration. This text may not be relevant in this section. Sentence to be DELETED	