UNITED NATIONS

UNEP

UNEP/GFC/IC.1/INF/8

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 6 (a) of the provisional agenda*

Global Framework on Chemicals – investing for impact: finance and investment

Analysis of options to support the long-term financial sustainability of the Global Framework on Chemicals

Note by the secretariat**

I. Introduction

1. At its first meeting, the Open-ended Working Group of the Global Framework on Chemicals, convened in Punta del Este, Uruguay, in June 2025, requested the secretariat to prepare an analysis of options to mobilize and leverage resources in support of the implementation of the Global Framework on Chemicals, including options to support the long-term financial sustainability of the secretariat and the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund.

2. The Global Framework on Chemicals is a voluntary, multisectoral and multistakeholder framework. Paragraph 80 of the Framework provides that the core budget of the secretariat is financed through voluntary contributions from Governments, the private sector and other stakeholders, and that Governments and stakeholder groups are invited annually to provide voluntary financial contributions.

3. The implementation of the Framework, including its governance arrangements, secretariat functions, the International Conference, intersessional work and the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund, requires predictable and sustainable financial support. This document provides supplementary information to support the consideration of financing options by the International Conference.

II. Financial sustainability context

4. The estimated financing requirements for the Global Framework on Chemicals for the 2027–2029 period are approximately USD 15.8 million, including secretariat staffing, the second session of the International Conference, and a possible meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. These estimates are based on the staffing structure proposed in the Programme of Work and Budget for the 2027-2029 period and anticipated governance and conference servicing requirements during the period, excluding the operational costs of the Fund.

* UNEP/GFC/IC.1/1.

** This document has not been formally edited

5. Recent contribution levels indicate both the value of voluntary support and the challenges associated with maintaining predictable financing. Contributions received by the secretariat amounted to approximately USD 0.3 million in 2023, USD 2.5 million in 2024 and USD 1.9 million in 2025.

6. While voluntary contributions remain the foundation of the Framework's financing arrangements, current contribution levels suggest that additional measures may be required to improve predictability, diversification and long-term sustainability.

III. Analysis of financing approaches

A. Predictable voluntary contributions from Governments using the United Nations scale of assessment as a non-binding indicative reference

7. A number of multilateral environmental agreements and United Nations processes invite voluntary contributions from Governments using the United Nations scale of assessment as a non-binding indicative reference. Such approaches are intended to support greater predictability and transparency in voluntary contributions while maintaining their voluntary nature.

8. Paragraph 80 of the Framework already provides that Governments are invited annually to provide voluntary financial contributions. The use of the United Nations scale of assessment as a non-binding indicative reference could provide Governments with an objective and internationally recognized benchmark when considering contribution levels.

9. Several Governments have indicated that indicative references based on the United Nations scale of assessment can facilitate internal discussions with finance ministries and budget authorities. Following recent contribution requests issued by the secretariat, several Governments requested indicative contribution references based on the United Nations scale of assessment to support internal budgeting considerations.

10. Such an approach could improve predictability, transparency and burden-sharing while preserving the voluntary nature of contributions.

B. Indicative stakeholder contribution framework for non-government stakeholders

11. Unlike Governments, for which the United Nations scale of assessment provides an established indicative reference, no equivalent reference mechanism currently exists for non-government stakeholders participating in the Framework.

12. An indicative stakeholder contribution framework could therefore be developed to provide a transparent and voluntary methodology to guide financial and in-kind contributions from stakeholder groups participating in the Framework.

13. The framework could differentiate stakeholders according to:

(a) stakeholder category, including private sector entities, industry associations, foundations, civil society organizations, academic institutions and other stakeholder groups;

(b) organizational scale and ability to contribute, taking into account factors such as annual turnover, operating budget, membership size or other appropriate indicators;

(c) level of engagement in Framework activities, including participation in governance processes, partnerships, technical initiatives and Implementation Programmes supported under the Framework; and

(d) the nature of support provided, including both financial and in-kind contributions.

14. Under such an approach, indicative contribution ranges could be established for different stakeholder categories and scales. Stakeholders actively participating in Implementation Programmes or other Framework-supported initiatives could be invited to contribute within higher indicative ranges reflecting their level of engagement and participation.

15. The objective would not be to establish mandatory contributions or membership fees, but rather to provide stakeholders with a transparent and voluntary reference mechanism analogous in function to the indicative role played by the United Nations scale of assessment for Governments.

Table 1. Illustrative structure of an indicative stakeholder contribution framework

Criterion	Examples of considerations
Stakeholder category	Private sector entity, industry association, foundation, civil society organization, academic institution, other stakeholder
Organizational scale	Annual turnover, operating budget, membership size or other relevant indicators
Level of engagement in the Framework	Participation in governance processes, technical initiatives, partnerships, or active participation in the Implementation Programmes
Nature of support	Financial contributions, technical expertise, hosting of events, or other in-kind support

Illustrative application

16. Under such an approach, a multinational company actively participating in an Implementation Programme could be invited to contribute within a higher indicative contribution range than a company with limited engagement in Framework activities. Similarly, an international industry association or large philanthropic foundation could be invited to contribute at a different indicative level than a national civil society organization or academic institution.

17. The objective would be to provide stakeholders with a transparent and voluntary reference mechanism while preserving the voluntary nature of all contributions and recognizing both financial and in-kind support.

C. Partnership and support modalities for conferences and activities

18. Partnership and support modalities could provide a complementary source of support for specific meetings, conferences and agreed activities under the Framework. Such approaches could include financial and in-kind contributions to support the International Conference, regional meetings, technical workshops, outreach activities, participation support, knowledge products and other agreed activities.

19. Similar arrangements have been used in a range of United Nations processes and multistakeholder initiatives to support convening functions and targeted activities, particularly where regular voluntary contributions alone are insufficient to finance large-scale meetings and outreach efforts.

20. Under the Framework, such approaches would require appropriate transparency, safeguard and due diligence arrangements consistent with applicable United Nations policies and procedures. Any support provided would need to remain clearly separated from decision-making processes and would not confer governance privileges or preferential treatment to contributing stakeholders.

21. Appropriate acknowledgement and visibility arrangements consistent with United Nations rules and policies could also be considered, including acknowledgement of contributions and participation in designated conference or outreach spaces.

22. While partnership and support modalities may provide useful flexibility and supplementary support for specific activities, they would likely remain less predictable and more activity-specific in nature and would therefore be most effective when combined with other financing approaches.

D. Support allocation models used in multistakeholder initiatives

23. The secretariat also examined support allocation models used in certain multistakeholder initiatives, including the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC).

24. Under such approaches, a defined percentage of implementation-related funding may be allocated to support coordination, governance, reporting and implementation-support functions. These arrangements are generally treated separately from standard United Nations programme support costs (PSC) and recognize that implementation-management and coordination functions form part of the broader delivery infrastructure required for effective implementation.

25. The analysis indicates that such approaches provide useful lessons regarding the distinction between programme support costs and implementation-support functions, and demonstrate one possible mechanism for linking operational support to implementation activities.

26. However, under the current financing arrangements of the Global Framework on Chemicals, including existing arrangements through which resources may be used to support secretariat functions

and the management and implementation of the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund, the analysis suggests that support allocation models may provide limited additional benefit at this stage.

27. Furthermore, based on current estimated financing requirements, a support allocation model alone would likely require implementation-related contributions significantly above current funding levels in order to generate sufficient resources to sustain the Framework architecture.

IV. Comparative analysis of financing approaches

28. Table 1 below provides a comparative overview of the financing approaches examined by the secretariat.

Table 1: Comparative overview of financing approaches

Option	Main Features	Potential Advantages	Considerations	Financial Realism	Secretariat Assessment
1. Predictable voluntary contributions from Governments using the UN scale of assessment as a non-binding indicative reference	Governments would be invited annually to provide voluntary contributions informed by the UN scale of assessment, while remaining fully voluntary in nature. This approach would build on existing practices used across several multilateral environmental agreements.	Improves predictability, transparency and burden-sharing; provides a structured basis for annual budget planning; aligned with established MEA practice; anchored in paragraph 80 of the Framework.	Contributions would remain voluntary and therefore vulnerable to non-payment or late payment.	**Moderate–High**. Likely the most realistic mechanism for supporting core governance and coordination functions if political support is maintained.	Likely to represent an essential core element of a sustainable financing approach for the Framework architecture.
2. Indicative stakeholder contribution framework for non-government stakeholders	Development of a voluntary and transparent stakeholder contribution framework providing indicative references for financial and in-kind contributions from non-government stakeholders. The framework could take into account stakeholder category, organizational scale, level of engagement in Framework activities and nature of support provided.	Reflects the multistakeholder nature of the Framework; broadens the potential support base; allows differentiated participation approaches rather than applying a single contribution model to all stakeholders.	Requires appropriate safeguards, transparency and due diligence arrangements; contribution levels may remain unpredictable.	**Moderate**. Could provide complementary diversification of support sources, though unlikely to provide sufficient predictable financing alone.	Innovative approach that could help operationalize paragraph 80 for non-government stakeholders and provide a voluntary reference mechanism analogous in function to the role played by the United Nations scale of assessment for Governments.
3. Partnership and support modalities for conferences and activities	Voluntary support arrangements for specific meetings, conferences, outreach activities, technical workshops, participation support, knowledge products or agreed activities. Support	May help support high-cost governance and convening activities such as the International Conference and related meetings; provides	Would require appropriate transparency, visibility and safeguard arrangements; support would likely remain activity-specific and less predictable;	**Low–Moderate**. More suitable as supplementary support for specific activities rather than as a primary sustainability mechanism.	Could represent a useful supplementary support modality, particularly for conferences and outreach activities, but would likely need to operate alongside

Option	Main Features	Potential Advantages	Considerations	Financial Realism	Secretariat Assessment
	could include financial and in-kind contributions.	targeted flexibility for specific activities.	unlikely to sustain core staffing requirements.		broader sustainability approaches.
4. Support allocation models used in multistakeholder initiatives	A defined percentage allocation (e.g. 15%) associated with selected implementation-related funding arrangements or activities would support core governance, coordination and implementation-support functions of the Framework architecture. This would be separate from standard UN programme support costs (PSC). Existing arrangements whereby GFC Fund resources support staffing and operational functions directly related to the management and implementation of the GFC Fund could continue.	Provides a more predictable source of support linked to implementation growth; recognizes that governance, coordination and implementation-management functions supporting implementation delivery are part of the Framework's delivery infrastructure; reduces reliance on separate ad hoc fundraising for operational support.	Requires clear eligibility criteria regarding the funding arrangements to which the allocation would apply, clear distinction from UN programme support costs (PSC), and transparent reporting arrangements.	**Low**. Based on current estimated financing needs, a 15% allocation alone would likely be insufficient unless implementation-related contributions increase substantially. A higher percentage or complementary approaches may therefore be required.	Provides useful lessons regarding the financing of coordination and implementation-support functions and the distinction between implementation-support costs and programme support costs. However, the analysis suggests limited additional benefit under current GFC financing arrangements.

V. Overall Findings

29. The analysis indicates that no single financing approach is likely to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Global Framework on Chemicals on its own.

30. Predictable voluntary contributions from Governments using the United Nations scale of assessment as a non-binding indicative reference appear to represent the most immediately operational and institutionally established mechanism for improving predictability and transparency of voluntary contributions.

31. The analysis also identified opportunities to further operationalize paragraph 80 of the Framework through the development of an indicative stakeholder contribution framework for non-government stakeholders. Such an approach would reflect the multistakeholder nature of the Framework while providing a transparent and voluntary reference mechanism for stakeholder contributions.

32. Partnership and support modalities may provide a useful complementary source of support for conferences, outreach activities and other agreed activities, particularly where targeted financial or in-kind support can be mobilized in a manner consistent with United Nations policies and safeguards.

33. Support allocation models examined by the secretariat provide useful lessons and precedents but may offer limited additional benefit under the current financing arrangements of the Framework and the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund.

34. Taken together, the analysis suggests that a combined financing approach drawing upon predictable voluntary Government contributions, an indicative stakeholder contribution framework and partnership and support modalities may provide the most viable basis for supporting the long-term financial sustainability of the Global Framework on Chemicals.