GFC/OEAHGMI.9/2

Distr.: General
27 May 2026
English only

Open-ended ad hoc group on measurability and indicators of the Global Framework on Chemicals – for a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste
Eighth meeting
Online, 31 March 2026, 14:00-16:00 CEST

Report of the Eighth Meeting of the Open-ended Ad hoc Group on Measurability and Indicators

1. Opening and welcome

The eighth meeting of the Open-ended Ad hoc Group on Measurability and Indicators (OEAHGMI) was held online on 31 March 2026 from 14:00 to 16:00 CEST. The meeting was facilitated by the Co-Chairs, Ms. Keima Gardiner (Trinidad and Tobago) and Ms. Katerina Sebkova (Czech Republic). Ms. Gardiner opened the meeting and welcomed participants, acknowledging the continued engagement of experts and stakeholders in advancing the measurability framework of the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC). She highlighted the importance of the meeting in consolidating progress following the transition to small expert groups and task forces, and in preparing for upcoming discussions at the International Conference.

2. Organizational matters: adoption of the agenda and previous meeting report

The Co-Chair introduced the provisional agenda for the meeting (GFC/OEAHGMI.8/1), which was adopted as presented. The Co-Chair then introduced the report of the seventh meeting of the open-ended ad hoc group (GFC/OEAHGMI.8/2), which was also adopted without amendment.

3. Overview of outcomes of the Hybrid Expert Meeting held on 19-20 February 2026

The Co-Chair presented an overview of the outcomes of the hybrid expert meeting held on 19–20 February 2026, which brought together 61 experts participating either in person or online through parallel sessions. Discussions focused on advancing the development of indicators under the strategic objectives of the Global Framework on Chemicals, as well as on the methodologies of the proposed high-level indicators. As a result of these discussions, a total of 68 draft indicators were proposed under the strategic objectives. The indicators were presented to the OEAHGMI in a way that took into account the level of agreement among experts, the completeness and/or availability of supporting factsheets, and the identification of custodians, enabling the group to prioritize decisions and highlight areas requiring further work. Concrete proposals for the High-Level Indicator on the Global Environmental Burden,

including its methodology and constituting elements, as well as the High-Level Indicator on the Global Burden of Disease were also presented to the group.

4. Decision on the way forward for the draft indicators under the Strategic Objectives

The way forward for each of the draft target indicators under the Strategic Objectives was considered using the following approach:

- Recommend that the draft indicator be taken forward for consideration at the International Conference, either following the group's approval or, given its complexity and the presence of divergent views, in recognition of the need to identify indicators to ensure the target is properly measured;
- Continue work on the draft indicator, and task the small groups of experts to develop the corresponding factsheet and/or the Secretariat to reach out to potential custodian to confirm their acceptance; or
- Deprioritize the draft indicator and set it aside for now, for possible consideration at a later stage.

For Strategic Objective A, eleven draft indicators (see Annex I) were considered sufficiently developed, with broad agreement, finalized factsheets, and confirmed custodians and were agreed to be put forward to the International Conference for further consideration. There was disagreement from two participants regarding two other draft indicators (A5.2, A5.3), however, as the majority agreement remained among the group, the Co-Chairs decided to also take them forward for consideration at the International Conference. Draft indicators related to highly hazardous pesticides (for Target A7) were recognized as complex, and the group agreed that further intersessional work would be required to refine them and reduce the number of indicators, together with two additional draft indicators (A2.2, A6.2) identified as requiring further intersessional work (see Annex II).

For Strategic Objective B, the group noted that progress varied across targets. Eight draft indicators (see Annex I) were considered well advanced with broad agreement, finalized factsheets, and confirmed custodians and were agreed to be put forward to the International Conference for further consideration. The group however requested additional work for ten of the proposed draft indicators (see Annex II), particularly in relation to identifying appropriate custodians and finalizing the corresponding factsheets. Discussions also highlighted the importance of ensuring that indicators are supported by existing data sources and that their scope aligns with available reporting mechanisms to the extent possible. In certain cases, policy concerns were raised regarding the relevance or interpretation of indicators, and it was agreed that these would need to be addressed through further work to be undertaken (see Annex II).

For Strategic Objectives D and E, five draft indicators (see Annex I) were recommended to be taken forward to the International Conference. Owing to time constraints, however, there was insufficient opportunity to consider the majority of these indicators in depth. The review was therefore conducted at a high level, noting that many indicators under these strategic objectives (see Annex II) remain under development, with further work required to confirm custodians, complete factsheets, and ensure data availability. The Co-Chairs emphasized the need to accelerate progress in these areas ahead of the next meeting.

Across all strategic objectives, the group agreed that where indicators were not yet fully developed or where there was no broad agreement, work should continue intersessionally, with a view to refining proposals. In depth consideration of *Strategic Objectives D and E* would be prioritised for the next meeting.

The outcome of the discussions held during the meeting is presented in Annexes I and II, which respectively set out the list of draft indicators recommended by the OEAHGMI for consideration at the International Conference; and the list of draft indicators still requiring decision for recommendation at the next meeting of OEAHGMI.

5. Update and next steps on the on the High-Level Indicator on the Global Environmental Burden

Joao Santos (UNEP) provided an update on the work of the Task Force on the High-Level Indicator (HLI) on the Global Environmental Burden as well as on progress made. The HLI is structured around three core dimensions: pressure, state, and impact, and distinguishes between core indicators that contribute to an overall HLI result and supplementary indicators that provide contextual information for interpretation, but do not contribute to the HLI result itself. Discussions of the Task Force were focusing on improving the interpretability of the HLI framework and analysis of its completeness, including through the use of sectoral and chemical groupings.

In addition, the Task Force is exploring modelling approaches to address gaps in available indicators, including approaches to estimate environmental concentrations from emissions and to assess potential impacts based on exposure-effect relationships. The approach also incorporates contextual signals, such as global environmental initiatives and system-level information, to support interpretation of results. Work is continuing on data validation, aggregation methodology, testing of approaches for modelling, and overall construction.

Further information was made available in the background note prepared for the meeting[1].

6. Presentation of the High-Level Indicator on the Global Burden of Disease

Virunya Bhat (WHO) introduced the work on developing a High-Level Indicator related to health to complement existing WHO and IHME Global Burden of Disease (GBD) estimates for selected chemicals. Existing GBD estimates are currently limited to a small number of chemicals and disease outcomes due to significant data and methodological constraints. As a result, the Task Force proposed the development of a complementary proxy framework that combines exposure, health impact, and policy response indicators.

This proxy framework aims to be applied in parallel with GBD estimates to provide a more practical and comprehensive approach to monitoring progress in GFC implementation. The Task Force is currently developing the supporting indicator fact sheet and information document and will continue refining the framework ahead of the next meeting.

7. Next Steps

The group agreed that substantive work remains before a final recommendation for a suite of draft indicators can be proposed to the International Conference. Intersessional work related to the draft indicators would focus on finalizing the factsheets, identifying and confirming custodians, addressing technical gaps, and resolving outstanding policy issues. Small expert groups, in collaboration with the Secretariat, were tasked to advance this work.

[1] See Background note on the status of work undertaken in relation to the High-level Indicator of the Global Environmental Burden available on the meeting webpage at: https://www.unep.org/events/conference/eighth-meeting-open-ended-ad-hoc-group-measurability-and-indicators

The next meeting of the OEAHGMI is scheduled to take place online on 8 June 2026, during which the group will be invited to finalise its recommendations ahead of the International Conference.

8. Any Other Business

Participants emphasized the importance of ensuring consultation and engagement during the intersessional period to strengthen the quality, inclusiveness, and acceptability of the proposed indicators.

9. Closure of the Meeting

In closing, the Co-Chairs expressed their appreciation to all participants (see Annex III), facilitators, and members of the Secretariat for their active engagement and contributions to the meeting. They acknowledged the progress made while also noting the work that remains to be completed. Participants were encouraged to remain engaged during the intersessional period and to contribute to advancing the development of the measurability structure and indicator framework. The meeting was then formally closed at 16:00 CEST.

Annex I – Draft indicators recommended by the OEAHGMI to be forwarded to the International Conference for consideration

Indicator	Indicator Description	Custodian
A1.2	Number of countries with controls for lead in paint	WHO
A1.3	Number of countries that have achieved core capacities for chemical events under the International Health Regulations	WHO
A1.4 | B6.1	Number of countries that have partially or fully implemented the GHS	UNITAR
A1.5	Number of countries with legislation in place to manage industrial and consumer chemicals	OECD
A1.6	The number of Parties to the Stockholm Convention** with regulatory and assessment schemes for new pesticides and/or new industrial chemicals ***Non-Parties may also provide data*	BRS+ GFC
A1.7	Number of Parties to the Basel Convention** that adopted legislation to implement the provisions of the Basel Convention. ***Non-Parties may also provide data*	BRS + GFC
A2.1	Number of users and views to the IOMC Toolbox	IOMC
A4.1	Number of Parties to the Basel Convention** which have adopted legislation to prevent illegal traffic of hazardous and other wastes and provide that illegal traffic is criminal. *** Non-Parties may also provide data* **one expert didn't agree to include 'other wastes'*	BRS+ GFC
A4.2	Number of closed cases of illegal traffic of hazardous waste and other wastes reported by countries (Parties to the Basel Convention) **one expert didn't agree to include 'other wastes'*	BRS
A5.1	Number of Parties to the Rotterdam Convention** sharing information on export notifications provided for banned or severely restricted chemicals *** Non-Parties may also provide data*	BRS + GFC
A5.2[2]	Number of countries prohibiting the export of chemicals prohibited nationally	GFC
A5.3[2]	Number of countries regulating the export of chemicals prohibited nationally	GFC
A6.1	Number of countries with access to poisons centres	WHO

[2]There was disagreement regarding this indicator during the OEAHGMI discussions; however, based on the majority agreement among the group, the Co-Chairs decided to take it forward for consideration at the International Conference.

B3.1	Number of countries with a PRTR (implementing international standards for PRTRs, including parties to the Kyiv Protocol on PRTRs, countries implementing OECD standards for PRTRs, or equivalent)	UNITAR, UNECE and OECD
B3.2	(a) Hazardous waste generated per capita; and (b) proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment	UNSD, UNEP
B3.3	Number of Parties to the Aarhus Convention or the Escazú Agreement	UNECE
B4.1	Number of countries adherent to the Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD) system.	OECD
B4.2	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. ***Non-Parties to Rotterdam Convention may also provide data* **one expert didn't agree*	BRS + GFC
B7.1	Changes in levels of persistent organic pollutants in the environment and humans	BRS
B7.5	Mortality rate attributed to unintentional poisoning	WHO
B7.6	Number of 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. ***Non-Parties may also provide data* **one expert didn't agree to include 'other wastes'*	BRS + GFC
D7.1	Number of ratifications of up-to-date ILO Conventions related to chemical risks	ILO
D7.2	Number of member States with national Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) profiles	ILO
E1.1	**Budget integration** Number of countries with annual budget allocated for programmes, projects and activities aiming for the sound management of chemicals and waste.	GFC
E1.2	**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.	GFC
E5.1	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.	GFC

Annex II – Draft indicators still requiring decision for recommendation at the next meeting of OEAHGMI

Indicator	Indicator Description	Custodian Assigned	Factsheet Finalized
A2.2 | B4.3	Number of new or updated guidelines developed by IGOs that support identified needs of Governments and stakeholders to implement effective chemicals and waste management strategies	☐	☒
A6.2	% of poison centres that meet Tier 3 (or 4 – tbd) criteria for country access, capabilities and training for poison centres.	☐	☒
A7.1	Identification: Number of countries that have made publicly available **[including to the GFC Secretariat]** a list of pesticides determined by regulatory authorities to meet the Joint Meeting on Pesticide Manageme nt criteria (FAO/WHO criteria) on HHPs.	☐	☐
A7.2	Identification: Number of countries that have made publicly available **[use and exposure]** information rela ted to pesticides, including any that have been determined/identified by national regulatory authorities in that country to be highly hazardous pesticides	☐	☐
A7.3	Assessment: 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.	☐	☐
A7.4	Assessment: Use and trade of registered or authorized biopesticides. **one expert questions the term 'use and trade', further discussion needed*	☐	☐
A7.5	Phase out/Mitigation: Number and volumes of HHP active ingredients and formulations sales in portfolios of industry, by country.	☐	☐
A7.6	Phase out/Mitigation: Number of countries that have implemented a regulation or risk reduction plan that encompasses phasing out HHP.	☐	☐
A7.7	Phase out/Mitigation: Total Applied Toxicity (TAT) of HHPs.	☐	☐
A7.8	Phase out/Mitigation Number of countries [where risks have not been managed] and where safer and affor dable alternatives are available, that have taken administrative, legal, or regulatory measures to phase out p esticides that have been identified or determined by [national regulatory authorities in] that country to be hi ghly hazardous pesticides.	☐	☐
B1.1	Number of chemical substances with publicly accessible data and information (physico-chemical, hazard, exposure data) from recognized chemical information platforms	☐	☒
B1.2	Number of participants actively using and/or contributing to globally recognized chemical information platforms	☐	☐

B2.1	Number of countries with measures on **[globally]** harmonized digital products and materials information systems across sectors.	☐	☒
B2.2	Number of stakeholders, including industry and the private sector, that use/implement a **[globally]** harmonized 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).	☐	☒
B3.4	Number of countries that make **[globally]** harmonized data on chemicals in materials and products publicly accessible.	☐	☒
B5.2	Number and diversity of people trained [through the GFC] on chemical safety, sustainability, safer alternatives, and benefits of reducing chemical and waste risks, disaggregated by gender, region, and GFC stakeholder type. **one expert didn't agree*	☐	☐
B5.3	Number of training materials on chemical safety, sustainability, safer alternatives, and benefits of reducing chemicals and waste risks developed that are relevant to the GFC.	☐	☐
B7.2	Number of countries undertaking biomonitoring of chemicals in humans and/or surveillance of chemical exposures and health impacts	☐	☒
B7.3	Number of countries undertaking environmental monitoring levels of chemicals and waste releases and/or i mpacts	☒	☐
B7.4	Proportion of countries with biomonitoring and/or surveillance systems in place that make disaggregated information and data available and accessible to health partners and stakeholders [for example, including for clinical and toxicological training and education, including for poison centres, chemical risk prevention/risk management, national and/or global GBD or other estimates, etc (e.g. to U of Washington's IHME, WHO global health observatory, etc)	☐	☒
D1.1	Percentage of revenue or R&D expenditure that contributes to advancing sustainable chemistry	☐	☐
D1.2	Annual number of approved patents aligned with the guiding principles of Green and Sustainable Chemistry as defined in the UNEP Framework Manual.	☐	☐
D2.1	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	☒	☐
D3.1 | A3.1	Number of companies reporting on dependencies, impacts, risks, opportunities, and on human health and the environment.	☐	☒
D3.2	Number of companies reporting the quantity of their hazardous waste directed to recovery, recycling, reclamation, landfilling, thermal treatment or other disposal operations.	☐	☐

D3.3 | A3.2	Number of financial institutions that include chemicals and waste in risk analysis, decision-making, policies, practices or disclosures.	☐	☒
D4.1	Number of companies that have established internal capacity and 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	☒	☐
D4.3	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.	☐	☐
D4.4	Number of stakeholders that are implementing green and sustainable procurement programmes that explicitly prioritize safer and more sustainable chemical alternatives in products	☐	☐
D4.5	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	☐	☐
D5.1	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.	☐	☒
D5.2	Extent of organic agriculture by area, percentage of total farming area, and, where available, the number of farms.	☐	☒
D5.3	Number of 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) ***Non-Parties may also provide data*	☐	☒
D6.1	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	☐	☒
E2.1	Number of countries with multistakeholder/multisectoral partnerships, networks or arrangements integrate d in national chemicals management systems.	☐	☒
E2.2	Number of partnerships and networks, their members and outcomes developed under the IGOs jointly with other partners and stakeholders aimed at the sound management of chemicals and waste	☒	☐
E3.1	International level: Number of multilateral and international development banks/development agencies that have incorporated criteria on chemicals management in their policies, safeguards, or lending frameworks	☐	☐

E3.2	National level: Number of countries with national budget allocated to chemicals-related international assistance	☒	☐
E3.3 | D2.2	Private Sector: Number of countries that have taxonomies for activities recognized under the GFC **one expert didn't agree*	☐	☒
E3.4	Private Sector: Amount of finance mobilized for the sound management of chemicals and waste **one expert considers further review on the term 'finance mobilized'*	☐	☐
E4.1	Number of projects funded by the GFC Fund and/or other major funding mechanisms (SP, GEF, SIP, MEAs) which explicitly address identified gaps	☒	☐
E4.2	Number of national projects, initiatives, and activities with 100% funding from countries' internal chemical and waste financing mechanisms	☐	☐
E6.1	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	☐	☒
E6.3	Number of stakeholders that integrate human rights considerations in chemicals and waste management approaches **one expert didn't agree*	☐	☒
E6.4	Number of stakeholders integrating chemicals and waste management into key environmental, health and l abour policies	☐	☐
E6.5	Number of countries integrating relevant actions to implement the sound management of chemicals and waste into a) National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), b) Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) and c) National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). **one expert didn't agree*	☐	☐

Annex III– List of participants

Participants	
Abdulwahab Steve Selvali	Koki Takaki
Abraham Matiza	Kwame Ofori
Aderiana Mbandi	Laura Nazef
Agustin Harte	Leo Levitt
Alessandra Cristina Azevedo	Lesley Onyon
Alexander Majer	Liliana Aguilar-Marcelino
Alexander Roeske	Lindita Molla
Alexandra Caterbow	Lisa Marie Guggenberger
Alexandra Mcpherson	Lovemore Mutaviri
Amany Mohamed	Maciej Saktura
Amna Alhitmi	Magdalena Frydrych
Ana Carolina De Carvalho	Maria Delvin Sweden
Andrea Rother	Maria Isabel Cárcamo Pavez
Andreas Prevodnik	Maria Nowacka
Angela Pinilla	Maria Ruiz-Cuevas
Angelina Buchar	Marion Sanders
Anna Odur	Martin Pavlovič
Anna Tarli	Mathieu Ortega
Ann-Lise Mikolajczak	Matthias Wolf
Antonio G.	Michaela Vytopilova
Ayumi Kochi	Michel Wildi
Azeb Dagne	Michèle Kolmitz
Ben Marks	Mick Saito
Brayan Salgado	Mohammed Javed Qureshi
Carlolin Zerger	Mohsen Alshateri
Cecilia Bianco	Monica Brown
Chinkie Golle	Monika Culka
Christina Charlotte Tolfsen	Monnapule Matlhare
Chrysanthi Sofokleous	Musa Mussa Wawuyo
Claudine Albersammer	Nancy Marangu
Cynthia Njaramba	Nannett Aust-Watzlaw
Dali Chouchi	Naoko Moritani
Daniel William Ndiyo	Nathalie Buijs
Danielle Morrison	Nfatou Ndiaye
Dina Rakotoarisoa	Nicole Caesar
Djamel Medjahed	Nicole Wenzel
Dorothy Amaleck Ngajilo	Olga Morales
Dr Oumar Cisse	Olga Speranskaya
Duong Nguyen	Oliver Wootton
Eeva Leinala	Pamela Brody-Heine
El Hadji Amadou Sow	Pasquale Falcigno
Ellie Haston	Peter Fantke
Emiko Hase	Pulchérie Donoumassou Simeon

Emmanuel Odjam-Akumatey	Pushkar Shejwalkar
Erdenesukh Otgonbayar	Rabeb Aloui
Federica Tommasi	Rakesh Vazirani Bureau Veritas
Felix Herzog	Raymond Shama
Finbarr Horgan	Rico Euripidou
Florian Schulze	Sadmeen Sadaf Jahan
Gilbert Kuepouo	Said Ali Thaoubane
Gloria Leon	Sajid Raza
Gohar Khojayan	Sam Van De Snepscheut
Guy Jones-Message	Sandra Averous
Haddy Guisse	Sandrine Jouan
Heejo Yang	Sara Brosche
Hemsing Hurrynag	Shailand Gunnoo
Henry Williams	Shannon Lisa
Hirokazu Seto	Sherika Whitelocke-Ballingsingh
Hiromitsu Takaoka	Siddika Sultana
Ida Brolin	Simone Marzeddu
Iman Nassar	Sonali Zol
Irina Talamoni	Stephanie Laruelle
Isabela Marchi	Steven De Regter
J. Isabel Lopez-Arroyo	Stewart Muir
Jago Wadley	Susan Haffmans
Jakia Sultana	Tadesse Amera
Janet Xiao	Takashi Nishida
Je Sun Park	Takeshi Asari
Jenna Shields	Tatsiana Pronina
Jenny Skytte Af Sätra	Telma Da Silva
Jerald Villarmino	Thaianne Resende
Jinani Nanayakkara	Tom Nickson
Jing Zhao	Tripti Arora
João Santos	Troy Martin
Joey Wilton	Victoria Mallofre
Johanna Hausmann	Virunya Bhat
Jowitt Li	Vladimir Chery
Kaori Murasawa	Vladislava Shlenskaia
Katka/Kateřina Šebková, CZ	Yasuhisa Ohtani
Kay Williams	Youssef Zidi
Keima. G	Yuyun Ismawati
Khadija Sarr	Zakya Rubab
Khadijetou Seneh	Zuleica Nycz
Kohjiro Hashizume	斉 加古
Koichi Ohno	