

Developing an Implementation Programme for the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC) on Strengthening National Chemicals Legislation and Institutional Capacities

A multi-stakeholder expert meeting and workshop

Punta del Este, Uruguay, 22–23 June 2025

Workshop Highlights and Key Outcomes

Global Framework on Chemicals, para. 24

The International Conference on the Global Framework on Chemicals – For a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste may adopt programmes to support the implementation of the Framework in order to achieve its strategic objectives, as presented in part V, “Strategic objectives and targets”. Such programmes should have their own focus and engage relevant sectors and stakeholders, and could include, in a flexible and dynamic format, the actions that the stakeholders intend to initiate or contribute to at the national, regional, and/or international levels in order to successfully meet the relevant targets identified in part V. Such programmes should also include any necessary mandates, terms of reference, workplans and/or other mechanisms, including actions to address identified issues of concern where relevant, to contribute to the success of the overall Framework and its strategic objectives.

Global Framework on Chemicals, 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.”

Table of Contents

Background.....	3
Overview of the Workshop.....	4
Summary of Day One.....	5
Session 1 – Ongoing initiatives on innovative approaches to chemicals management (upstream and downstream).....	5
Session 2 – New technologies and financial innovative tools for “smarter” chemicals management.....	9
Summary of Day Two.....	11
Group 1: Objectives, Scope, and Governance of IP1	11
Group 2: Knowledge-Sharing, Collaboration, and Capacity Development.....	12
Group 3: Benchmarking, Indicators, and Monitoring for IP1.....	13
Group 4: Workplan for IP1	13
Next Steps	14

Background

Following the adoption in 2023 of the “Global Framework on Chemicals – For a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste”, [resolution V/8](#) was agreed on implementation arrangements, inviting “stakeholders ... to collaborate on and develop proposals for implementation programmes”. The proposals should address “respective mandates, terms of reference, workplans and other mechanisms”. The topic of developing integrated national chemicals and waste management systems and capacities at the national and regional levels is one of the topics mentioned explicitly in the resolution. The OEWG meeting in June 2025 provided an opportunity to generate feedback from stakeholders in further developing the mandates, TORs, and workplans for the proposed Programmes in advance of the next International Conference on the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC) in 2026.

Resolution V/8 extends an invitation to the IOMC and other stakeholders to collaborate on and develop proposals for implementation programmes for further consideration at the next Conference. Responding to this, the IOMC offered to play a role in facilitating, encouraging, and coordinating the development of a small number of implementation programmes which correspond to the mandate provided in resolution V/8. In doing so, the IOMC is bringing together its collective expertise and support of its ten Participating Organizations.

The proposed Implementation Programme on “Strengthening Legal Frameworks and Institutional Capacities for Chemicals Management” (IP1) aims to help countries establish and strengthen the legal and institutional foundations needed for the sound management of chemicals throughout their life cycle. Based on Strategic Objective A of the GFC, the Programme will encourage efforts to develop, implement, and enforce national legal instruments that reduce adverse effects from chemicals and waste, in accordance with national circumstances and priorities. Drawing from past consultations and technical guidance - such as the IOMC Information Paper on Integrated Chemicals and Waste Management, the LIRA Guidance¹, and resources in the IOMC toolbox - the Programme will facilitate the exchange of good practices, offer technical assistance, and foster capacity-building partnerships.

This Programme will primarily focus on GFC Target A1, which calls for governments to adopt, implement, and enforce legal frameworks and establish institutional capacity by 2030. Additional relevant targets include: A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, B1, B2, B3, B4, B6, D2, D4, D7, E2, E3, E5, and E6. Initial focus areas may include the development of national legislation requiring classification and labelling in accordance with the GHS; establishing legal mandates for generating and disseminating knowledge on industrial and consumer chemicals; empowering national authorities to conduct risk assessments and manage chemical risks; aligning national legislation with international labour standards; and designing cost-recovery schemes to ensure the financial sustainability of chemicals management systems.

¹ “Development of Legal and Institutional Infrastructures and Measures for Recovering Costs of National Administration for Sound Management of Chemicals”: <https://www.unep.org/resources/report/lira-guidance>

Through the workshop, stakeholders were invited to provide input on priority legal elements and institutional arrangements that should be addressed under the Programme.

Overview of the Workshop

The IOMC convened a dedicated multi-stakeholder workshop to focus on strengthening national chemicals legislation and institutional capacities. The workshop was structured in two components: a small expert meeting held on Sunday, 22 June, followed by an open workshop on the morning of Monday, 23 June. The legal workshop contributes to the work on supporting regulatory measures to assist countries in transitioning towards effective, safe, and sustainable chemicals and waste management systems. The outcome of this workshop will be part of the activities under IP1 on “Strengthening National Chemicals Legislation and Institutional Capacities”.

The first day brought together approximately 100 invited experts, carefully selected to ensure regional and stakeholder balance, for in-depth discussions on existing legislation and institutional mechanisms. This closed session provided a platform for reflection and exchange, with the aim of generating innovative approaches to strengthen national frameworks. Due to resource constraints, participation in this session was limited, but its outcomes were consolidated and shared with participants of the broader workshop on day two. Specifically, during the first day workshop representatives:

- discussed ongoing initiatives on innovative approaches to risk assessment and their potential replicability in low and middle-income countries;
- explored the role of non-traditional enablers, such as downstream users, and highlighted tools that shift the decisions on chemical use and the responsibility to chemical users;
- reviewed the role of emerging technologies in supporting and transforming national chemical management systems; and
- discussed how innovative financing can enable and sustain national chemicals legislation (highlighting policy models linking polluter responsibility, cost recovery, and institutional capacity investment).

The second day, held at the OEWG conference venue, expanded the dialogue to a larger audience. The discussion in breakout groups focused on the detailed elements of the design for Implementation Programme 1 (IP1). This session was designed to shape the mandate, terms of reference, and workplan for IP1, which was to be discussed further during the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) session (24–27 June 2025). The workshop’s outcomes served as critical inputs to guide the OEWG deliberations later in the week, ensuring that the voices and perspectives of a diverse set of stakeholders are reflected in the emerging framework.

Workshop documentation, presentations, and other information may be accessed [here](#).

Summary of Day One

Session 1 – Ongoing initiatives on innovative approaches to chemicals management (upstream and downstream)

In introducing the session, UNEP presented the outcomes of an expert brainstorming meeting from 28 January 2025, aimed at identifying core legal issues on chemicals management systems, especially in industrial chemicals and consumer products, which informed the agenda of the workshop by highlighting several innovations in chemicals legislation and experiences. Further, UNEP presented the results of a survey carried out in February 2025 to better understand the challenges, successes and needs countries have in relation to chemicals management and its institutional and regulatory infrastructure.

The survey mainly had respondents from government representatives, with 82% from ministries or agencies. Notably:

- 95% from 91 countries confirmed they have some legal or policy framework for chemical management, with ongoing reforms to strengthen regulation.
- 58 respondents said their country has such frameworks, only 4 lack policies or regulations.
- Chemical manufacturing is common, with 67% indicating a domestic industry, though 24% reported no activity and 9% were unsure—highlighting understanding gaps.
- Agriculture was reported as the most chemical-intensive sector, far surpassing pharmaceuticals, mining, and textiles.
- A key finding was the low awareness and use of global tools designed to support chemical management. Over half of the respondents were unaware of key resources, such as the IOMC Toolbox² (56%) and the LEAP Platform³ (57%).
- Despite being considered a key tool in GHS (Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals), implementation remains incomplete and fragmented.

The survey also highlights common regional challenges and specific needs. Countries most often cited a lack of technical expertise, funding, and human resources as primary obstacles. Monitoring and enforcement are often underdeveloped, and inter-agency coordination—although present—frequently appears weak or inconsistent. Respondents emphasized the need for targeted capacity building in risk assessment, data collection, and laboratory infrastructure, as well as increased access to training.

The workshop proceeded with two parallel group discussions on National Experiences with Innovative Legal Instruments on Risk Assessment and Downstream Users as Drivers of Chemicals Management along Value Chains.

² <https://www.iomctoolbox.org/en>

³ <https://leap.unep.org/en>

Group 1 – National Experiences with Innovative Legal Instruments on Risk Assessment

This session provided an overview of national experiences in developing and applying innovative legal and policy tools for chemical risk assessment. Speakers from the European Commission on behalf of the European Union (EU), Canada, and Australia shared practical methods that shift regulatory paradigms—such as reversing the burden of proof, grouping chemicals, and relying on trusted data sources—while discussants from Tanzania and Brazil reflected on how these models could be adapted to different national contexts.

Key Highlights:

- The EU presented how it implements the Reversal of the Burden of Proof: Under the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation, and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) before a substance is manufactured or placed on the market into the EU, the manufacturer or importer must register it. The company must provide information, in particular on the chemical properties and uses, and the amount and type of data required for registration depend on the volume of the chemical produced or imported. Therefore, industry—not government—must demonstrate the safety of substances that they market, and that measures are put in place to minimize the risks from exposures to chemicals on human health and the environment. Public oversight happens only after the product is placed on the market.
- The EU also presented a Generic Risk Assessment approach for restricting some hazardous chemicals: Under this approach, there is an automatic trigger for certain risk management measures, including bans and restrictions, based on the hazardous properties of the chemical. It applies to chemicals that are, for example, cancer-causing, hormone-disrupting, toxic to reproductive or neurological systems, or persistent in the environment, bioaccumulative, and toxic. Due to such hazardous properties, risks can be assumed as a default for certain uses (e.g., certain consumer uses). It simplifies and makes it easier for public authorities to protect citizens and the environment by avoiding the need for a resource-intensive specific risk assessment, particularly for chemicals for which the level of exposure is difficult or impossible to measure or mitigate. Examples of restrictions: several carcinogenic, mutagenic, and reprotoxic (CMR) chemicals in clothing, textiles and footwear and eight polycyclic-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in rubber and plastic.
- Both the EU & Canada highlighted their initiatives on the grouping of chemicals. Both jurisdictions promote the assessment of chemical groups (e.g., phthalates, flame retardants) for chemicals that share either similarities in their chemical structure or in their function. Through grouping, these jurisdictions achieve assessment efficiencies, management efficiencies, the ability to support informed substitution decisions, avoiding regrettable substitution, timing of international actions, and stakeholder engagement. For example, the European Chemicals Agency uses the grouping of substances as an approach for filling data gaps in registrations submitted under REACH. This approach uses relevant information from similar substances to predict the properties of another substance.
- A representative from the Australian Industrial Chemicals Introduction Scheme (AICIS) presented Australia's Trusted International Assessments Model, designed to streamline the regulation of industrial chemicals. The model allows companies to rely on risk assessments conducted by trusted international bodies, such as

Environment and Climate Change Canada, Health Canada, and the European Commission's Scientific Committee on Consumer Products, when introducing chemicals into the Australian market. By recognizing these assessments, AICIS reduces duplication, lowers costs, and accelerates market access, while ensuring that safety standards are not compromised. Safeguards are in place to ensure that the use, concentration, and risk levels in Australia do not exceed those assessed abroad, and that any conditions imposed internationally also apply locally. While it avoids duplication, it is mainly used for market access.

Participants discussed efforts to modernize legislation in relation to assessing the risk of chemicals, as well as the challenges posed by resource and capacity constraints. It was noted that national chemicals legislation must adapt to the needs and priorities of individual countries. Many countries primarily import chemicals for specific uses (e.g., mining, agriculture), while others produce chemicals, resulting in varying risk profiles. In recognition of the valuable experiences from the EU, Canada, and Australia, Brazil shared insights into its journey and challenges in developing chemicals legislation that partly draws inspiration from Canada's and the EU's frameworks.

Group 2 – Downstream Users as Drivers of Chemicals Management along Value Chains

This session examined how actors beyond traditional regulators—particularly downstream users—are increasingly shaping decisions on the use of chemicals across product life cycles. The discussion focused on mechanisms that place more responsibility and agency in the hands of users, buyers, and consumers, and emphasized the importance of tools that promote substitution, efficiency, and accountability.

Key Highlights:

- The EU Commission presented the Essential Use Concept & Chemicals Authorisation. The essential use concept represents a practical and effective tool for both regulators and industry. By clearly defining where the use of hazardous substances is genuinely necessary and where safer alternatives can and should be applied, this concept provides a structured approach for phasing out non-essential uses. Germany underscored the value of applying this approach broadly across sectors to drive innovation, reduce risks to health and the environment, and create regulatory certainty for companies.
- The Toxics Use Reduction Institute (TURI) from Massachusetts (USA) presented the Toxics Use Reduction Act (TURA), which requires Massachusetts companies that use large quantities of specific toxic chemicals to evaluate their operations, plan for pollution prevention, and report on the results each year. TURI shared a concrete example of how legislation supports the use of data and knowledge sharing to help businesses in identifying and reducing the use of toxic substances. By making hazard information more transparent and accessible, companies are better equipped to evaluate alternatives, improve workplace safety, and strengthen compliance with regulations. TURI emphasized that such initiatives not only help businesses advance safer chemicals management but also build capacity across supply chains by enabling informed decision-making and collective progress.

- The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) introduced its Chemical Leasing Model: a performance-based business model that shifts the focus from selling large quantities of chemicals to providing the function or service that the chemicals fulfill. This approach encourages more efficient and safer use of chemicals while reducing waste, emissions, and costs. UNIDO noted that chemical leasing has been successfully implemented in various regions and can be adapted to diverse resource and policy settings, offering a scalable model for advancing safe chemicals management globally

Participants' Reflections

Participants discussed shifting chemical management responsibility along the supply chain. A key point was the need for stronger government-industry collaboration, possibly through interagency committees. Although some progress has been made, challenges remain in understanding chemicals throughout the supply chain and finding safer alternatives that maintain business competitiveness. Participants also noted that industrial relations are crucial—and that national laws often do not match the realities of downstream users. This highlights the importance of assessing the investment and business climate to ensure relevant and effective regulations.

Participants said many national systems have started incorporating downstream user considerations into chemical safety laws. One example was a country where the Ministry of Health manages chemicals, aligning public health and occupational safety and health. The International Labour Organization (ILO) and the labour sector's role was also highlighted—international labor standards related to chemical safety assign explicit responsibilities to governments and employers and ensure fundamental principles and rights for workers. These include obligations such as setting occupational exposure limits, providing safety data sheets (SDSs) and ensuring training for workers. Participants agreed that international labour standards offer a clear structure for responsibility and are supported by a number of technical tools and guidelines.

Key barriers and enablers identified during the discussion include:

- Weak enforcement of legislation, often due to limited communication with downstream users.
- The cost and complexity of translating labels in different languages, especially for smaller markets.
- The need to build trust between suppliers and downstream users to ensure effective implementation.
- The existence of countries with large informal economies influences how chemical management systems function. Small economies face specific challenges, making regional collaboration essential for harmonizing standards.
- The need for robust communication between upstream and downstream actors to enhance coordination and manage chemical risks more effectively.
- Innovation and the search for safer chemical alternatives—without sacrificing competitiveness—were regarded as essential. Sector-specific initiatives were highlighted as practical examples for establishing effective communication channels between upstream and downstream actors.

There was a strong call to move beyond “responsibility” toward legally defined “liability.” The group considered it to be neither practical nor ethical to shift the burden of protecting against toxic chemical exposure onto downstream users who may lack the capacity to respond. A more balanced system is needed—one that reflects a hazard-based, precautionary regulatory approach with responsibility tied to legal liability through the creation of strong national legal frameworks.

Session 2 – New technologies and financial innovative tools for “smarter” chemicals management

Group 3 – Harnessing Technology Innovation

This session explored how emerging technologies are transforming chemicals management by improving data integrity, regulatory confidence, and decision-making. Presentations covered artificial intelligence, non-animal testing methodologies, and blockchain-based traceability, illustrating how innovation can support scalable, cost-effective, and science-based systems for assessing and managing chemical risks.

Key Highlights:

- The OECD introduced New Approach Methodologies (NAMs), which are technologies, methods, approaches, or combinations that can provide information on chemical hazard and risk assessment to avoid animal testing. NAMs offer faster, more ethical, and cost-effective alternatives to traditional animal testing. Integrated approaches to testing and assessment (IATA) are increasingly recognized in international guidelines, supporting the grouping of chemicals and the early detection of biological effects relevant to health and the environment.
- An International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA) representative presented on Blockchain and Digital Product Passports: Blockchain technology enables real-time, secure data sharing across the value chain, enhancing traceability, transparency, and regulatory oversight. The proposed EU Digital Product Passport will require structured, interoperable data on product content and lifecycle, accessible to regulators and consumers, thus promoting safer chemical use and supporting the circular economy.
- Canada presented on their use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Chemicals Management: AI has potential to revolutionize chemicals management by analyzing large datasets, identifying hazard patterns, and optimizing risk assessments. It supports predictive toxicology, prioritization of substances, and enhanced efficiency in decision-making.

Participants’ Reflections

Participants acknowledged the transformative potential of innovative technologies such as NAMs, blockchain and digital product passports, and AI in strengthening chemicals management. However, many participants emphasized that the adoption of these tools remains limited in practice, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. For NAMs many countries lack technical infrastructure, regulatory alignment, and trained personnel to

fully integrate these methodologies. Similarly, blockchain and digital product passports were welcomed for their ability to improve traceability, transparency, and compliance across the product lifecycle, but participants raised concerns about interoperability, data governance, and the digital divide that risks excluding actors without adequate technological capacity. Participants further discussed the role of AI in analyzing complex chemical data and improving risk assessment processes. However, it was stressed that effective use of AI requires not only access to quality data but also significant investments in digital literacy and regulatory frameworks that can keep pace with innovation. Across all three technologies, participants called for enhanced international cooperation, targeted capacity-building efforts, and the development of practical technical tools and guidance.

Group 4 – Harnessing Financial Incentives

This session explored how financing mechanisms can support the implementation and sustainability of national chemicals legislation. Discussions focused on approaches that link producer responsibility, cost recovery, and public-private collaboration. Practical models from international organizations and national experiences demonstrated how financial tools can strengthen institutional capacity, improve regulatory enforcement, and mobilize resources for long-term impact.

Key Highlights:

- UNEP presented on Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR): EPR schemes hold producers financially or operationally responsible for their products' post-consumer impacts. These models improve transparency, shift waste management costs from governments to producers, and increase recycling and eco-design. The Global Action Partnership for EPR provides tailored technical assistance, with examples from over a dozen countries and pilot support under GEF initiatives.
- Australia presented on its Cost Recovery Mechanism for chemicals: National schemes (e.g., Australia) recover the cost of chemical regulation by charging fees for registrations, assessments, or compliance activities. These mechanisms ensure that regulatory bodies have stable funding while reinforcing the "polluter pays" principle. They also create incentives for more responsible chemical use and reduce dependence on general public funds.
- The GEF highlighted experiences on Financing Tools and Lessons learned on chemicals financing: The Global Environment Facility (GEF) has supported legislative development and implementation through targeted investments. Examples include support for institutional reforms, national plans, and EPR development. Recent programs have emphasized financial sustainability, co-financing models, and embedding cost recovery into regulatory design.
- France shared experiences on economic instruments for chemicals, such as the Pesticide Tax, set at 0.9% of turnover since 2020 and generating about €4.5 million a year. These funds support a monitoring system on pesticide impacts and contribute to a compensation fund for victims of pesticide use. France also charges distributors and importers of plant protection products a fee based on active substances, raising €188 million in 2023 for a quantity of 43,549 tonnes of active substances to

fund water agencies and support the “Ecophyto Plan” that aims at reducing pesticide use and risks by 50% by 2030.

Participants’ Reflections

Participants noted that while these instruments were widely recognized as necessary for a financially sustainable legal infrastructure on chemicals, their use remains limited and uneven across regions, and that setting them up requires considerable investments. Angola stressed the importance of adapting financial tools to national economic realities, warning that poorly tailored mechanisms—such as flat environmental taxes—could directly impact the cost of living and disproportionately affect vulnerable populations. Similarly, Trinidad and Tobago shared their national experience with green funds and environmental taxation, emphasizing the critical need for transparent governance structures to ensure that revenues are actually allocated to environmental and health goals, rather than diverted to general budgets. Participants broadly supported the potential of EPR systems to enhance accountability and promote eco-design, especially when accompanied by technical assistance. The discussion also acknowledged the benefits of cost recovery schemes, as demonstrated in countries like Australia, where fees on chemical registrations and compliance support stable regulatory funding, but also recognized that for most countries, this is far from being a reality. Overall, the session underscored the need for context-specific financial tools, supported by robust institutional capacity and clear guidance to ensure effectiveness, fairness, and social acceptability.

Summary of Day Two

Day two of the workshop was held at the venue of the GFC Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG), bringing together a wider range of stakeholders. The session focused on an in-depth discussion of the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) and the global workplan for Implementation Programme 1 (IP1) on “Strengthening National Chemicals Legislation and Institutional Capacities for the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste.” Participants examined the scope, governance, capacity-building strategies, monitoring approaches, and priorities for implementing the Programme.

The session started with a presentation by OECD on a modular approach to chemicals management. This framework emphasizes the development of effective national systems through interconnected governance modules—including GHS classification and labelling, enforcement, occupational safety and health, and cost recovery schemes. The approach underscores mutual data acceptance, sectoral and stakeholder involvement, traceability, and due diligence across value chains. It promotes gradual, adaptable implementation tailored to national contexts and aims to operationalize the GFC Implementation Programme through practical sequencing of legislative developments, adapted to national priorities.

Group 1: Objectives, Scope, and Governance of IP1

This group examined the alignment of IP1 with the GFC’s Strategic Objective A, the articulation of its expected outcomes, and its governance structure. Discussions centered on

refining the Programme's goals to reflect actionable results, while considering the governance arrangements necessary for effective and inclusive implementation.

Key Takeaways:

- The TOR should more clearly define the objectives of IP1, translating them into actionable, outcome-oriented goals. Several participants noted the need for stronger articulation of expected results and the added value of the Programme.
- Flexibility should be embedded in the design of IP1 to reflect the diversity of national circumstances. The Programme should promote mutual learning and knowledge exchange, particularly between high-income and low-/middle-income countries.
- Participants emphasized the importance of a clear distinction between IP1 and other Implementation Programmes, especially IP2 (focused on industry engagement), while maintaining coordination and coherence across the IP structure.
- There was a divergence of views on governance structures. Some stakeholders advocated for a single overarching advisory group to guide all IPs, while others supported sector- or IP-specific advisory bodies. Considerations included effectiveness, inclusivity, and cost.

Group 2: Knowledge-Sharing, Collaboration, and Capacity Development

This group focused on how IP1 can best support national capacity development, foster knowledge-sharing, and promote inclusive collaboration. Discussions covered the institutional landscape, legal models, and mechanisms to improve access to data, technical support, and networks.

Key Takeaways:

- The TOR should clarify the role of competent authorities in national chemicals governance and encourage the dissemination of adaptable legal models tailored to different institutional and legal contexts.
- Participants stressed the importance of inclusive coordination mechanisms, calling for stronger engagement of scientific institutions and civil society.
- Improved data access—for example, for customs authorities—was identified as a key enabler of effective enforcement.
- The Programme should promote data-driven approaches to capacity building, with emphasis on health and environmental data, exposure pathways, and protection of vulnerable groups such as workers, including farmers.
- Stakeholders recommended the use of targeted matchmaking mechanisms to align countries' needs with available expertise and resources.
- There was support for enhancing global platforms for collaboration, including the mapping of existing initiatives, integration of gender considerations, and replication of successful models like ICCA's Latin America Regulatory Forum—a transparent, multi-stakeholder platform supporting harmonized regulatory development.

Group 3: Benchmarking, Indicators, and Monitoring for IP1

This group addressed how to measure progress and success under IP1 using benchmarks, indicators, and key performance metrics. It focused on the importance of tracking both legislative adoption and institutional effectiveness.

Key Takeaways:

- The TOR should propose a monitoring framework that combines benchmarking and performance indicators, allowing for assessment of both the existence and effectiveness of chemicals legislation, including enforcement capacity.
- Participants suggested leveraging existing tools such as the WHO health systems benchmarking tool, the IOMC Toolbox, and GHS indicators, and adapting them to sector-specific needs (e.g., cosmetics, pharmaceuticals), as well as to broader issues such as waste, legacy chemicals, and environmental impacts.
- It was recommended that IP1 focus its monitoring efforts on all targets in the GFC plus B5, B6, and B7 while acknowledging the relevance of other targets—such as those that should be integrated as secondary priorities.
- Stakeholders saw value in promoting self-assessment and benchmarking exercises to identify institutional and legislative gaps, guide national planning, and track progress through indicators such as the establishment of multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms and communication strategies.
- To support transparency and shared learning, it was recommended to expand the IOMC Toolbox with lessons learned, templates, blueprints, and recorded webinars that showcase tangible results and progress to the International Conference.

Group 4: Workplan for IP1

This group focused on the components of the global IP1 workplan. It explored the sequencing of activities, early action planning, capacity-building needs, and coordination between actors at the national, regional, and global levels.

Key Takeaways:

- The workplan should include a sequenced roadmap of priority actions, starting with high-impact areas such as legislation on high-risk substances (e.g., CMRs, lead). Model legal provisions and adaptable guidance documents should support this roadmap.
- There was strong support for prioritizing capacity building and GHS implementation, including through regional training workshops, national capacity mapping, and partnerships with IOMC Participating Organizations and other key stakeholders.
- The Programme should promote coordination between global and national actions, with particular attention to balancing the needs of countries with different resource levels and fostering interministerial collaboration.
- Participants encouraged the launch of quick-start activities prior to 2026, such as national action plans, institutional assessments, customized training, and the establishment of communities of practice to build early momentum.

- The workplan should outline mechanisms for coordination and knowledge exchange with other Implementation Programmes, while maintaining simple and efficient structures and ensuring cross-sectoral stakeholder engagement (e.g., health, water, labour, agriculture, finance, development, and environment sectors).

Next Steps

The IOMC information document for the June 2025 GFC OEWG summarises the work done to date on the implementation programmes, including draft terms of reference, mandates, and workplans.⁴ The outcomes from the IP1 workshop were reported to the OEWG, which provided an opportunity for formal stakeholder feedback in advance of the International Conference in 2026.

The IOMC intends to pilot some activities related to IP1 in advance of the first Conference, such as the development of a regulatory benchmarking tool for countries to self-assess their national chemicals legislation and identify possible gaps. The consultative process to prepare the (revised) TOR and workplan for IP1 in advance of their submission to the International Conference in 2026 will also be continued.

⁴ https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/47685/UNEP_GFC-OEWG_1_INF_11%20IP1_implementation.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y