

Summary of the First Meeting of the Open-ended Working Group for the Global Framework on Chemicals: 24–27 June 2025

Modern society’s reliance on chemicals makes their production one of the biggest and most globalized sectors of the world economy. However, the essential economic role of chemicals and their contribution to improved living standards needs to be balanced with the recognition of potential costs: heavy use of water and energy in their manufacture and the potential adverse impacts of chemicals on the environment and human health. The diversity and potential severity of such impacts makes sound chemicals management a key cross-cutting issue and one of the main challenges for sustainable development.

A diverse set of stakeholders came together in September 2023 to address these issues and adopted the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC), a comprehensive, voluntary, multi-stakeholder agreement with five strategic objectives and 28 targets to guide countries and stakeholders in jointly addressing the lifecycle of chemicals, including products and waste. They also decided that the first meeting of the GFC’s governing body, the GFC International Conference (IC-1), would be held in 2026, and a subsidiary body, the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG), would prepare for the Conference.

The mandate of the OEWG, as set forth in the GFC, is brief and vague, so participants were uncertain if they were empowered to adopt formal decisions. Several countries at OEWG-1 proposed that IC-1 clarify the role of the OEWG and its modalities.

OEWG-1 focused on taking stock of progress on the tasks set for IC-1 and exchanging ideas and views on ways to ensure effective implementation of the Framework. Among other things, they discussed:

- terms of reference (ToR) for three planned GFC “Implementation Programmes,” one of which will include sector-specific sub-programmes aimed at greater industry engagement and stimulating positive change in chemicals management in sectors such as electronics, textiles, health care, and construction;
- choosing which chemical “issues of concern” to spotlight for focused global action;
- the operation of the special GFC Fund, and how it might be improved;
- ideas for a resource mobilization strategy for meeting GFC objectives and targets;

- stocktaking and gap identification in the ongoing work to flesh out the GFC’s measurability structure with indicators;
- ways for the GFC to catalyze capacity building in the sound management of chemicals;
- guidelines for how national focal points will function and serve GFC objectives; and
- plans for launching a global alliance on highly hazardous pesticides.

In line with the multi-stakeholder nature of the GFC, an entire day of the OEWG served as a special Multi-Stakeholder Day packed with sessions, workshops, “master classes,” “fireside chats” and breakout sessions. These diverse meeting formats promoted exchange about how to handle crosscutting issues such as disclosure and reporting, transparency and traceability, green chemistry, and chemical footprinting in the industry-focused Implementation Programme and further developed the ToR for the planned sub-programmes on electronics, textiles, and health care.

In this Issue

A Brief History of the Global Framework on Chemicals.	2
GFC OEWG-1 Report.	2
Global Framework on Chemicals	2
Financial Considerations	7
Programme of Work and Draft Budget of the Secretariat for the Period 2024–2026	7
Preparations for the First Session of the International Conference of the Global Framework on Chemicals	7
Other Matters.	8
Multi-Stakeholder Day	8
Closing Plenary	12
A Brief Analysis of GFC OEWG-1	13
Upcoming Meetings	14
Glossary	15

The first meeting of the OEWG was convened in Punta del Este, Uruguay, from 23–27 June 2025. Representatives from governments, the private sector, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, youth, and academia gathered for the first time since the GFC was established in 2023.

A Brief History of the Global Framework on Chemicals

The [Global Framework on Chemicals - For a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste](#) is the successor to the Strategic Approach to the International Chemicals Management (SAICM), which was established in 2006 in response to a 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) goal that by the year 2020 chemicals would be used and produced in ways that minimize significant adverse effects on human health and the environment. When it became apparent that SAICM would not achieve the 2020 goal, negotiations were launched in 2016 to develop its successor. This eventually led to the adoption of the GFC at the fifth International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) in Bonn, Germany, on 30 September 2023.

The GFC is a comprehensive, voluntary, multi-stakeholder, multi-sectoral agreement that aims to guide countries and stakeholders in jointly addressing the lifecycle of chemicals, including products and waste, promoting safe and sustainable use while preventing negative impacts. The GFC is organized around five strategic objectives and 28 time-bound targets.

ICCM5 also adopted 12 resolutions, now referred to as the GFC Resolutions, mandating follow-up on:

- financial considerations;
- mainstreaming a gender perspective and promoting gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls in chemicals and waste management;
- emerging policy issues and issues of concern (IoC);
- international cooperation and collaboration;
- development of guidelines for national focal points (NFPs);
- implementation arrangements;
- measurability structure;
- health surveillance systems;
- highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs); and
- programme of work (PoW) and budget.

The new agreement created the GFC International Conference as its principal decision-making body. The Conference is to meet every three years with the first session tentatively slated for the last quarter of 2026. Between Conference sessions, an OEWG takes stock of the implementation of resolutions adopted by the prior Conference and prepares for the next.

GFC OEWG-1 Report

GFC Secretariat Coordinator Kay Williams opened the meeting on Tuesday, 24 June 2025. She stressed that the OEWG's focus would be on ensuring successful implementation of the Framework, requiring stakeholders to work together and engage actively. Noting that GFC President Aisha Humera Chaudhry (Pakistan) was unable to attend the OEWG, she said GFC Vice President Santos Virgilio (Angola) was endorsed by the Bureau to act in her stead.

Virgilio stressed that the OEWG is not intended for line-by-line text negotiation of decisions and resolutions but for delegates “to exchange views, build collaboration, be creative, find solutions, and learn about approaches that will help us engage and transform the way chemicals and waste are managed, day-in, day-out.”

Alejandro Nario, National Director of Quality and Environmental Assessment, Environment Ministry, Uruguay, welcomed delegates to Uruguay. He called for a more holistic approach to chemicals beyond existing multilateral conventions that is proactive and adequately financed, with true multi-stakeholder collaboration. Nario underscored the importance of involving civil society, academia, and the private sector, including banks and financial institutions.

Sheila Aggarwal-Khan, UN Environment Programme (UNEP), hailed the decision taken the previous week establishing the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution (ISP-CWP) as an example of multilateralism at work. She said the GFC offers a chance to address not just chemical risks but also opportunities. Aggarwal-Khan urged OEWG brainstorming on sector-focused Implementation Programmes, financial resources, fiscal policies, and policy mechanisms such as extended producer responsibility.

Tessa Goverse, Secretariat Principal Coordinator, *Ad Hoc* OEWG on a Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution Prevention, lauded the agreement to establish the ISP-CWP as “a defining, moment for multilateralism” that should help direct and strengthen collective action under the chemicals and waste conventions and the GFC.

Election of Officers: Delegates elected Vanessa Aliaga (Peru) and Přemysl Štěpánek (Czechia) as OEWG Co-Chairs, and GFC Vice President Magda Frydrych (Poland) as Rapporteur.

Adoption of the Agenda and Organization of Work: Delegates adopted the agenda ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/1](#) and [Add.1](#)) and agreed to the schedule of work and scenario note ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/1/Rev.1](#) and [INF/2](#)).

Global Framework on Chemicals

Implementation Arrangements: On Tuesday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item. Secretariat Coordinator Williams introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/8](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/11](#)). Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) Chair Bob Diderich, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), highlighted activities to develop Implementation Programmes since ICCM5, noting proposals being prepared for the first IC-1 for at least three:

- strengthening national legislation and institutional capacities (“IP1”);
- strengthening economic and industry sector engagement and action for the sound management of chemicals and waste along value chains (“IP2”); and
- integrating chemicals and waste issues in sustainable development decision-making (“IP3”).

He called for feedback on the draft proposals. He also cautioned that the internal financial and in-kind resources provided by IOMC participating organizations were now exhausted and future work will not be possible unless new and additional resources are found.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH called for an implementation programme to strengthen education and awareness of chemicals management, possibly modeled around work by the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) on integrating climate change into school curricula, with Children and Youth as key partners.

BRAZIL underscored:

- enhancing nationally-owned risk assessment capacities;

- capacity building and technology transfer that also include support for infrastructure development; and
- actively promoting voluntary licensing and open innovation platforms to support alternatives that do not increase inequality.

CHINA called for strengthening developing countries' participation and for capacity building as a key component in the development of Implementation Programmes.

The EU highlighted its financial contributions, including USD 28 million to the GFC Trust Fund and USD 2.6 million in operational support for the Secretariat.

PESTICIDE ACTION NETWORK (PAN) highlighted the integration of IoC as a cross-cutting theme in the Implementation Programmes, and welcomed targeted, sector-specific meetings leading to sectoral sub-programmes for adoption at IC-1 in 2026. Emphasizing the importance of private sector engagement, he expressed hope that initial multi-stakeholder progress in the textiles and health care sectoral sub-programmes will lead to proactive collaborative initiatives to develop these and other sectoral programmes over the coming 18 months.

SWITZERLAND invited others to support development of GFC Implementation Programmes.

SAUDI ARABIA underscored capacity building and technology transfer.

The US suggested Implementation Programmes should focus on promoting best practice, not just "lists of chemicals."

HEALTH CARE WITHOUT HARM (HCWH) proposed that the health sector Implementation Programme support eliminating unnecessary plastics in health care products to complement the goals of an international plastics treaty.

The INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHEMICALS ASSOCIATIONS (ICCA) and El Salvador, on behalf of the LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GROUP (GRULAC), called for a strong capacity-building programme. GRULAC called for such a programme to focus on three priorities:

- capacity-building for risk assessment and chemicals management;
- effective technology transfer initiatives to address technical gaps; and
- adaptable model legislation, accompanied by practical implementation roadmaps, to support national regulatory frameworks.

Delegates agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Linda Kosgei (Kenya) and Sam van de Snepscheut (the Netherlands), with a mandate to gather views to inform further development of proposals for Implementation Programmes.

Global Alliance on Highly Hazardous Pesticides: On Wednesday, Co-Chair Štěpánek opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/10](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/14](#)), highlighting a proposed operational framework to map the structure and responsibilities of an alliance to address HHPs.

The FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UN (FAO) provided an update on the task force formed in 2023 to advance establishment of the alliance, consisting of the FAO, UNEP, World Health Organization (WHO), and UN Development Programme (UNDP), with the INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (ILO) attending as an observer.

Several stakeholders supported a timely start for the alliance. CHILDREN AND YOUTH called for dedicated youth seats on the

advisory council; South Africa, for the AFRICAN REGION, for adequate financing; and the INTERNATIONAL POLLUTANTS ELIMINATION NETWORK (IPEN), for inclusive structures. The AFRICAN REGION and the EU called for measurable indicators to assess progress.

SAUDI ARABIA opined that phasing out HHPs may be beyond the GFC's scope and, with ARGENTINA, cautioned against duplicating work of specialized multilateral fora, such as the FAO.

PAN ASIA-PACIFIC and the OFFICE OF THE UN HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS (OHCHR) supported complete phaseout of HHPs.

MEXICO stressed an agreed definition of HHPs, balancing science, equity, and justice.

BRAZIL bemoaned intellectual property rights making safer alternatives inaccessible. He urged pilot projects for eliminating HHPs, dedicated funding for the alliance, and reference to binding multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

OHCHR questioned distribution of the costs of pesticides and agrochemicals companies' narratives blaming farmers for misuse. She urged tracking HHP exposure and companies' influence and, with the INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION CONFEDERATION (ITUC) AFRICA, banning HHP exports from countries where they are banned from the domestic market.

The RUSSIAN FEDERATION urged assistance to developing countries and farmers and, with MADAGASCAR, affordable alternatives.

The US called for IC-1 oversight of the alliance, querying the necessity of alliance members accepting all stated alliance goals.

ITUC AFRICA called for a database identifying HHPs, given frequent rebranding for export.

ASSOCIATION OF UGANDA PROFESSIONAL WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT called for proactive campaigns at the community level, given insufficient information and lack of educational material in local languages, as well as limited resources for shifting to safer alternatives.

The INVESTOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH NETWORK (IEHN) lamented slow progress from pesticide producers and urged decisive raising of standards, information disclosure, and public commitments to reductions by chemical companies, with regulatory enforcement by governments.

ANGOLA said, "Global Alliance" stands for "the voiceless' right to survival."

Co-Chair Štěpánek suggested possibly addressing HHPs further under IoC.

Global Framework on Chemicals Fund: On Tuesday, Co-Chair Štěpánek opened this agenda item. Ivo de Zwaan, the Netherlands, GFC Fund Executive Board Co-Chair, introduced the relevant documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/3](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/5](#)). He highlighted that USD 28.5 million had been contributed to the Fund, 105 applications from 77 countries had been received in the first round of applications, and four projects, across 11 countries, had been selected. De Zwaan noted the Board prioritized quality, transformative potential, and strategic connection with the GFC.

GRULAC, CHILE, Saudi Arabia on behalf of the ASIA-PACIFIC REGION, and BRAZIL queried priorities for selection of projects, noting the Fund should be accessible to developing countries and countries with economies in transition without differentiation. CHILE and the ASIA-PACIFIC REGION proposed amending text in the application form. BRAZIL said the ambition of GFC targets

“must be matched with means of financing” and urged the Fund to “act as enabler, not as gatekeeper.”

IPEN lamented the scant contributions to the Fund, noting the assessment of SAICM indicated that one reason the 2020 target was not reached was the lack of adequate, predictable, and sustainable funding. He called for increased contributions, including from the private sector, and for including civil society members on the Fund Board to ensure transparent and equitable access to its funding. HCWH agreed that civil society is needed on the Board.

The EU and SWITZERLAND called for discussions among stakeholders at the OEWG on possibly modifying the Fund’s ToR.

ITUC, with support from HCWH, queried Fund governance and operational process. He noted several barriers to successful civil society applications, particularly from labor unions, including:

- hostility to trade unions by many NFPs, who are the gatekeepers for first round submissions; and
- the requirement for co-financing, which is difficult for civil society organizations to obtain.

The Gambia, on behalf of the AFRICAN REGION, decried the low number of applications approved and called for the Board to prioritize proposals involving developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

The ILO noted the Fund’s administrative protocols hinder intersectoral collaboration proposals and called for their review.

HCWH urged the Board to recognize the exceptional nature of civil society proposals.

KENYA requested more Board transparency about criteria used in selecting proposals for approval.

Delegates agreed to create an informal group, facilitated by the Fund Board’s Co-Chairs de Zwaan and Virgilio to provide more feedback on Fund operations.

On Wednesday morning, de Zwaan reported that the informal group had discussed:

- revised ToR for the Board, with participants calling for, *inter alia*, upholding the eligibility criteria established in the ICCM5 Resolution and ensuring NGO accessibility to the Fund;
- composition of the Board, with participants suggesting greater balance and clarification on in-kind contributions; and
- the role of NFPs, with some participants highlighting barriers created by the current endorsement process.

Co-Chair Štěpánek announced the outcomes of discussions will be considered by the Board, inviting stakeholders to submit additional written input to the Secretariat by 31 July 2025.

Gender Action Plan: On Tuesday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item. Maria Eugenia Gonzalez Anaya, Multi-Stakeholder Processes for Sustainable Development Institute, introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/4](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/6](#)).

CHILDREN AND YOUTH urged specific mention of children and youth in the proposed gender action plan, including on leadership.

ARGENTINA emphasized that “gender” refers to “both sexes, masculine and feminine.” The US called for using clearer terminology “such as boys, girls, women, and men” and avoiding ambiguous terms. The EU supported actions leading to the gender action plan and gender-responsive policies.

IPEN emphasized integrating a gender perspective in research and called for targeted research to identify pathways and solutions, calling for open and transparent gender-balanced representation

across all GFC processes to increase the overall effectiveness of programme implementation.

COSTA RICA, URUGUAY, and COLOMBIA stressed continual gender action plan implementation.

The Gambia, for the AFRICAN REGION, stressed a participatory and inclusive gender action plan, fully integrated into all GFC activities.

BRAZIL underscored disaggregated data as a basis for evidence-based policy design.

The GERMAN FORUM ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT supported by OHCHR, stressed “gender” as a tool for justice and inclusion, calling for a strong gender action plan.

OHCHR called for: addressing the exclusion of women from decision-making; intersectional discrimination, including Indigenous and other women; and disaggregated data.

CANADA proposed the gender action plan consider the intersectionality with Indigenous Peoples, socioeconomic status and occupational exposure.

MEXICO recalled that “leaving no one behind is the mandate,” noting the importance of language for legitimacy, inclusiveness, and ownership.

Emerging Policy Issues and Issues of Concern: On Wednesday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the document ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/5](#)). IOMC Chair Diderich summarized the IOMC recommendations in the document about whether to retain SAICM Emerging Policy Issues as IoC under the GFC, namely:

- expanding the IoC on lead in paint to all lead exposures;
- keeping HHPs as an IoC until the new global alliance “gains momentum”;
- eventually integrating the three IoC of chemicals in products, hazardous substances within the life cycle of electrical and electronic products, and environmentally persistent pharmaceutical pollutants, into sectoral Implementation Programmes;
- dropping the IoC on nanotechnology and manufactured nanomaterials; and
- keeping the management of perfluorinated chemicals and endocrine-disrupting chemicals as IoC.

NORWAY suggested IoC be prioritized also taking into account their potential for progress under the GFC.

The UK called for a targeted, streamlined approach and, with SAUDI ARABIA and the US, avoiding duplicative efforts.

PAN urged recognition by OEWG that measures for tackling IoC are at an “embryonic stage” and have not yielded concrete results, querying how progress indicators will be evaluated and compiled.

CHINA said IoC are among the cornerstones of GFC and called for addressing developing countries’ capacity-building needs and ensuring meaningful participation. BOTSWANA underscored engaging with the IOMC. SOUTH AFRICA emphasized early risk identification and capacity building for monitoring.

Many countries and stakeholders, including CHILDREN AND YOUTH, GERMAN FORUM ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT, INDIGENOUS PEOPLES, and PAN INTERNATIONAL, called for retaining all IoC and objected to dropping nanotechnology and nanomaterials. SWITZERLAND and BRAZIL cautioned against losing momentum on nanomaterials, with BRAZIL highlighting the risks.

Stressing the numerous significant sources of exposure to lead, many participants, including UNEP, the GLOBAL ALLIANCE ON HEALTH AND POLLUTION, MEXICO, SWITZERLAND, BRAZIL, JAPAN, and URUGUAY, supported expanding the scope on lead beyond paint to include other areas of exposure, as in the proposal co-sponsored by Ghana, Mexico, Nigeria, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Uganda ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/CRP.1](#)). URUGUAY proposed inclusion of other metals with adverse effects on human health and the environment, such as arsenic and chrome.

SAUDI ARABIA questioned including lead as an IoC given “significant progress” in various platforms.

The ICCA supported integrating chemicals in products (CiP) into the proposed IP2.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH called for clear communication and an IoC on children’s specific vulnerability to hazardous chemicals.

Delegates agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Dzejna Milaković-Ramadani (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Lamin Jaiteh (The Gambia), tasked to reflect on proposals for IoC, including consideration of the conference room paper (CRP) on lead. Delegates accepted BRAZIL’s suggestion that the group also consider the Implementation Programmes and the global alliance on HHPs.

The contact group met on Wednesday afternoon, taking up each IoC one by one.

On **Lead** and CRP.1, one participant explained this proposal is a formal, detailed request to IC-1 for an IoC that covers all avenues of lead exposure. Several participants said this issue should be integrated into an implementation programme, with one requesting Secretariat guidance on procedures for this. Others preferred keeping “Lead in paint” as a standalone IoC and establishing a different IoC covering other sources of lead.

On **CiP**, several participants suggested this be incorporated into IP2 or into all Implementation Programmes. Others favored retaining it as a standalone IoC. Some underscored the need for a sectoral approach, calling for its inclusion in the sector-specific programmes. One participant preferred simply sharing experiences and best practices until IC-1.

On **Nanotechnologies and Manufactured Nanomaterials**, most participants agreed that this IoC should be kept, given rapid growth in their use and many medical and agricultural risks. One called for a harmonized definition, monitoring, and risk assessment. Another noted that many countries lack capacity to manage them effectively and they meet all the criteria for IoC. One delegate opposed keeping this IoC, saying more appropriate fora already address it.

On **Managing Perfluorinated Chemicals and the Transition to Safer Alternatives**, all participants called for continued work on this IoC, many calling it a priority given transboundary impacts of these chemicals in air, water, and agriculture.

On **Endocrine-disrupting Chemicals**, participants broadly supported keeping it as an IoC.

On **Environmentally Persistent Pharmaceutical Pollutants**, several participants called for its retention, stressing the One Health Approach and the impacts of antimicrobial resistance.

On **Hazardous Substances Within the Lifecycle of Electrical and Electronic Products**, there was broad agreement to keep it as an IoC, with possible inclusion also in IP2.

On **HHPs**, views were divided on whether to keep it as an IoC, remove it given its inclusion in the proposed global alliance on HHPs, or keep it until the alliance is up and running, with some noting insufficient work on alternatives.

Co-Chairs Milaković-Ramadani and Jaiteh reported the contact group’s outcomes to Friday’s plenary. OEWG Co-Chair Štěpánek said the Co-Chairs’ report would be annexed to the meeting report and uploaded to the website.

International Cooperation and Coordination: On Wednesday, Co-Chair Štěpánek opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/6](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/8](#) and [INF/9](#)).

UNEP updated participants on the establishment of the ISP-CWP, stressing its complementary nature and potential for synergies related to, *inter alia*, capacity building.

Many delegations emphasized the need to enhance synergies and avoid duplication.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH, with PAN INTERNATIONAL, urged close coordination with the UN Environment Management Group (EMG) and collaboration on climate change and biodiversity.

El Salvador, for GRULAC, called for international support for national sectoral plans.

The EU welcomed inputs to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) and highlighted a high-level dialogue on pollution.

IPEN urged concrete action and a whole-of-society and whole-of-government approach, stronger cooperation with UN bodies, and global and South-South cooperation.

The DOMINICAN REPUBLIC highlighted collaboration with relevant MEAs and the ongoing negotiations on plastics.

ARGENTINA expressed a reservation to each mention of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

PAN INTERNATIONAL drew attention to the invitation by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to collaborate on GBF Target 7 on pollution reduction, noting this could effectively deliver reductions and advance monitoring, and recommended a reciprocal commitment for cross-collaboration with the CBD.

Tanzania, for the AFRICAN REGION, emphasized: strengthened regional and sub-regional platforms; capacity building and technology transfer through international partnerships; inclusive multi-stakeholder engagement to foster ownership; and resource mobilization to encourage regional initiatives.

SWITZERLAND highlighted close collaboration with the ISP-CWP and called for the Secretariat to ensure continuing engagement with the Panel.

The US welcomed the ISP-CWP’s establishment and emphasized clear delineation of complementary roles.

CANADA stressed coordination on climate, labor, and biodiversity policies.

The INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE (IUCN) noted pollution is one of five major drivers of biodiversity degradation and ecosystem loss, also damaging health and social systems. She called for interconnected solutions encompassing a strong scientific base, all stakeholders, and a circular economy approach.

The BRS SECRETARIAT said BRS implementation contributes to achieving GFC targets, including on, *inter alia*, combating illegal traffic, e-waste, textile waste, and chemicals in articles and pesticides, confirming this cooperation will be enhanced.

Co-Chair Štěpánek said comments expressed would be reflected in the meeting report.

National Focal Points: On Wednesday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/7](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/10](#)).

The WORLD FEDERATION OF PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATIONS (WFPHA), WHO, HCWH, CANADA, COSTA RICA, and ILO called for representatives from health, labor, and environment ministries to be involved as NFPs, with WFPHA proposing to measure multi-sectoral collaboration through an indicator. The EU said NFPs should represent all relevant sectors.

NORWAY, CHILE, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION, and SAUDI ARABIA cautioned against major changes to existing institutional arrangements for NFPs, favoring national-level designations.

JAPAN shared on best practice for multi-sectoral GFC implementation at the national level.

Lesotho, for the AFRICAN REGION, IPEN, and TANZANIA called for regular capacity building, and the AFRICAN REGION for clear practical guidelines for NFPs, tailored to national contexts.

Measurability Structure and Indicators: On Wednesday, Co-Chair Štěpánek opened this agenda item. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Ad Hoc Group on Measurability and Indicators, Keima Gardiner (Trinidad and Tobago) and Itsuki Kuroda (Japan), introduced the relevant documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/9](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/12](#)), and provided information on the Group's work in three workstreams on:

- streamlining existing indicators;
- developing a high-level indicator on the global environmental burden attributable to chemicals and waste; and
- identifying and assessing thematic and sector-specific indicators.

El Salvador, for GRULAC, underscored the relevance of indicators for monitoring GFC implementation. ARGENTINA, CHINA, and Tanzania, for the AFRICAN GROUP, said the indicators should have clear links to GFC targets. The EU called for agreeing on the indicators as soon as possible, noting most targets are time-bound to 2030.

Noting financial resources are falling short, IPEN proposed tracking progress on resource mobilization. He also called for data transparency, citing public reports on chemical footprints as an example.

BRAZIL stressed sound, visible indicators responsive to countries' institutional capacities.

PAN called for: identifying gaps and developing new indicators where needed; proposals for impact indicators; and recommendations for technical cooperation and methodologies.

SWITZERLAND cited work remaining on: balancing qualitative and science-based quantitative indicators; indicators reflecting sectoral diversity and enabling comparability; and accessibility of results.

The US opposed references to gender or the SDGs, instead encouraging focus on specific environmental threats.

SAUDI ARABIA called for: streamlining indicators to avoid duplication and ensure measurability; explicit safeguards upholding the GFC's voluntary nature; and sharing outcomes to build knowledge and best practices.

The BRS SECRETARIAT, as custodian of some indicators, noted, *inter alia*, new indicators for solid wastes and persistent organic pollutants (POPs)-related health issues, and proposals for collaboration on GBF Targets 7 and 11.

Delegates agreed to establish an informal group to identify gaps in international reporting schemes, with Gardiner and Kuroda as co-facilitators.

Gardiner reported on the informal group to plenary on Friday, noting a productive discussion identifying gaps and prioritizing which indicators have to be finalized before IC-1. She also noted a call for involving more stakeholders in the process of developing the indicators to broaden inputs.

Health Surveillance Systems: On Wednesday, WHO reported on this agenda item, highlighting its updated [Chemicals Road Map](#) and the WHO Global Chemicals and Health Network comprising over 70 Member States.

The WFPHA emphasized health surveillance, data, and poison centers. She expressed readiness to assist dissemination and implementation, calling for prioritizing selected actions and actively promoting intersectoral collaboration.

MEXICO said toxicological centers are key to identifying exposure and offer alternatives for hazardous substances but require global collaboration. She proposed the development of a digital operable platform, with regional pilot projects.

ITUC pointed to existing ILO conventions, requirements, and recommendations already dealing with chemical exposure, and recommended exploring this existing network.

Tanzania, for the AFRICAN REGION, urged integrating the WHO Chemicals Road Map in the GFC, suggesting the Secretariat initiate work on collecting relevant health surveillance data.

BRAZIL called for the further development of health data and surveillance systems through concrete initiatives and supported a dedicated provision on health and plastic pollution.

Capacity building: Co-Chair Štěpánek introduced this item. Williams introduced the relevant documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/12](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/16](#)), inviting delegates to consider developing a strategy for capacity building and supporting technology transfer on mutually agreed terms, to forward to IC-1.

The MALDIVES queried criteria for selecting least developed countries and small island developing states for "differentiated support" and how to "meaningfully involve" the private sector and civil society.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH called for: workshops to build capacity; support for young scientists; revamping the knowledge platform; joint review of capacity building by the GFC and others; investigating the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions' networks on local support and training; and a higher proportion of funding for civil society projects.

The EU called for synergies with the BRS Conventions, UNEP's Special Programme for sustainable chemicals and waste management, and others working on waste.

IPEN urged building accountable systems; monitoring chemicals throughout their life cycle; cost recovery mechanisms per the polluter pays principle; predictable, adequate, and sustained financing for civil society groups; easy-access knowledge-sharing mechanisms; and measurable, monitored outcomes to ensure real world impacts.

BRAZIL stressed access to technology on mutually agreed terms and an ambitious, inclusive strategy including resource mobilization.

MEXICO highlighted: the means necessary for complying with the GFC; communities as agents of change; compulsory capacity building to build traceability across the value chain; and monitoring of financing for implementation in low- and middle-income countries.

The US stressed technology transfer references must include “voluntary” and “on mutually agreed terms,” to protect intellectual property rights holders.

IRAN noted that restrictions on some countries regarding receiving funds limits the possibility of achieving success on the GFC’s goals.

The ICCA cautioned against inefficient parallel efforts on capacity building and technology transfer within the GFC and in a separate strategy, calling for integrating capacity building into IP1.

Noting difficulties managing hazardous chemicals and waste, IRAQ stressed capacity building as essential “for countries with specific characteristics.”

Financial Considerations

Assessing the Existing Financial and Investment Flows as well as Financial Needs Associated with the Implementation of the Framework: On Tuesday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/2](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/3/Rev.1](#)).

BRAZIL proposed requesting that the Secretariat work on a mobilization strategy to present for adoption at IC-1, stressing concessional finance as catalytic and key to leveraging co-financing. The US called for focusing and streamlining instead. The RUSSIAN FEDERATION stressed that it is the GFC’s responsibility to operationalize resources based on consensus, driven by all governments, not just by donors.

The UK, with SAUDI ARABIA and the US, questioned language requesting the Secretariat to develop indicative criteria for ensuring that public and private investment decisions are compliant with the GFC, including how such criteria could shape future disclosures, as exceeding the OEWG’s mandate. UNEP clarified that it falls within the mandate of the OEWG to request work from the Secretariat, if resources are available.

Co-Chair Aliaga said the interventions would be noted in the meeting report.

Costs of Inaction: On Tuesday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the documents ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/2](#), [UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/4](#)).

CHILDREN AND YOUTH outlined their recommendations for updating the report on costs of inaction, including to reflect societal values that go beyond conventional economic framings and consider future risks. SWITZERLAND and the EU voiced support for completing the report in a quick and effective manner, with SWITZERLAND emphasizing assessing the benefits of early action. CHINA called for enhanced participation of developing countries’ experts.

IPEN urged sufficient funding to ensure that the updated report is ready in time for IC-1 to act on its findings.

Co-Chair Aliaga said the interventions would be noted in the meeting report.

Programme of Work and Draft Budget of the Secretariat for the Period 2024–2026

On Tuesday, Co-Chair Štěpánek opened this agenda item. Williams introduced the document ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/11](#)), noting receipt of voluntary contributions of USD 3.06 million to support the PoW and USD 28.5 million to implement activities under the GFC Fund. She highlighted that both limited resources and the lack of predictable funding affect the scope and pace of implementation.

Lesotho, for the AFRICAN REGION: lamented the funding gap for 2025 and 2026; called upon partners, with the EU, to ensure financial sustainability; and urged the Secretariat to explore funding options beyond core donors. He said that “industry must be held accountable,” highlighting “the problems we are facing originate from industry.”

JAPAN announced plans to support Secretariat activities as outlined in the document. On transitioning to alternatives, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION said accessibility of those alternatives should be investigated. The US cautioned against allocating resources to “broad initiatives,” urging that the PoW remain centered on the scope of the GFC.

Delegates agreed to establish a contact group, co-facilitated by Isabelle Mayr (Canada) and Jonah Ormond (Antigua and Barbuda). The group was mandated to reflect on:

- current funds available for staffing the Secretariat;
- the proposed PoW;
- ways to secure financial means;
- composition of the Secretariat; and
- a resource mobilization strategy.

The Group met Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday evening, discussing a staffing table provided by the Secretariat, and exchanging views and suggestions about systemic approaches to leverage funding to support a fully functioning Secretariat to deliver its PoW and support the implementation of Fund ambition.

In his report to plenary on Friday, Co-Chair Ormond said the Group suggested that the plenary consider recommending that the Secretariat provide a more complete staffing table, outlining where the Secretariat received support on the priorities it has established for staffing positions, as well as identifying gaps in staffing, to support the PoW mandated by ICCM5, and provide an updated budget in the fourth quarter of 2025 to stakeholders to indicate the budget for 2026.

The Group also suggested that the plenary consider recommending that the Secretariat prepare an options paper for consideration by IC-1 on identifying systemic approaches that leverage funding to ensure financial sustainability and development of both the Secretariat and the GFC Fund, taking into consideration elements raised at OEWG-1.

There was no objection and Co-Chair Aliaga confirmed endorsement of the suggestions.

Preparations for the First Session of the International Conference of the Global Framework on Chemicals

On Friday, Co-Chair Aliaga opened this agenda item and invited offers to host the IC-1, noting funding constraints. Williams introduced the document ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/13](#)). She noted that holding the meeting at a UN complex is tentatively an option if no hosting offer is forthcoming, and explained the various activities mandated to the Secretariat before the Conference.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH announced the preparation of several activities, including the third Youth Forum as a special event at IC-1; hands-on learning workshops on IoC and relevant topics; and training materials. They also called for support for these activities and recalled their proposal for a Children and Youth action plan.

The EU highlighted their upcoming efforts to support IC-1 and invited others to support it as well.

Other Matters

On Friday, BRAZIL, CHILE, and SAUDI ARABIA presented a joint proposal to clarify the OEWG's role and mode of work ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/CRP.2](#)). They suggested the OEWG could advance work beyond recording views in the meeting report and deliver draft decisions for adoption by the International Conference. They proposed to have the OEWG recommend that the Secretariat prepare a draft resolution for consideration at IC-1 clarifying the OEWG's functions and working methods, taking into account, *inter alia*, lessons-learned, including from SAICM, and input from all relevant stakeholders.

The EU, the UK, the US, and CANADA expressed openness to the idea, but preferred it be taken up at IC-1 itself, objecting to a standalone recommendation as an outcome of OEWG-1 separate from the meeting report. MEXICO emphasized the importance of establishing direct links with the GFC's International Conferences but cautioned against losing the wealth of exchange with civil society facilitated by the OEWG.

Noting lack of consensus, Co-Chair Štěpánek suggested the discussion be reflected in the meeting report and inform the preparation of IC-1.

Multi-Stakeholder Day

In its opening plenary on Thursday, Williams explained that Multi-Stakeholder Day was organized with a focus on GFC Strategic Objective D on safer alternatives and innovative sustainable solutions in product value chains, particularly targets D3 (strategies and policies to implement the sound management of chemicals and waste in its finance approaches and business models), and D6 (strategies adopted by major sectors that identify priority chemicals of concern, and standards and measures, to reduce their impact).

IOMC Chair Diderich explained that the Day seeks to support the development of IP2. He said it is "absolutely essential" that this programme deliver value and that there is ownership by all stakeholders, particularly in the sectors involved. Diderich emphasized the importance of integrating the finance sector throughout IP2's work, and of addressing crosscutting topics and issues that IP2 will tackle.

Williams noted that a report summarizing messages from the Day's sessions would be appended to the OEWG-1 meeting report.

Multi-stakeholder Dialogues on Thematic Workstreams and Global Workplan Topics: Knowledge-Sharing on Priority Chemicals of Concern: The session was introduced by Mario Yarto, FAO, and moderated by Jonah Ormond, Antigua and Barbuda.

Jago Wadley, PAN UK, outlined key steps to address chemicals of concern, starting with identification, for example, through PAN's lists of HHPs and banned pesticides, alongside monitoring and surveillance, possibly through PAN's mobile app Tool for Monitoring Acute Pesticide Poisoning (T-MAPP), available in 14 languages. He also spoke of PAN's work on training and demonstration projects to help farmers reduce HHPs and adopt

integrated pest management and agroecological practices and its engagement with market actors to encourage adoption of sustainability standards and rewards programmes for farmers.

Juergen Helbig, European Commission, elaborated on the EU's Regulation on the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals ([REACH](#)) process for identifying chemicals of concern. He highlighted the transparency of the process and the high level of protection of health and environment.

Benjamyn Marks, Responsible Business Alliance (RBA), explained RBA's initiatives advancing responsible chemical management, including through the [RBA Chemical Platform](#), a chemical data collection, assessment, and reporting platform to identify chemicals of concern within supply chains. He drew attention to work with the Clean Electronics Production Network (CEPN) to harmonize chemicals lists in the electronics sector.

Mark Rossi, Lowell Center for Sustainable Production, spoke on the identification of chemicals of concern and the various criteria used in listings, highlighting the preference for classifying chemicals by groups and classes based on their toxicity, structure, and function.

Ruthy Eleonora, Indonesia, reported on policy development in Indonesia addressing chemicals of concern, including a national plan and reduction strategy, green industry certification schemes, good waste management policies, and regulation on prioritizing eco-products.

Jason Gay, ICCA, highlighted, *inter alia*, that context of use is critical; the importance of identifying market opportunities that drive innovation and improvement; and the growing space for third parties' support, for example that of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD).

During the ensuing discussion, participants addressed GFC Target D6, including work needed to: go beyond the sector-specific approach and identify incentives to disseminate practices in other sectors; address surveillance under relevant conditions of use; and consider the burden of proof of adverse effects.

Transparency and Traceability Along Value Chains:

Moderator Oliver Wootton, UN Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), explained that transparency and traceability were issues that emerged from the February 2025 IOMC workshop on Implementation Programmes.

Nicole Wenzel, ICCA, reviewed the role of chemical safety data sheets (SDS), noting opportunities to improve on current practice, including more consistent language, availability in more languages, and strengthened training programmes for workers and other stakeholders to improve interpretation of SDS. She urged OEWG participants to provide feedback on how to improve SDS through the QR code survey offered at the venue.

Maria Delvin, Swedish Chemical Agency (KEMI), reviewed the history and rationale of the SAICM CiP project, observing that when it was launched in 2009 the presence of chemicals in a wide variety of goods was not well understood. She called for updating the [2015 SAICM guidance](#) on exchanging CiP information and improving such information for recyclers and material reuse in a circular economy, perhaps through tools such as product passports.

Timo Unger, Hyundai Motor Europe, noted he had been part of the steering committee for the CiP project and credited CiP with helping automotive manufacturers understand the need to be better informed about the thousands of chemicals and materials assembled into finished vehicles. He reviewed the development of

the industry's online [International Material Data System](#) (IMDS) and lessons learned, including:

- building a quality tracking system like the IMDS can take as much as five years;
- building a quality tracking system for a complex value chain can be expensive – in the case of the IMDS, USD 20 billion; and
- different tracking systems should be built for each industry, since no one size fits all.

Unger suggested the GFC promote cross-sector data exchange, especially among sectors that share supply chains.

Yiliqi, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), discussed the complexity of the textiles value chain and the challenges it poses for tracking the thousands of chemicals used. She outlined how the industry is responding to the challenges of transparency and traceability, including through: widely adopted lists of priority chemicals of concern; value chain mapping tools and initiatives; sophisticated chemical management tools; validated and shared safer alternatives; and multi-stakeholder and cross-border collaboration.

Azeb Dagne Asrat, Ethiopia, discussed some of the chemical transparency and traceability challenges developing countries face. She said her country is gathering information on chemicals through import/preapproval permits and chemical registrations, but challenges include:

- no national chemicals database;
- lack of communication/data sharing among the four agencies receiving the information;
- no fully automated data management;
- limited application of SDS and the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals; and
- resource constraints.

Rico Euripidou, Groundworks, called for:

- a harmonized standard for disclosing the presence, identity and hazard class information for chemicals in manufactured items;
- linking of disclosed chemical composition information to individual manufactured items, to establish traceability; and
- defined stakeholder responsibilities in relation to the other two conditions.

Reeaz Chuttoo, ITUC Africa, expressed skepticism that workers in developing countries will benefit from global initiatives, noting that disclosure, consultation, information, and human rights commitments made by multinational corporations globally never seem to benefit workers in subsidiaries in places like Mauritius.

Disclosure and Reporting Standards/Frameworks: Peggy Lefort, UNEP Finance Initiative (UNEP FI), introduced this session, noting the increase of disclosure standards alongside investors' demand for transparency.

Benjamin Warr, UNEP FI, presented findings from UNEP FI's [Accountability for Nature](#) report summarizing trends in pollution disclosure methods in seven leading standards. He highlighted: how to define impacts' "materiality"; coverage of sectors and value chains; nature-related impacts, dependencies, and opportunities; and differences/similarities among the metrics. He said pollution is always material and requires reporting.

Alan Gomez, Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD), highlighted documented financial impacts of USD 80+ billion from nature-related risk. He described TNFD's work increasing understanding on integrating risks of impacts on nature as a financial risk, which addresses companies' responsibilities to

shareholders and introduces business opportunities from protecting nature.

Thamar Zijlstra, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), updated participants on GRI's standards. Citing existing chemicals, waste and hazardous waste disposal, and water standards, she pointed to new soil pollution, air pollution, and critical incidents standards, saying GRI draws from the GFC.

Olena Liakh, European Financial Reporting Advisory Group (EFRAG), said EFRAG's European Sustainability Reporting Standards (ESRS) compel companies to disclose: material environmental, social, and governance impacts, including from chemicals released into air, water, and soil; chemicals produced and released into the environment; and workforce health and safety. She noted EFRAG aligns with GFC Targets B and D.

Angela Pinilla, Clean Production Action (CPA), said chemicals elimination and substitution is cost effective. She cited indicators including company policies, chemicals inventories, and goals for reducing chemicals of concern. She said CPA's Chemical Footprint Project helps companies benchmark efforts in reducing their chemical footprint, highlighting CPA's alignment with the GFC.

Larisa Ruoff, Loring, Wolcott & Coolidge Trust, urged companies to manage the financial risk from chemicals, noting the long-term capital risk inherent in investing only to make money. She lamented that investors cannot eliminate exposure to financial and litigation risks or the uncertainty of consumer preferences and regulatory environments, but cited IEHN recommendations on new environmental standards to help companies conduct hazard assessment, manage risks, and develop safer alternatives.

Tayo Adedeji, World Bank, stressed moving from information to action through a GFC workstream in this thematic area, aiming for comparable and interoperable, or similar, disclosure standards schemes.

In ensuing comments, one participant cautioned against transferring responsibility of judging materiality to companies. Another emphasized trust, given the risk of litigation emanating from disclosures.

Green and Sustainable Chemistry Innovations and Solutions:

This session was moderated by Baskut Tuncak, Massachusetts Toxics Use Reduction Institute.

Ludovic Bernaudat, UNEP, gave an overview of UNEP's work on green and sustainable chemistry (GSC), noting the opportunity for GSC given the growing market for chemicals.

Rodica Ella Ivan, UN Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), highlighted UNIDO's mandate to promote inclusive and sustainable industrial development. She pointed to the IOMC Toolbox for Decision Making in Chemicals Management; the UNIDO Green Chemistry Toolkit; the new Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme; and the Green Chemistry for Sustainability global platform.

Paul Anastas, Yale University, shared thoughts on what is required to make chemistry greener based on what he called the six "I's": invention, innovation, incentives, investment, implementation, and iteration. He stressed the need for these to work together as an integrated system and urged recognition of the vast and vibrant community pursuing GSC.

Keima Gardiner, Trinidad and Tobago, emphasized the importance of integrating GSC within policy frameworks and harmonizing policies to ensure coherence with international commitments. To illustrate, she described the adoption of a national

standard on biodegradable materials for composting, which minimizes chemical pollution and reduces imports, advancing sustainability in production processes.

Chris Wallace, ICCA, spoke about the implementation of GSC principles in a financially sustainable manner as “a challenge and an opportunity.” He noted the increased use of sustainability assessment tools to guide innovation, and the importance of public-private partnerships, education, and benchmarking and metrics.

Evelyn Swain, Global Environment Facility (GEF), elaborated on GEF’s proactive approach to GSC, exemplified by the Global Greenchem Innovation and Network Programme and the integration of green chemistry in national-level projects, which she said will be further expanded in the GEF’s 9th replenishment cycle. She highlighted, *inter alia*, private sector involvement, de-risking technologies, and removing policy disincentives.

Anna Becker, International Sustainable Chemistry Collaborative Centre (ISC3), addressed the role of international organizations in promoting and upscaling GSC, including as catalysts, providing structures and mapping entrepreneurial ecosystems. She drew attention to ISC3’s Sustainable Chemistry Club and projects with the German Corporation for International Cooperation (GIZ) in India and Colombia on plastics and textiles, emphasizing there are numerous players at all levels and a “bouquet of approaches and best practices.”

Shannon Eileen Lisa, Major Group for Children and Youth, stressed youth education and engagement are essential to ensure a green chemistry future. She highlighted the impact of chemical pollution in war-torn and post-conflict countries. Noting the lack of public awareness and funds, she said chemicals have “a PR problem” and need visionaries to create narratives and draw attention, for which the Children and Youth Major Group stands ready.

In the ensuing discussion, participants addressed, *inter alia*, the importance of: micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises; regulatory cooperation and international learning of best practices; and barriers to standardization and the challenges its absence poses.

Chemical Footprint Approaches: Moderator Llorenç Milà i Canals, UNEP, outlined the session’s aim to discuss different approaches to chemical footprint methodologies, their strengths for supporting GFC targets, and next steps to implement progress on chemical footprint approaches in the implementation programme workplan.

She provided a brief overview of chemical footprint approaches, comprising the Chemical Footprint Project, Cradle-to-Cradle, Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), Environmental Product Declarations (EPDs), the WBCSD’s Portfolio Sustainability Assessment (PSA), and the Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR), highlighting, *inter alia*, their different objects of analysis.

In reflections from industry representatives, Myriam Tryjefaczka, Tarkett, said Tarkett uses the cradle-to-cradle approach for modeling products’ circularity, adding that LCAs complement this approach to capture carbon emissions. She highlighted the importance of EPDs for standardization and Material Health Statements (MHS) for transparency.

Marcia Frieze, Case Medical, US, shared best practices for tracking the chemical and carbon footprint of products, highlighting the importance of measuring hazardous waste reductions on a regular basis.

Bettina Siggelkow, Clariant Foundation, Switzerland, outlined how risk assessments on chemicals are carried out in the innovation process and for the existing product portfolio, underlining the importance of early risk identification.

Thaddeus Anim-Somuah, Philips, said that Philips formulates hazardous substances reduction targets based on own definitions and highlighted the use of LCA methodology for measuring the impact on the environment.

In the interactive part of the session, participants provided views on, *inter alia*: other chemical footprint approaches, with participants highlighting eco-design and “safe and sustainable by design” (SSbD) approaches; key opportunities for synergies in applications, with one participant sharing best practice on accessing data from the value chain through a third-party assessor; and needed support for implementation to deliver GFC targets, with participants highlighting education, funding and scalability.

In an online vote on which chemical footprint approaches support identifying chemicals of concern, most participants opted for the Chemical Footprint Project, followed by WBCSD’s PSA. On next steps for the implementation programme, participants voted that the development of guidance to apply chemical footprint approaches in sector programmes was the main priority.

Private Sector Financing: Peggy Lefort, UNEP FI, convened this session.

In the opening address, Sheila Aggarwal-Khan, UNEP, observed that sound chemicals and waste management lacks public finance for the many tasks it faces. She suggested that the 2024 statement by 150 financial institutions calling for a plastics treaty signals increasing financial sector engagement on chemicals and waste issues. Aggarwal-Khan urged that participants discuss how to unlock and leverage private finance, to address not only chemical risks but also opportunities in the sector such as those represented by green chemistry.

Rory Sullivan and Tanya Cox, Chronos Sustainability, South Africa, outlined their work on a study for the GFC on assessing financial flows and financial needs across chemicals value chains, with Cox explaining the study’s narrow focus on the cotton textiles value chain because of the complexity and diversity of the sector and because of existing pressure to make cotton more sustainable and circular. Sullivan explained the focus on four stages within the chain that involve the greatest chemicals use, and identifying possible intervention points for financing to prompt transformation. He underscored the importance of discussing the sector with banks and investors, “because generally they already have commercial relations with key actors in the chain.”

Caroline Boden, Mercy Investment Services, highlighted the just released [statement](#) from more than 43 investors with over USD 4 trillion in assets under management calling on chemical companies to phase out highly hazardous chemicals and transition to safer alternatives to protect biodiversity and human health. Boden noted negative and positive “screens” for faith-based investing, based on companies’ negative or positive impacts on people and the planet.

Marijn Lanting, Rabobank, recounted how his bank works with potato farmers and suppliers to incentivize farmers to produce more sustainably. He highlighted Rabobank’s restructuring of its agro-chemicals policy and discussed a sustainability-linked loan tied to an indicator estimating the environmental impact of pesticides used, whereby the client gets their desired loan if they reduce the pesticides they use.

Anil Sookdeo, GEF, presented on four cases of GEF financing involving chemicals and waste, citing lessons learned for scaling up financing under the GFC. He cited the GEF's goal to encourage countries' use of GEF grant resources to de-risk and incentivize private capital and noted the GEF is establishing a chemicals sector assistance facility.

Rakesh Vazirani, Bureau Veritas Consumer Products Services, presented a case study on chemicals up and down the textiles value chain, reporting findings that standards and mechanisms are in place for verification. Vazirani stressed a "business case" for people and the planet, lamenting that available funds are not always used for cleaner production.

Moderator Johannes Heister, World Bank, confirmed participants' input would be considered in developing potential activities in this area. Noting ongoing work to quantify GFC indicators, he cautioned that if GFC progress cannot be quantified, investments in its work will be disincentivized.

Developing GFC Industry Implementation Programmes Along Value Chains: *Electronic Industry Sector Workshop:* Moderator Jacqueline Álvarez, UNEP, recalled GFC Resolution V calls for bold and practical action across sectors. She said electronics is a key sector for the GFC to address, not only for its intensive use of chemicals, but also the many social and economic issues involved in the value chain.

Benjamyn Marks, RBA, said chemicals emerged as a standalone focus in 2015, leading to an Industry Focus Process Chemicals Policy (IFPC Policy) in 2021, followed by a Validated Assessment Program (VAP) on Chemicals Management. He said RBA, working with CEPN, is currently developing lists of priority chemicals of concern for restriction in electronics production, with an initial focus on solvents.

Pamela Brody-Heine, CEPN, discussed CEPN's work on identifying and assessing priority chemicals of concern, chemical safety training for workers, and a "Toward Zero Exposure" commitment programme for the electronics sector on phasing out priority chemicals of concern along value chains that has already enlisted Dell, Apple, Hewlett Packard (HP) and Fairphone.

Angela Pinilla, CPA, outlined CPA's work and tools in the sector, such as the [GreenScreen](#) hazard assessment tool, the Chemical Footprint Project, the BizNGO network bringing together business and environmental leaders to promote the use of safer chemicals and sustainable materials in products and supply chains, and CPA's efforts to promote proactive chemicals safety leadership beyond simple regulatory compliance. She cited HP as an example of best practice in the electronics sector.

Rolph Payet, Executive Secretary, BRS Conventions, outlined the ways electronics are dealt with under the Stockholm and Basel Conventions, including restrictions on POPs in equipment, regulation of trade in electronic waste and used equipment, combating illicit traffic, and guidance on environmentally sound management of electronic waste. He called this "the tip of the iceberg" for chemical/waste issues involving the sector, expressing hope that stakeholder engagement in the GFC will help address the rest.

Shindo Chikako, Environment Ministry, Japan, reported on her country's implementation of the GFC, including:

- the creation of a special interagency committee on the GFC, involving nine ministries;
- the adoption of a national GFC implementation plan of action;

- alignment of the chemicals portion of the national environment plan to the GFC Strategic Objectives; and
- a Fundamental Plan for Establishing Sound Material-Cycle Society.

She reported that her government is considering the creation of a framework for handling chemicals information, and an online information platform on resource recycling that would include data on the safety of recycling and reusing used parts.

Textile Industry Sector Workshop: Moderator Yiliqi, NRDC, welcomed participants to the session. In welcoming remarks, Sheila Aggarwal-Khan, UNEP, highlighted lack of transparency, disclosure, and traceability as challenges to addressing threats to workers' and consumers' health posed by harmful chemicals in the textile sector. She invited participants to reflect on what an implementation programme for the textile sector could look like.

In the first panel discussion, Jago Wadley, PAN-UK, highlighted the disproportionate use of HHPs in cotton production and urged that this problem be addressed. He said a critical mass of different initiatives needs to be reached to advance action.

Marcelo Lobo, Zero Discharge of Hazardous Chemicals (ZDHC), underscored that pesticides are the core environmental risk in the textile sector and called for boosting capacity and facilitating collaboration between stakeholders. In response to questions from the audience on relevant stakeholders and recycling challenges for textiles containing hazardous chemicals, he said downstream companies are important stakeholders through providing data and increasing transparency and pointed out that safe chemicals are "the basis for circularity."

In a second panel discussion, Tadesse Amera, PAN-Ethiopia, shared practices on knowledge co-production processes in "farmer field schools" for biological pest control. He said that cotton is the most promising sector within the textile industry to stop future accumulation of pesticides.

Debaaj Abidi, ILO, urged considering how international labor standards can be integrated with other environmental standards. He noted that workers' chemicals exposure remains a big problem and called for focusing on how daily exposure can be reduced.

Mariano Piñeyrua, TraceSurfer, highlighted that a lack of access to digital tools and technological illiteracy pose challenges for small- and medium-sized enterprises to comply with traceability obligations.

Tanya Cox, Chronos Sustainability, said scaling up best practices and inconsistencies in policies and incomplete implementation are two major bottlenecks, noting these could be addressed through the implementation programme.

Keima Gardiner, Trinidad and Tobago, reported on work on the development of indicators, including for the textile sector. On government initiatives, she highlighted a national programme to minimize chemical pollution in the carnival industry.

In closing remarks, Agustin Harte, BRS Secretariat, outlined the BRS Conventions' role in addressing parts of the problem faced in the textile industry. He noted that many pesticides used in cotton production had been listed under the Stockholm Convention and outlined how the Basel Convention regulates the use of textile waste, including through the Household Waste and Plastic Waste Partnerships.

Health Care Industry Sector Workshop: Virunya Bhat, WHO, moderated this session, highlighting that the GFC recognizes this sector's critical role and unique expertise.

Susan Wilburn, HCWH, noted the sector comprises 10% of the global economy, implying huge potential to advancing sustainability. She pointed to health care chemicals' role in antimicrobial resistance and threats to health care workers. She also noted achievements including the WHO Chemicals Road Map, saying a health care implementation programme can achieve many GFC Targets.

Megha Rathi, WHO, reported on WHO's 78th World Health Assembly and its work on climate resilient and environmentally sustainable health supply chains. She particularly noted comparisons between this work and GFC Targets, but bemoaned barriers to regulation on pharmaceuticals.

Fernando Gastón Iturburu, UNEP, spoke on key aspects of pharmaceuticals in the environment for a health care implementation programme, noting rising global production and consumption and pharmaceuticals' negative effects on wildlife and ecosystems, their toxicity and endocrine disruption properties, and the spread of antimicrobial resistance. He said the health sector value chain is a global IoC, particularly for developing countries, noting possible actions, include: prioritization of prevention; innovation; and legal frameworks for the whole lifecycle.

Hilda Van der Veen, UNDP, reported on lessons learned from health care initiatives. She cited model health care facilities in developing countries and work on national policies on sustainable procurement, including work on the Sustainable Procurement Index for Health.

Halshka Graczyk, ILO, reported labor sector perspectives, particularly on occupational health and safety considerations in the health care sector and on developing safer and more innovative and sustainable health care supply chains. She reported ILO's work on: national-level legally binding labor standards and the right to a healthy and safe working environment; international basic standards such as chemicals risk assessments and worker awareness of chemicals' risks; ensuring elimination and substitution of the worst chemicals; and training models for chemicals exposure in the health sector.

Participants then heard presentations on selected case studies.

Alessandra Azevedo, Healthy Hospitals Project, Brazil, spoke on chemicals inventories and phaseout of chemicals of concern in hospitals in Brazil and on PVC substitution in Colombia through replacing single use trocars with reusable ones and single-use PVC face masks with reusable silicone masks.

Pankaj Bector, National Center for Disease Control (NCDC), India, spoke on sustainable procurement of safer chemicals in India as a tool for the NCDC. He noted, *inter alia*, a "green transition service" in public procurement and a legal framework supporting the SDGs.

Delegates then focused on proposed ToR for a health care implementation programme. Participating in an online interactive brainstorming session for developing safer alternatives and innovative and sustainable supply chains, delegates were surveyed on questions of: prioritizing objectives for action on chemicals in the health care sector; priority chemicals of concern in the health care supply chain; stakeholders to be included in action on health care-related chemicals; and priority activities that would contribute to a health care implementation programme.

Closing Plenary

On Friday, Rapporteur Frydrych presented the draft meeting report ([UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/L.1](#) and [Add.1](#)), and took the plenary through it paragraph by paragraph. Upon request from BRAZIL, the plenary also went through the annexes of the report containing the unedited draft reports from the contact groups. Several amendments were suggested. The OEWG then adopted the full report.

Numerous delegates intervened to thank the host country and everyone involved in organizing and supporting the meeting and to welcome progress made.

Malawi, for the AFRICAN REGION, *inter alia*: highlighted that full participation of all regions is crucial in shaping the GFC Fund; reiterated opposition to "assessed contributions" to the Fund; and called on industry to take responsibility, especially in countries with limited capabilities.

GRULAC called for all developing countries to receive assistance "without arbitrary distinctions" and in line with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Noting there is "no space where you can escape from hazardous chemicals, and no baby that will enter this world unpolluted," the CHEMICAL AND WASTE YOUTH PLATFORM recalled that the GFC was created because SAICM did not deliver on its goals, expressing concern at the lack of funding. They underscored their commitment to continued engagement and called for a GFC that is not only meaningful on paper but transformative in practice, adding that "where policy lacks, community leads."

BRAZIL cautioned about development of the global alliance on HHPs, stating that while they support its objective, it was developed by a task force after ICCM5 and: is not open to revision; is prescriptive; and does not address developing countries' concerns and capacity-building needs.

The EU expressed hope for expeditious finalization of the resource mobilization strategy.

ICCA celebrated the GFC for building common ground and for its multi-stakeholder approach. He stated ICCA's commitment to advance its share of the work, including on data transparency, and recalled its contribution of EUR 500,000 this year.

IPEN underscored the need for a concrete plan with specific targeted action items, effective implementation, and equitably accessible funds. Noting that the multi-sectoral approach is a key GFC strength but needs to be put into practice, she emphasized, *inter alia*: the polluter pays principle; transparency; and contributions by GFC to broader global goals, including those of the GBF.

North Macedonia, for the CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN REGION, welcomed the establishment of the GFC Fund and called for greater clarity and regional balance in the next stages of its operation, ensuring it supports all regions in a fair and inclusive manner.

Stressing that the principle of intergenerational equity must remain at the heart of discussions, CHILDREN AND YOUTH underscored the need for sustainable financing to support research and youth action.

URUGUAY expressed its commitment to work intersessionally before IC-1 and his hope that more Fund projects will be approved in a transparent and fair manner.

Co-Chairs Štěpánek and Aliaga thanked everyone for a rich discussion to inform the preparatory process for IC-1 in 2026. Co-Chair Štěpánek then declared OEWG-1 closed at 5:27 pm.

A Brief Analysis of GFC OEWG-1

Thousands of chemicals are released every year, and their production is projected to double from 2017 levels by 2030. Yet only a few chemicals are subject to international regulation at different parts of their life cycles. The scale and complexity of the problem is almost unfathomable: chemicals can be largely invisible, toxic, slow to break down, and found in places they were never intended to be. In addition, new chemicals are constantly being created, with little to no burden of proof upon the companies to show they are safe before marketing.

Accessing reliable and practical information is difficult even for governments, as it is generally protected by intellectual property rights. Chemicals are also sometimes “hidden” in components so the producer of the final product does not always know what is in their products’ (outsourced) components. To address this ballooning problem and fill gaps left by existing multilateral environment agreements (MEAs), such as the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm (BRS) and Minamata Conventions, the Global Framework on Chemicals (GFC) was adopted in 2023 as a comprehensive umbrella for the sound management of chemicals and wastes not already regulated internationally.

The GFC is a voluntary, multi-stakeholder process that includes governments and non-governmental actors, both civil society and industry associations. Beyond functioning as an “orphanage” for chemicals not covered by existing MEAs, the GFC is set up to identify emerging issues of concern and to develop and operationalize Implementation Programmes for taking action.

Governments and stakeholders gathered this week for the first meeting of the GFC Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG 1). They convened to collaboratively take stock of the implementation of resolutions adopted by the fifth International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM5) in 2023 and prepare for the first GFC International Conference (IC-1), the governing body of the Framework, in late 2026. The meeting featured an innovative format in Thursday’s Multi-Stakeholder Day, which was devoted to dialogues among all stakeholders to consider cross-cutting issues and promote sector-specific action for electronics, textiles, and health care.

This brief analysis considers the opportunities and challenges of the multi-stakeholder approach, explores links with the recently established Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel for Chemicals, Waste and Pollution, and reflects on how the GFC is dealing with limited financial resources.

Living Up to the Ambition for “Multi-Stakeholderism”

It is rare to experience the blurring of hierarchies between governments and non-governmental actors in the multilateral arena. Just like its predecessor, the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM), the GFC grants equal participation rights to all actors that have a stake in chemical and waste management. Besides governments, this includes those most affected from chemical pollution, such as children and youth, farmers, and workers. It also includes major users of chemicals, such as the textiles sector, as well as producers of chemical products, who, as one delegate put it, are “at the source of the problems we are facing.” The rationale for a multi-stakeholder process that is not exclusively driven by governments is to involve a variety of actors to take ownership in the process of tackling the risks posed by chemicals and waste and jointly move towards their sound

management. There are practical differences between governmental and non-governmental actors when it comes to implementation, however. For example, governments appoint national focal points, who are key to GFC implementation at the national level.

On Multi-Stakeholder Day, participants fleshed out proposals for Implementation Programmes in the electronics, textile, and health care sectors. A buzz spread across the conference center from the many parallel dialogues, master classes, and fireside chats. Many participants found these informative sessions the most valuable part of the week, diving into chemical footprinting, transparency and traceability along value chains, and disclosure and reporting standards.

One delegate highlighted the importance of such broad stakeholder involvement, saying this innovative format has the potential to expand ownership of the Implementation Programmes currently under development and strongly driven by the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC). Such wider ownership is not only necessary for broad implementation but also for raising financial resources. As delegates heard at the beginning of the week, the IOMC Participating Organizations’ financial resources to support the development of Implementation Programmes have been exhausted and further work depends on additional funds. It will be interesting to see whether the fire ignited during Multi-Stakeholder Day also sparks the necessary financial momentum for the Implementation Programmes.

Fostering multi-stakeholder cooperation by involving the variety of sectors relevant to the sound management of chemicals and waste is central to GFC implementation. While the envisaged sectoral Implementation Programmes reflect this aim, there are challenges to live up to this ambition at the national level. The need for “multi-sectoralism” has long been recognized but is still lacking. This became clear when delegates shared their views on a guidance document for national focal points (NFPs). On the one hand, Japan shared their national experience, highlighting an effort for inter-ministerial coordination to implement the GFC’s ambition at the national level, which brings together nine ministries. On the other hand, several other countries urged recognizing different institutional realities. In their countries, NFPs are often located in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which are then tasked to reach out to their colleagues in relevant ministries, such as those working on the economy, health, labor and social affairs, or the environment, although some delegates lamented that their NFPs are not sufficiently representative.

Then there is the question of involvement by the different stakeholders at the national level. Workers’ unions, for example, pointed to challenges in access when everything goes through government focal points. However, recognition is growing that a multi-stakeholder approach is crucial for implementation.

Scanning the Horizon for Issues of Concern

Identifying and acting on Issues of Concern (IoC) are key mechanisms of the GFC. Once on the “IoC red list,” the issue is supposed to acquire visibility as an insufficiently addressed threat to human health and the environment that requires international action. Which issues identified under SAICM should be kept, expanded, dropped, or integrated into sectoral Implementation Programmes sparked lively discussions during a dedicated contact group session.

For example, a proposal to broaden the scope on lead exposure beyond the current focus on lead in paint was supported by many participants. The argument is that, while lead in paint is recognized

as a preventable source of lead exposure, other significant sources of lead exposure, such as informal recycling of lead-acid batteries, pose serious health risks, especially to children and workers, mainly in developing countries.

One country cautioned against duplicating efforts elsewhere, such as the Partnership for a Lead-Free Future launched at the UN General Assembly in 2024. Several participants scoffed at this suggestion, noting the GFC can simply join forces with the Partnership, and, as one put it, “no effort is too much” for preventing lead exposure.

Views also diverged on how to deal with highly hazardous pesticides (HHPs), which are recognized as an IoC. Specifically, one delegation suggested its de-classification as an IoC, given it will be the subject of a dedicated alliance, currently under development, that will take further action on this issue. Still, there was broad agreement that, given their impact on health and the environment and their growing numbers, HHPs should remain an IoC at least until the alliance is up and running.

Many participants welcomed the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel for Chemicals, Waste and Pollution (ISP-CWP) just a few days earlier at the same venue. It was during the long preparatory phase for the GFC that the volume of calls for strengthening the science-policy interface on chemicals, waste and pollution had increased.

Of particular interest for the GFC is the new science-policy panel’s agreed function to undertake “horizon scanning” to identify emerging issues and inform action at an early stage. This may enable productive links to be established between the GFC and the ISP-CWP. This would directly link policy-relevant science to implementation by multiple stakeholders and allow the GFC to not only raise awareness about issues of concern, but also act on them, based on a sound science basis that has been endorsed by governments.

Money, Money, Money

Implementation needs financial resources. Following the decision to establish the GFC Fund in 2023, the first projects to receive funding were announced at OEWG-1. From 105 applications, four regional projects have been selected, benefiting 11 countries across Africa and Latin America focusing on implementing the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals, and reducing risks from highly hazardous pesticides.

Several participants voiced their concern about prioritization criteria applied in the selection process, noting that funding should be accessible to developing countries and countries in transition without differentiation. Some delegates perceived the Fund acting as a “gatekeeper” rather than enabler.

A selection process always implies choosing some projects over others. However, delegates pointed to challenges for applications from civil society projects, which, in some cases, lacked support from the NFPs that must endorse their application. Specifically, applications from labor unions have reportedly been treated unfavorably in cases where NFPs are hostile towards them. Moreover, the requirement for co-financing poses additional barriers for many civil society projects. The second round for applications is scheduled for the last quarter of 2025; it remains to be seen if these issues can be adequately addressed, or addressed at all, by then.

Many lamented the lack of financial resources, recalling that inadequate, unpredictable, and unsustainable funding was one major reason that SAICM missed its 2020 targets. The GFC was set up

with clearer strategic objectives, time-bound targets, a measurability structure with indicators, and plans for bold and concrete Implementation Programmes. The sector-specific Implementation Programmes now being developed in the textiles, electronics, and health care sectors are also meant to draw in other major chemicals-using sectors. Several participants expressed hope for business and industry to step up their contributions. It was noted by one observer that the International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), whose membership represents over 90% of global chemicals sales (totaling over EUR 5 trillion in 2023), contributed USD 534,611 to the GFC Fund in 2024.

The lack of financial resources was also discussed when exchanging views on the Secretariat’s work programme and its staffing situation. Several work streams mandated by ICCM5 are on hold due to the lack of resources to hire staff. While the OEWG contact group co-chairs noted that discussions resulted in awareness about the financing shortfall, only a few ideas were expressed about what a resource mobilization strategy could look like. A proposal made by some developed countries to set up a mechanism of annual voluntary but “assessed” contributions, as exists for the UN as a whole and in the BRS Conventions, did not garner full support. Again, the question arose whether, in the light of the multi-stakeholder character of the GFC, all stakeholders could be included in such a mechanism.

Looking Ahead

Aside from the wealth of information exchange, not all participants were satisfied with the modalities and outcomes of the first OEWG session. In a joint conference room paper, Brazil, Chile and Saudi Arabia questioned whether simply collecting views and recording them in the meeting report was a wise use of everyone’s time and resources. They called for updating the OEWG’s mandate, its functions, modalities of work, and expected outcomes, so that the OEWG may deliver draft decisions that advance the work of the GFC’s International Conference. This would imply some level of negotiations that were absent at this first OEWG meeting and change its dynamic. In the end, participants decided this merits further consideration and will take up these discussions at the Conference in late 2026.

The outputs of this meeting, mainly comprising views shared on the various topics discussed during the week, will guide the preparatory work for the IC-1. While the extent and vigor of stakeholder engagement at the OEWG gave hope to many participants, it remains to be seen what fruits the stocktaking exercise of Punta del Este will bear, to what extent the spirit of Multi-Stakeholder Day will boost the development of the envisaged sectoral Implementation Programmes, and, importantly, the extent to which additional financial resources can be raised.

Upcoming Meetings

47th Meeting of the Open-ended Working group to the Montreal Protocol (OEWG 47): The 47th meeting of the Montreal Protocol’s Open-ended Working Group will review the implementation of the decisions of previous meetings and prepare for the next one by adopting recommendations to forward to the Meeting of the Parties (MOP) for consideration and final decision. **dates:** 7-11 July 2025 **location:** Bangkok, Thailand **www:** [ozone.unep.org/meetings/47th-meeting-open-ended-working-group-parties](https://www.unep.org/meetings/47th-meeting-open-ended-working-group-parties)

Second Part of the Fifth Session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee on Plastic Pollution (INC-5.2): Delegates at INC-5 agreed to convene a resumed meeting of the fifth session to try to conclude negotiations on a treaty on plastics pollution. **dates:** 5-14 August 2025 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **www:** unep.org/inc-plastic-pollution

21st Meeting of the Chemical Review Committee (CRC-21): The CRC to the Rotterdam Convention will review up to 30 new notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for severely hazardous pesticide formulations, and will continue to review notifications of final regulatory action and proposals for listing three severely hazardous pesticide formulations that it was unable to complete during its 20th meeting. **dates:** 23-26 September 2025 **location:** Rome, Italy **www:** pic.int

21st Meeting of the Persistent Organic Pollutants Review Committee (POPRC-21): POPRC will review the outcomes of the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention that are relevant to its work and consider the draft risk profile for polyhalogenated dibenzo-p-dioxins and dibenzofurans (PXDD/ PXDF). **dates:** 29 September - 3 October 2025 **location:** Rome, Italy **www:** pops.int

Minamata Convention on Mercury COP 6: The sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Minamata Convention on Mercury will review implementation of the Convention. **dates:** 3-7 November 2025 **location:** Geneva, Switzerland **www:** minamataconvention.org/en/meetings/cop6

37th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (MOP 37): MOP 37 will review implementation and strengthening of the Montreal Protocol. **dates:** 3-7 November 2025 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** ozone.unep.org/meetings/thirty-seventh-meeting-parties

Open-ended Committee of Permanent Representatives Seventh Meeting (OECPR-7): The OECPR is a preparatory meeting for UNEA and negotiates the content and wording of proposed resolutions, declarations, and decisions for endorsement and approval by the Assembly. **dates:** 1-5 December 2025 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** unep.org/environmentassembly/unea7/oeopr7

Seventh Session of the UN Environment Assembly (UNEA-7): UNEA is the highest decision-making body on environmental matters in the UN system and has a universal membership of all 193 Member States. The Assembly sets the global environmental agenda, provides overarching policy guidance, and defines policy responses to address emerging environmental challenges. **dates:** 8-12 December 2025 **location:** Nairobi, Kenya **www:** unep.org/environmentassembly

GFC First International Conference (IC-1): IC-1 will discuss GFC implementation, including which Implementation Programmes and indicators to adopt, which IoC the GFC will address, the status of the GFC Fund, resource mobilization, guidelines for NFPs, the launch of the Global Alliance on HHPs, and the mandate and modalities of the OEWG going forward. **dates:** fourth quarter 2026 (TBD) **location:** TBD **www:** unep.org/global-framework-chemicals/international-meetings

For additional upcoming events, see: sdg.iisd.org

Glossary

BRS	Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions
CEPN	Clean Electronics Production Network
CiP	Chemicals in products
CPA	Clean Production Action
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
GBF	Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GFC	Global Framework on Chemicals
GRULAC	Latin American and Caribbean Group
HCWH	Health Care Without Harm
HHPs	Highly hazardous pesticides
ICCA	International Council of Chemical Associations
ICCM	International Conference on Chemicals Management
IEHN	Investor Environmental Health Network
IC-1	First GFC International Conference
ILO	International Labor Organization
IoC	Issue of concern
IOMC	Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals
IPEN	International Pollutants Elimination Network
ISP-CWP	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Panel on Chemicals, Waste and Pollution
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
MEAs	Multilateral environmental agreements
NFP	National focal point
NRDC	Natural Resources Defense Council
OEWG	Open-ended Working Group
OHCHR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
PAN	Pesticide Action Network
POPs	Persistent organic pollutants
PoW	Programme of Work
RBA	Responsible Business Alliance
SAICM	Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management
SDS	Safety data sheets
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
ToR	Terms of reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WFPHA	World Federation of Public Health Associations
WHO	World Health Organization