



Distr.: General
25 January 2023

English only

**Open-ended Working Group of the Basel Convention
on the Control of Transboundary Movements of
Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal
Thirteenth meeting**

Geneva, 21–23 February 2023

Item 3 (a) (i) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters related to the work programme of the
Open-ended Working Group for the biennium
2022–2023: strategic issues: strategic framework**

**Findings and recommendations to improve, as appropriate, the
strategic framework for the implementation of the Basel
Convention for 2012–2021**

Note by the Secretariat

As is mentioned in the note by the Secretariat on the strategic framework (UNEP/CHW/OEWG.13/2), the annex to the present note sets out the findings and recommendations to improve, as appropriate, the strategic framework for the implementation of the Basel Convention for 2012–2021, prepared by the small intersessional working group on the strategic framework. The present note, including its annex, has not been formally edited.

* UNEP/CHW/OEWG.13/1.

Annex

Draft report of findings and recommendations to improve the strategic framework for the implementation of the Basel Convention for 2012–2021

I. Introduction

1. Canada volunteered to prepare a draft report of findings and recommendations to improve, as appropriate, the strategic framework for 2012–2021, in collaboration with the Small Intersessional Working Group (SIWG) on the review of the strategic framework. The draft report is to be submitted for the consideration of the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) at its thirteenth meeting.

2. This draft report consists of six sections: I) Introduction; II) Overarching issues; III) Current goals, objectives and indicators, IV) Means of implementation; V) Evaluation; and VI) Conclusion. It contains findings and recommendations relevant to elements assessed in the report on the final evaluation of the strategic framework for the implementation of the Basel Convention for 2012–2021 (hereinafter referred to as the evaluation report)¹. Further information related to the Basel Convention as well as basic strategic planning and performance measurement rules were also considered in the development of the findings and recommendations.

3. In keeping with the mandate provided by the Conference of the Parties (COP)², the findings and recommendations in this draft report were developed on the basis of those identified in the evaluation report and as such, the vision and guiding principles of the strategic framework for 2012–2021 are not discussed in this report.

II. Overarching issues

4. The evaluation report brings forward overarching recommendations that are most relevant for the preparation of this report, these are: 2030 timing; existing data sources; solid and verifiable baseline data; measurable outcome indicators; tracking of legislation; tracking of gender issues; and improved means of implementation of the strategic framework.

Timing of the next strategic framework:

5. **Findings:** the evaluation report proposes to align the strategic framework with the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), in particular targets 12.4 and 12.5 with a general 2030 timing. As Target 12.4 was to be achieved by 2020, it seems like this may not constitute the best basis for determining the timing. One approach may be to align the timing and/or the indicators with the ones of the SDGs that span out to 2030 to allow both instruments to be on the same evaluation cycle and synergistically contribute towards their mutual evaluation. Another approach could be to align with the COP cycles and decide on a suitable period of time. Allowing sufficient time to generate data and information, to progress in implementation at the domestic level, and possibly undertake mid-term reviews needed for measurement is also a relevant consideration. The role of the Secretariat in liaising with the UN Sustainable Development Group and relevant Custodian Agencies to facilitate data sharing between the reporting systems for the Convention and the SDGs should also be considered.

6. **Recommendations:** It is recommended to align the timing of a next strategic framework with the COP cycles, ensuring that sufficient time for data generation and progress measurement is provided. The timing could, for example, be for a six-year period, equivalent to three-COP cycles, for example, from 2025 to 2031, and synchronized with the seventeenth to the nineteenth meetings of the COPs. For a six-year period, a mid-term evaluation would not be needed. If a longer period is preferred, a mid-term evaluation could be required.

¹ UNEP/CHW.15/INF/5: Draft report on the final evaluation of the strategic framework for the implementation of the Basel Convention for 2012–2021.

² UNEP/CHW.15/31/Add.1: Decision BC-15/3 of the report of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal on the work of its resumed fifteenth meeting (face-to-face and high-level segments) (advance).

Verifiable baseline data:

7. **Findings:** the preparation of a verifiable baseline is key to being able to measure progress. Identifying the year of the baseline as well as the availability of the data over the course of the measurement period will be key.

8. **Recommendations:** the baseline year could be decided upon at the same time the next strategic framework starts (e.g. 2025). It should be ensured that the data used to establish the baseline continue to be generated throughout the measurement period and is available for the final evaluation.

Data sources:

9. **Findings:** one of the main challenges that was encountered during the evaluation of the strategic framework of 2012–2021 was the lack of data. There are three sources of information: 1. Information already collected under the Convention; 2. Information collected for other purposes that could be used for the evaluation of a next strategic framework; and 3. Information from specialized data collection exercises such as surveys³. The levels of responses of the two questionnaires used to prepare the baseline and measure progress for the period of 2012–2021 were very low, with a different sampling of Parties each time, making it almost impossible to draw any conclusions with certainty.

10. **Recommendations:** relevant information sources underpinning each indicator should be identified and agreed upon at the same time indicators are developed. Sources of information that is already being collected under the Convention should be prioritized as much as possible and additional surveys should be avoided when possible.

Measurable outcome indicators:

11. **Findings:** indicators can either measure process, i.e., what happens during implementation, for example the adoption of legal or administrative measures or the development of national strategies and plans); or outcomes, i.e., the desired impact of the measures adopted to implement the treaty, for example reductions in the quantity of waste generated.⁴ In the strategic framework for 2012–2021, there were 16 process indicators or sub-indicators and 5 outcome indicators or sub-indicators. Some of these were difficult to measure.

12. **Recommendations:** the next strategic framework should focus on process indicators as these are relevant to measure implementation of Parties' obligations. To the extent possible, outcome indicators could be developed in a greater number relative to that of the 2012–2021 strategic framework to provide a better picture of the results of the Convention implementation. The indicators should be built in a way that would allow measuring of Parties' progress towards the goals and objectives, which are the ultimate desired outcomes.

Tracking of national legislation:

13. **Findings:** the existence of legislation implementing the Convention is still lacking among a significant number of Parties, which is impacting their capacity to fulfil several of their obligations, including to prevent illegal traffic, to develop inventories, and provide national reports, among other things.

14. **Recommendations:** as it is a fundamental underpinning in achieving the objectives of the Convention and as having legislation implementing the Convention is a prerequisite to many other Parties' obligations, measuring this key implementation aspect could be done as part of a new Goal. A new objective and one or more new indicators for tracking legislation development should be included. For example, this could address the contribution of technical guidelines to the development of national legislation. The Implementation and Compliance Committee could contribute to provide the necessary data for the purpose of performance measurement and ensuring consistency with current reporting requirements.

³ <https://www.canada.ca/en/treasury-board-secretariat/services/audit-evaluation/evaluation-government-canada.html>.

⁴ UNEP/FAO/RC/COP.9/INF/22, at paragraph 30.

III. Current goals, objectives and indicators

Goal 1: Effective implementation of Parties' obligations on transboundary movements of hazardous and other wastes

15. **Findings:** this Goal remains highly relevant for the next strategic framework. It focuses on transboundary movement (TBM) obligations with four objectives addressing key elements of TBM. The objectives however also relate to other Convention implementation aspects beyond TBM. The term "effective", although providing a sense of progress toward Parties implementation, is challenging to measure as reaching an understanding of what is "effective" may prove difficult.

16. **Recommendations:** this Goal should be maintained and ensure its objectives are focused on the TBM aspects of Parties implementation, including elements relevant to the Prior Informed Consent (PIC) procedure. Other elements that are not solely relevant to TBM could be included under a separate goal. The objective could be reworded to remove the subjectivity related to the use of the word effective and to read as an outcome statement.

17. *An example could be: Parties implement their obligations on transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and other wastes.*

Objective 1.1: To reach a common understanding among Parties of the definition, interpretation and terminology of wastes covered by the Convention, including the distinction between wastes and non-wastes

18. **Findings:** this objective remains relevant for the next strategic framework. It is however difficult to measure as reaching a "common understanding" can be prevented by a multitude of factors specific to each individual and Party. This objective is relevant to assessing progress in meeting several obligations not limited to those related to TBM.

19. **Recommendations:** this objective should be included under a new goal applicable to several obligations. The objective could be reworded for more clarity and measurability. Other terms that would contribute to clarifying waste covered by the Convention could also be considered in this objective through the indicator(s).

Indicator 1.1: The number of agreed technical guidelines that assist Parties in reaching a common understanding on definitions, interpretations and terminologies covered by the Basel Convention.

20. **Findings:** the indicator partially contributes to measuring performance against the objective. Technical guidelines are important documents supporting Parties' implementation and they contribute to building a common understanding on definitions, interpretations and terminologies of wastes covered by the Convention. Measuring their number is however not directly proportionate to measuring a greater common understanding. Other factors such as translation into local languages and personnel trained are also relevant. In addition, the updates to existing technical guidelines and other documents, such as manuals, guides and glossaries of terms, also contribute to the development of common understandings and yet are not part of this indicator. The absence of the term "waste" in this indicator broadens the concept of definitions, interpretation and terminology to the Convention as a whole. This indicator is also relevant to Objectives 2.1 and 2.4.

21. **Recommendations:** technical guidelines, as well as other relevant documents including their updates, in supporting a common understanding on the definitions, interpretations and terminologies should continue to be recognized. The indicator could focus on measuring the contribution of Convention documents to the definition, interpretation, and terminology of "wastes", and other key terms. The availability of guidelines in different UN languages should be considered.

22. *An example could be: Technical guidelines and other relevant documents developed or updated under the Convention provide information relevant to the definition, interpretation and terminology of wastes and other key terms covered by the Convention.*

Objective 1.2: To prevent and combat illegal traffic in hazardous and other wastes.

23. **Findings:** this objective remains highly relevant and supports this Goal. Achieving this objective contributes to an effective implementation of obligations on TBM of hazardous and other wastes. As to preventing and combating illegal traffic, it is not fully clear what is captured by each of these concepts. The notion of punishment was not included in this objective and yet it is part of Article 9 of the Convention and is referred to in some of the national report questions.

24. **Recommendations:** this objective could be expanded to add the aspect of punishment. While the term “combat” is not part of Article 9, it may be retained in the objective if it relates to measurable activities that support implementation, including those of the Implementation and Compliance Committee. If two or three of the concepts (prevent, combat and punish) are kept in the objective, then an indicator will be needed to measure each of them. This will allow for clarifying the meaning of each concept.

25. *An example could be: Illegal traffic in hazardous wastes and other wastes is prevented, combated, and punished.*

Indicator 1.2: Parties have reached an adequate level of administrative and technical capacity (in the form of Customs, police, environmental enforcement and port authorities, among others) to prevent and combat illegal traffic and judicial capacity to deal with cases of illegal traffic.

Sub-indicators 1.2: Number of Parties that develop and execute training programmes for the staff involved; number of controls and inspections carried out.

26. **Findings:** the indicator includes subjective wording in the form of “adequate”. It somewhat supports the objective in its current wording. Both sub-indicators appear to intend measuring aspects related to combatting illegal traffic and assume that all the required elements in that regard are already in place, which may not be the case. The number of controls and inspections carried out could be a good indicator of the Parties’ capacity to prevent and combat illegal traffic, however, this information is not required in the national report.

27. **Recommendations:** the indicator should be reworded to remove the subjectivity. The sub-indicators should be removed and if needed, additional indicators could be developed. One indicator could cover the notion of having legislation, one indicator could cover the notion of training staff or other technical capacity, and another indicator could cover the notion of judicial capacity. Potential new indicators could reflect information contained in key documents of the Convention, for example toolkits relevant to the implementation of TBM.

Objective 1.3: To improve performance in meeting requirements pertaining to, among other things, notifications of national definitions of hazardous and other wastes, prohibitions and other control measures.

28. **Findings:** this objective remains relevant to this Goal. The objective may however be confusing as it includes notifications of national definitions of other wastes. Also, as it covers several elements (i.e. requirements pertaining to, among other things, notifications of national definitions of hazardous and other wastes, prohibitions and other control measures), its scope is undefined and is challenging to measure. Processes already exists under the Convention for Parties to notify changes to definitions, prohibitions or control measures.

29. **Recommendations:** the objective should be maintained as the notifications included in this objective is central to the operationalization of the Prior Informed Consent procedure and directly support efforts to prevent illegal traffic. The objective should be reworded for greater clarity and accuracy with a defined scope by removing the terms “among other things”. The development of two indicators would enable measurement of notification on both national definitions and prohibitions.

30. *An example could be: National definitions of hazardous wastes, prohibitions and other control measures are made available to all Parties.*

Indicator 1.3: Percentage of Parties that have notified national definitions of hazardous wastes to the Secretariat in accordance with Article 3 of the Basel Convention.

31. **Findings:** this indicator is limited in scope and partially supports the objective as it relates solely to notification of national definitions of hazardous wastes. Parties’ notification of prohibitions and other control measures is not measured by the current indicator.

32. **Recommendations:** developing an additional indicator would enable measuring notifications of prohibitions and other control measures. The indicator may also include a notion of timeliness. The indicator should be aligned with current requirements under the national report.

33. *An example could be: Notifications of national definitions of hazardous wastes, prohibitions and other control measures are provided to the Secretariat subsequently to entry into force at the domestic level using relevant forms and the national report.*

Objective 1.4: To generate, provide, collect, transmit and use reliable qualitative and quantitative information and data regarding export, import and generation as required under Article 13 of the Convention.

34. **Findings:** this objective remains relevant. Its scope however ranges beyond information to support obligations related to TBM, which is the primary focus of the Goal. It includes several aspects namely: generate, provide, collect, transmit and use of a variety of types of information, such as export, import and generation of waste, which would all have to be taken into consideration when measuring progress.

35. **Recommendations:** this objective should be maintained in its current form given its alignment with Article 13 of the Convention. It could however be part of a new goal applicable to several obligations given its relevance to reporting obligations.

Indicator 1.4: Percentage of Parties reporting information to the Secretariat under Article 13.

36. **Findings:** the indicator partly contributes to measuring performance against the objective but not entirely as it relates only to the transmission of data. In addition, the mere submission of a national report by a Party does not allow for complete measurement of this objective given the rate of incomplete reports submitted. As reporting levels under the Convention remain low, certain aspects relying on data generated through national reporting are more challenging to measure.

37. **Recommendations:** a general indicator on the reporting levels should remain. Alternatively, several indicators covering each aspect of the objective may be developed.

Goal 2: Strengthening the environmentally sound management of hazardous and other wastes

38. **Findings:** this Goal remains highly relevant. Reframing this Goal towards a desired outcome would facilitate its measurement and reduce the subjectivity, measurement and operationalization challenges arising from the use of the word “strengthening”.

39. **Recommendations:** it is proposed to review the wording of this Goal for greater clarity and to read as an outcome statement

40. *An example could be: Parties shall ensure that hazardous wastes and other wastes are managed in an environmentally sound manner.*

Objective 2.1: To pursue the development of environmentally sound management of hazardous and other wastes, especially through the preparation of technical guidelines, and to promote its implementation in national legislation.

41. **Findings:** this objective supports Goal 2, however the use of “pursue the development” introduces an unclear meaning. The objective also includes two different aspects linked to the development of ESM approaches, namely the preparation of technical guidelines, and the implementation of ESM via national legislation. Of note, findings under Objective 1.1 in relation to technical guidelines are also relevant to this objective.

42. **Recommendations:** the objective should be streamlined to focus on implementation of ESM in national legislation and expand to other measures that Parties may have in place, such as guidance developed at the national level. An additional objective could be developed to ensure that the Convention provides information on the ESM of waste covered by the Convention. This new objective should also take into account the value of providing Parties with knowledge on the ESM of waste through the use of the ESM toolkit and technical guidelines.

Indicator 2.1: Number of Parties with national hazardous waste management strategies or plans in place.

Sub-indicator 2.1: Number of guidelines on environmentally sound management of wastes developed.

43. **Findings:** the indicator and sub-indicator are partly relevant to the objective. The indicator focuses on activities to be undertaken at the national level, while the sub-indicator is likely referring to guidelines under the Convention. The relationship between the indicator and the sub-indicator is not logical and performance in relation to the sub-indicator does not contribute to performance in relation to the indicator. This indicator partially duplicates Objective 2.2 in relation to waste generation and

reduction. The findings related to technical guidelines under the indicator of Objective 1.1 in relation to technical guidelines is also relevant to this objective.

44. **Recommendations:** the current indicator is relevant to the aspect of ESM in national legislation included in the objective and could be maintained. It is recommended to remove the sub-indicator. Depending on the scope of a revised objective, new indicators focusing solely on the ESM aspects may be needed.

45. *Examples could include:*

Indicator: COP decisions adopting a new or a substantially updated technical guideline or guidance document include that the Secretariat, in cooperation with the regional and coordinating centres under the Basel Convention (BCRCs) provide the means of dissemination, learning and use of such technical guideline or guidance document.

Indicator: Newly adopted or substantially updated technical guideline or guidance document is disseminated to all Parties by the Secretariat, including one short document developed by the Secretariat explaining how such technical guideline or guidance document can be used at the national level.

Indicator: Webinar or other training is offered by the Secretariat, in cooperation with BCRCs, for all relevant regions for each newly adopted or substantially updated technical guideline or guidance document.

Indicator: Training activities on each new or substantially updated technical guideline or guidance document are included in budget activity fact sheets of upcoming biennia and included in the proposed work programme and budget and other relevant meeting documents prepared by the Secretariat for consideration by the COP.

Objective 2.2: To pursue the prevention and minimization of hazardous waste and other waste generation at source, especially through supporting and promoting activities designed to reduce at the national level the generation and hazard potential of hazardous and other wastes.

46. **Findings:** this objective is highly relevant to this Goal as prevention and minimization are important parts of ESM. Prevention may include strict avoidance, source reduction and direct reuse. Minimization includes strict avoidance, source reduction, direct reuse, reuse and recycling⁵. There is overlap between objectives 2.2 and 2.3 which include several similar points. Similar to Objective 2.1 this objective lacks clarity by using “to pursue” which is challenging to measure. The objective appears to give prominence to reducing waste generation at source through the use of the term “especially”. This objective is relevant to Target 12.5⁶ of SDG 12.

47. **Recommendations:** this objective should be maintained and could be reworded to focus on the measures implemented by Parties to prevent and minimize the generation of waste and/or the outcomes of such measures, so as to reduce the overlap with Objective 2.3. The concepts of supporting and promoting activities related to capacity building could be removed and integrated in objectives 2.3. Different indicators could be developed to reflect the two concepts of prevention and minimization and/or the concepts of measures and outcomes.

48. *An example could be: Parties shall ensure that measures to prevent and minimize the generation of hazardous wastes and other wastes are implemented.*

Indicator 2.2: Number of Parties that have developed and implemented national strategies, plans or programmes for reducing the generation and hazard potential of hazardous and other wastes.

Sub-indicator 2.2: Number of Parties that have implemented systems for measuring hazardous waste generation in order to assess progress in selected hazardous waste streams and to reduce the generation and hazard potential of hazardous wastes and other wastes.

49. **Findings:** the indicator and sub-indicators may not fully contribute to measuring performance against the objective as the mere existence of strategies, plans, programmes and measuring systems

⁵ UNEP/CHW.13/INF/11/Rev.1: Guidance to assist Parties in developing efficient strategies for achieving the prevention and minimization of the generation of hazardous and other wastes and their disposal.

⁶ Target 12.5: By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse.

may not amount to actual waste reductions. Indicators 12.4.2 and 12.5.1⁷ of the SDGs are relevant to this objective.

50. **Recommendations:** it is recommended to maintain the current indicator. Additional indicators could be developed based on the SDG targets and indicators related to this objective. This would allow for measuring results of efforts undertaken in order to prevent and minimize waste generation and contribute data to the SDG process while leveraging data generated through reporting under the SDGs. It is recommended to remove the sub-indicator and to rather develop an indicator addressing measuring systems.

Objective 2.3: To support and promote capacity-building for Parties, including technological capability, through technology needs assessments and technology transfer, so as to reduce the generation and hazard potential of hazardous and other wastes.

51. **Findings:** this objective remains highly relevant to this Goal as it is linked to waste prevention and minimization which in turn are directly related to ESM. Similar to the previous objective, Objective 2.3 relates to reduction of waste generation and hazard potential of hazardous and other wastes while focusing on capacity-building. The prominence of technological capability as the focus of capacity-building brings uncertainty as to whether the measurement of progress should be limited to technological capability or also include other types of capabilities.

52. **Recommendations:** this objective should be kept and could be reworded for greater clarity. It could also include the notion of prioritisation to evaluate the allocation of resources accordingly.

53. *An example could be: Capacity-building relevant to the technological capability needed for Parties to reduce the generation of hazardous wastes and other wastes is supported.*

Indicator 2.3: Number of Parties that have developed and implemented national strategies, plans or programmes for hazardous waste minimization.

Sub-indicators 2.3:

Number of Parties receiving capacity-building support that report reductions in hazardous waste generation;

Number of Parties receiving capacity-building support for hazardous waste minimization.

54. **Findings:** the indicator does not allow to measure performance against the objective and is duplicative of indicators in objective 2.2. The terms “reductions” and “minimization” seem to be used interchangeably between the different indicators and sub-indicators under Objectives 2.2 and 2.3 notwithstanding that “reductions” is also part of “prevention”. The relationship between the indicator and the objective is not logical and the indicator is repetitive of the indicator under objective 2.2. In addition, while the goal and objective cover both hazardous and other waste; the indicator and sub-indicators cover only hazardous waste.

55. **Recommendations:** the indicator should be reworded to align with the scope of the objective, avoid confusion between terms (i.e. reduction, prevention and minimization) and overlap with objectives 2.2. The sub-indicators should be removed and new indicators developed as appropriate. Information on capacity-building activities provided to Parties, such as the type and number of activities, could be considered.

Objective 2.4: To facilitate national, regional and international commitment with regard to the management of priority waste streams, as identified in the programme of work of the Convention, taking into consideration the priorities of developing countries and countries with economies in transition and in accordance with the requirements of the Convention.

56. **Findings:** this objective is relevant to Goal 2. Its scope is however unclear and challenging to measure: it is limited in the sense that it targets priority waste streams only, and yet very broad as it covers commitments to manage priority waste streams at the national, regional and international levels, and it is unclear what is meant with “commitments”. The objective lacks a clear outcome.

57. **Recommendations:** the objective should be maintained and reworded in a manner that more directly relates to the Goal. The notion of commitment is key and should be retained and clarified.

⁷ Indicator 12.4.2: Hazardous waste generated per capita and proportion of hazardous waste treated, by type of treatment. Indicator 12.5.1: National recycling rate, tons of material recycled.

58. *An example could be: Commitments made at the national, regional or international levels to achieve the environmentally sound management of hazardous wastes and other wastes are maintained and expanded, taking into consideration the programme of work and obligations of the Convention.*

Indicator 2.4: Number of programmes, projects or activities carried out by Parties, jointly with other Parties or together with other stakeholders (regional and international organizations, conventions, industry bodies, etc.), aimed at the environmentally sound management of priority waste streams that have been monitored and assessed to achieve this goal.

59. Findings: the scope of the indicator is very broad and challenging to measure with three levels of undertaking that may be carried out by an infinite number of bodies, with any combinations possible. The result of this is a high number of activities but it is unclear if they are relevant to the objective. There is also no common system within the Basel Convention to report consistently on such undertakings, and not every undertaking will have the same outcomes, if ever monitored and assessed as per the indicator.

60. Recommendations: it is recommended to streamline the indicator to provide more clarity on which aspects it is measuring. In order to retain different valuable aspects of the indicator, it may be suitable to develop additional indicators. The resources mobilized and the specific contribution of regional centres could be relevant aspects to consider for the indicators.

Objective 2.5: To enhance and promote the sustainable use of resources by improving the management of hazardous and other wastes and to encourage the recognition of wastes as a resource, where appropriate.

61. Findings: this objective is similar to some of the guiding principles identified in section II of the strategic framework and as such, has limited value in assessing progress in the implementation of the Convention. This objective does not appear to be directly related to obligations of the Convention and is very challenging to measure.

62. Recommendations: in the event that objective 2.5 is removed, it is recommended to explore whether certain aspects it contains, for instance related to circularity, could be included in a more specific manner under the other objectives under Goal 2.

Indicator 2.5: percentage of Parties that collect information on the generation, management and disposal of hazardous and other wastes.

Sub-indicators 2.5:

Number of training and awareness-raising activities undertaken to enhance and promote the sustainable use of resources;

Percentage of Parties that require the separation of hazardous wastes from non hazardous other wastes;

Percentage of Parties that have national inventories on the generation and disposal of hazardous wastes and other wastes;

Percentage of selected Convention waste streams reused, recycled or recovered.

63. Findings: the indicator is not relevant to the objective as it only requires a percentage of Parties collecting information on the generation, management and disposal of hazardous and other wastes, and does not request an analysis of the data collected. Reporting is covered under Objective 1.4 and including reporting under this objective is redundant. The first sub-indicator is linked to the objective but not the indicator. It is very broad, in particular as it refers to “sustainable use of resources” which is not a term commonly used under the Convention and is open to interpretation. The other three indicators are linked to the objective and indirectly to the indicator as the data needed to measure these sub-indicators should normally come from reporting. Sub-indicator 3 about inventories has a much broader impact than the subject of objective 2.5. Sub-indicator 4 is related to indicator 12.5.1 of Goal 12 of the SDGs and duplicates measurement under Objective 2.2.

64. Recommendations: in the event that Objective 2.5 is removed, the indicator and sub-indicators should also be removed. Where appropriate, aspects of these indicators and sub-indicators that are measurable may be included under other objectives in keeping with the commonly used terminology of the Convention. For example, the aspect of having inventories, which is linked to the current objective 1.4, could be covered under the new goal.

Goal 3: Promoting the implementation of the environmentally sound management of hazardous and other wastes as an essential contribution to the attainment of sustainable livelihood, the Millennium Development Goals and the protection of human health and the environment

65. Findings: the subject of Goal 3 is duplicative of Goal 2, as both are about the ESM of hazardous wastes and other wastes. The only difference between the two is that Goal 3 is presented as a means to contribute to sustainable livelihood, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and the protection of human health and the environment. The first objective under the Goal relates to integrating waste management issues into national sustainable development strategies and plans. The second objective relates to the coordination with the other conventions.

66. Recommendations: a reframed Goal 3 may add value by allowing the development of objectives and indicators relating to obligations that range beyond or are not adequately addressed under the other Goals. This new goal could be presented as Goal 1 given its possible overarching nature and contribution to completing the two goals.

Objective 3.1: To develop national and regional capacity, particularly through the Basel Convention regional and coordinating centres, by integrating waste management issues into national sustainable development strategies and plans for sustainable livelihood.

67. Findings: this objective relates to the development of capacity which is duplicative of Objective 2.3. The Goal only refers to capacity being developed but is vague on the nature of the capacity. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) replaced the MDGs in 2015, and SDG 12 was developed with targets specific to hazardous and other wastes. The MDGs are no longer relevant and the data collected for measuring progress under the SDGs is not relevant for this objective. The development of capacity, the integration of waste management issues into national sustainable development strategies and plans, and the support of BCRCs are all very important elements that can contribute to the ESM of hazardous wastes and other wastes.

68. Recommendations: depending on the desired outcome of this objective, it could either remain under this Goal if the outcome is to develop capacity supporting implementation of a range of obligations beyond TBM or ESM. If a narrower scope for this objective is desired, then it could be moved under the Goal where it is the most relevant. The new objective could consider how the Convention supports the regional and coordinating centres in delivering these activities, such as the amount of funds and the number of projects carried out by the Secretariat or other Parties.

Indicator 3.1: Number of Parties reporting, through the Secretariat, to the Conference of Parties on the integration of waste and hazardous waste issues into their national development plans or strategies.

69. Findings: the indicator refers to “national development plans and strategies” while the objective refers to “national sustainable development plans and strategies”. The indicator was likely inspired by target 7.A of the MDGs: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources, from Goal 7 – Ensure environmental sustainability. A substantial number of Parties indicated having integrated waste management issues. No Parties have requested assistance to the Conference of the Parties to assist them in doing so despite a decision made at COP-13 in that regard.

70. Recommendations: this indicator may be reworded or other indicators may be developed according to the revised objective. Funding aspects could also be covered as appropriate.

Objective 3.2: To promote cooperation with national, regional and international bodies, in particular cooperation and coordination between the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, to improve environmental and working conditions through the environmentally sound management of hazardous and other wastes.

71. Findings: this objective is linked to the Goal. It was interpreted in the report of the final evaluation as a whole: promoting cooperation with the aim of improving environmental and working conditions. A synergies process for the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions was established and is deemed sufficient.

72. Recommendations: the objective could either be removed in light of the synergies process in place under the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions or reworded to consider cooperation beyond the three conventions and included where relevant in a new structure of a future strategic framework.

Indicator 3.2: number of activities on common issues undertaken by the bodies under the three conventions.

73. Findings: this indicator is very broad; the word “bodies” was defined in the report of the final evaluation to limit its scope.

74. Recommendations: similar to the recommendation for the objective, it is recommended to remove this indicator.

IV. Means of implementation

75. Findings: the strategic framework for 2012–2021 identified the desired outcomes (goals and objectives) and indicators and sub-indicators to measure performance against them, but did not identify how performance would be improved from the baseline. In section IV of the strategic framework for 2012–2021, there was a list of mechanisms that could support its implementation but there was not clear path forward established as activities to implement the strategic framework were to be agreed upon at each meeting of the conference of the Parties.

76. Document UNEP/CHW.15/3 provided relevant linkages between the strategic framework and the various decisions for the consideration of the Conference of the Parties. Although these linkages were helpful to keep in mind the objectives of the strategic framework, they did not ensure that the relevant activities agreed upon were aligned with the goals and objectives of the framework.

77. Recommendation: should the COP decide to prepare a next strategic framework, it could also consider developing recommendations on how such framework can be used to inform the decision making process of the COP. Consideration could also be given to how each goal and objective could be reflected in the means of implementation. That would ensure its goals and objectives are integrated and used to inform which activities are to be undertaken by the Parties and others.

V. Evaluation

78. Findings: the strategic framework for 2012–2021 covered a period of 10 years and included a mid-term and a final evaluation. The mid-term evaluation was not carried out because of a number of factors including the lack of funding.

79. The final evaluation led to a comprehensive report on the implementation of the Convention including its accomplishments and limitations during the evaluated period and recommendations for the consideration of the COP. The preparation of the final evaluation was also somehow challenging because of a lack of data, linkages between the goals, objectives and indicators were not always logical, and of the lack of clarity due to the use of subjective or undefined wordings, the use of examples and the fusion of many elements in one statement. Furthermore, additional sources of information relevant to each indicator had to be identified in order to carry out the evaluation.

80. Recommendations: It is recommended that changes be made to the next strategic framework as described in this report in order to enhance clarity of goals, objectives and indicators and improve logical links between them. Such changes could also take into consideration the transformative approaches relevant to waste management. Available sources of information, or any new source of information, should be drawn upon to support measurement of the strategic framework. Furthermore, to facilitate the evaluation of a next strategic framework, it is recommended to develop approaches for indicator measurement from the beginning. The process leading to the evaluation of a next strategic framework should be defined by the COP and the same time that it adopts the next strategic framework.

VI. Conclusion

81. This draft report provides findings and recommendations developed by the SIWG on how to improve the strategic framework.

82. In relation to the goals of the next strategic framework, it is recommended to have a new overarching goal to measure Parties’ implementation related to obligations that are central to the Convention. This could include national definition of hazardous wastes and Parties legislation implementing the Convention. The existing goals which are more specific to obligations related to TBM and ESM or referring to collaboration should remain and could be revised to enhance clarity and be complementary to the overarching goal.

83. The objectives should be revised to ensure they are as specific as possible (e.g. written in plain language), measurable, achievable, realistic, time-bound, and fully contribute to attaining their related goal. When required, new objectives could be added as appropriate to further support the revised goals.

84. Indicators should be developed for each aspect included in an objective and supported by available sources of information. It is not recommended to retain or develop new sub-indicators but rather develop additional indicators if needed.

85. Having a strategic framework, including all elements needed for its evaluation, is considered key to enable the COP to evaluate progress towards full implementation of Parties' obligations and the effectiveness of activities undertaken under the umbrella of the Convention. The next strategic framework should be used to assess progress throughout the measurement period and be used as a prioritization tool to inform the COP, and its subsidiary bodies, on future work needed for Parties to achieve the agreed upon objectives and goals.
