



First International Conference Global Framework on Chemicals

16–20 November 2026 | Geneva, Switzerland

Implementation Programme

“Legal frameworks and institutional capacities for the sound management of chemicals and waste”

Title of document: National Self-Assessment Survey based on the Building Blocks for National Systems for the Sound Management of Chemicals

Convenor(s): IOMC / OECD. Bob Diderich.

About this document: This document is the national self-assessment tool accompanying the **Building Blocks for the Sound Management of Chemicals**. It is intended to help countries understand the current status of their national chemicals management systems, identify strengths, gaps and priority areas for action, and determine where technical assistance, capacity-building or financial support may be most useful.

The tool follows the four Building Blocks and can be completed collaboratively by the relevant government agencies and competent authorities. It uses a two-step approach: a **Rapid Overview** for a high-level assessment and a **Full Assessment** for a more detailed review of individual Building Blocks and components. Countries may complete only the Rapid Overview where time or resources are limited, or use it to identify areas requiring deeper analysis.

The self-assessment is not a compliance, ranking or benchmarking exercise and does not prescribe a single regulatory model. Results should be interpreted in light of national circumstances and used to support prioritisation, planning, coordination and capacity-building.



Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals

A cooperative agreement among FAO, ILO,
UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR, WHO, WORLD
BANK, OECD, and BRS Conventions

National Self-Assessment Survey

Building Blocks for the Sound Management of Chemicals

Draft version - September 2026

Target audience:

Government agencies and competent authorities with responsibilities related to chemicals management, including ministries of environment, health, labour, agriculture, trade, customs and industry.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	3
Purpose of this Survey	5
Two-step approach	5
How to complete this survey	5
Completion tracking	5
Working Definitions	6
Country Profile Summary	9
CPS.1 Basic identifying information	9
CPS.2 Coordination and institutional responsibilities	9
CPS.3 Legal and policy context	9
CPS.4 Sectors covered by existing chemicals management systems	9
CPS.5 Industrial and economic context	10
PART 1 — Rapid Overview	12
Building Block 1: Governance and enabling conditions	12
Building Block 2: Information and transparency	12
Building Block 3: Risk management and control	13
Building Block 4: Legacy management and market transformation	14
Cross-cutting priorities	14
PART 2 — Full Assessment	16
Building Block 1: Governance and Enabling Conditions	16
1.1 Framework legislation/policy and institutional setup	16
1.2 Sustainable financing and economic viability	19
1.3 International integration	20
1.4 Enforcement, compliance assurance and trade control	21
1.5 Governance and stakeholder coordination	23
1.6 Monitoring, evaluation and learning	24
Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 1	25
Building Block 2: Information and Transparency	26
2.1 Hazard classification and labelling: The GHS	26
2.2 Harmonised data quality and mutual acceptance of data (GLP, MAD)	28
2.3 Pollutant release and transfer registers (PRTR)	29
2.4 Transparency, disclosure and information systems	31
Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 2	32
Building Block 3: Risk Management and Control	33
3.1.A Regulation for chemical products for specific uses	33
3.1.B Regulation for industrial and consumer chemical substances	35
3.2 Occupational safety and health (OSH) requirements	38

3.3 Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness (CAPPR)	39
3.4 Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC/BAT)	41
3.5 Public health management of chemicals	42
Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 3	43
Building Block 4: Legacy Management and Market Transformation	44
4.1 Environmental and legacy management	44
4.2 Product and supply chain measures (product standards, circular economy)	46
4.3 Green and sustainable chemistry innovation.....	48
Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 4	49
Final Section — Overall Assessment and Priority Needs	50
Three most urgent gaps or priorities	50
Areas where technical assistance, capacity-building or financial support would be most helpful.....	50
Follow-up	50
Readiness and Next Steps	52
R.1 Areas for priority attention.....	52
R.2 Type of support needed	52
R.3 Most important next step	52
R.4 Additional comments on next steps	52
Appendix: Summary Score Sheet.....	52

Purpose of this Survey

This survey is a national self-assessment tool designed to support countries in: (a) identifying gaps and priorities in their national systems for the sound management of chemicals (SMC); (b) planning and strengthening national chemicals management systems; and (c) identifying areas where technical assistance, capacity-building or financial support would be most beneficial.

The survey is not a compliance assessment, maturity ranking or benchmarking tool. It does not compare countries or suggest that one regulatory approach is superior to another. Countries have different legal traditions, institutional structures, risk profiles and policy priorities. Any aggregated analysis should be used only to identify common challenges and shared capacity-building needs — not to rank countries.

Two-step approach

Step 1 — Rapid Overview (Part 1, approximately 30–45 minutes): A concise set of high-level questions providing an initial overview of the national system. Countries may complete only this step if resources or time are limited.

Step 2 — Full Assessment (Part 2, approximately 3–5 hours): A detailed diagnostic assessment of each building block. May be completed in multiple sittings and coordinated across relevant authorities.

How to complete this survey

- Complete the sections relevant to your national context.
- Select the response that best reflects the current national situation.
- Use **"Not applicable"** only where a function is genuinely not relevant or has been deliberately deprioritised based on national circumstances and a risk-informed approach (see Working Definitions below).
- Use **"Not in place"** where a function is relevant to the national context but has not yet been established, implemented or operationalised.
- Where different arrangements apply across sectors, jurisdictions or competent authorities, explain these differences in the supporting information field.
- Where a function is established or operating in some ministries, sectors or jurisdictions but not others, select the 'Partially in place' or 'Partially operational' option and describe the differences in the supporting information field. Do not select 'Not in place' where a system exists but national coverage is incomplete.
- The survey may be completed collaboratively by multiple institutions. Partial responses are acceptable and may be updated as additional information becomes available.
- Each question includes its response options directly within the survey. Select the option that best reflects the national situation. For multi-select questions, tick all options that apply.
- Navigation boxes (highlighted in yellow) indicate when it may be appropriate to skip specific sub-sections. These are intended to reduce respondent burden where certain functions are not yet relevant or established.
- Where available, provide examples, references or supporting information to help contextualise responses and facilitate interpretation of results.

Completion tracking

Use the progress table below to track completion. Check the box once a section is complete or assign it to the responsible authority.

✓	Section	Part	Est. time	Completed by
---	---------	------	-----------	--------------

☐	Country Profile Summary	Both	10–15 min	
☐	Part 1 — Rapid Overview (all building blocks)	Part 1	30–45 min	
☐	BB1: Governance and enabling conditions	Part 2	45–60 min	
☐	BB2: Information and transparency	Part 2	30–45 min	
☐	BB3: Risk management and control	Part 2	60–90 min	
☐	BB4: Legacy management and market transformation	Part 2	30–45 min	
☐	Final Section — Overall assessment and priority needs	Both	15 min	

Working Definitions

The following definitions support consistent interpretation across countries. They are practical working definitions for this survey and do not replace definitions in national legislation. Countries should classify their system according to the information required, the timing of submission and the regulatory consequence, regardless of which term national legislation uses. Where a national system does not correspond exactly to a definition below, select the closest function and explain the national terminology in the supporting information field. The examples given are illustrative only and are not presented as models to be followed.

Term	Working definition for purposes of this survey	Illustrative examples (examples only — not universal)
Inventory	A national system used to identify chemical substances manufactured, imported, placed on the market and/or used within a jurisdiction. Inventories may support prioritisation, information management, risk assessment and regulatory oversight.	
Registration*	A regulatory procedure through which a defined set of information on a chemical substance or product — which may include identity, physico-chemical, toxicological and ecotoxicological data, intended uses and volumes — is submitted to a competent authority in connection with manufacture, import or placing on the market. The scope of the required information varies considerably between systems, as does the regulatory consequence: in some systems the authority must approve, accept or acknowledge the submission before the activity may lawfully proceed; in others the submission itself completes the obligation. Classify a national system as registration where a defined information package must be submitted and the authority reviews, accepts or acts on it.	REACH: submission of a registration dossier containing prescribed information to ECHA for substances manufactured or imported above applicable tonnage thresholds. ARCP guidance has used a narrower formulation — “submission of physical, chemical, simple and advanced toxicological data to a competent authority, with the authority’s approval” — which describes one type of registration system and should not be read as implying that all registration systems require the same data set or a formal approval decision.
Notification*	A regulatory procedure through which specified information on a substance, mixture, product or activity is communicated to a competent authority, generally without a prior approval decision being	TSCA: a Premanufacture Notice must be submitted before a new chemical substance is manufactured

	required before the activity may proceed. Notification obligations are usually triggered by a defined event — for example placing a new substance on the market for the first time, exceeding a volume threshold, or assigning a hazard classification. The authority may review the notification and subsequently object, request further information or impose conditions. Classify a national system as notification where the duty is to inform the authority and the activity may proceed unless the authority intervenes.	or imported. CLP: manufacturers and importers must notify the classification and labelling of substances placed on the market. Other systems operate simplified inventory or declaration notifications. National terminology varies and none of these examples is definitive.
Licensing / Authorisation	A formal decision by a competent authority allowing specified activities involving a substance or product under defined conditions.	Under REACH, authorisation allows specific uses of substances listed in Annex XIV where risks are adequately controlled or socio-economic benefits outweigh risks.
Restriction	A legally binding measure limiting manufacture, import, export, placing on the market or use of a substance, mixture or product.	Under REACH, a restriction is any condition for, or prohibition of, manufacture, use or placing on the market of a substance.
Ban / Prohibition	A legally binding measure prohibiting a substance, product or specific use.	
Substance of Concern	A substance identified as warranting regulatory attention because of hazardous properties, exposure potential, persistence, bioaccumulation, mobility or other characteristics of concern.	
Obsolete Chemicals		FAO defines obsolete pesticides as pesticides that can no longer be used for their intended purpose or cannot easily be modified for such use.
Hazard Assessment	Evaluation of the intrinsic hazardous properties of a substance or mixture.	Closely aligned with WHO/IPCS and OECD hazard identification concepts.
Risk Assessment		OECD Glossary: a process intended to calculate or estimate risk to a given organism, system or population.
Risk Management	Process of identifying, selecting and implementing measures to reduce, control or prevent risks.	
Chemicals in Products	Chemical substances intentionally added to, present in, or generated by products and articles.	

Priority Substance	A substance formally identified for further assessment, monitoring or risk management.	
--------------------	--	--

** Distinguishing registration from notification: the practical difference is usually the regulatory consequence, not the label. Where the authority must take a decision before the activity may lawfully proceed, the function is closer to registration, licensing or authorisation. Where the obligation is to inform the authority and the activity may proceed unless the authority intervenes, the function is closer to notification. Where a national system combines both — for example submission of a dossier followed by automatic listing — describe it in the supporting information field rather than forcing it into one category.*

Country Profile Summary

Instructions

Please provide a brief overview of your national context before responding to survey questions. This information helps to interpret survey results and tailor capacity-building support. It is not used for comparison or ranking purposes.

CPS.1 Basic identifying information

Country:

Click here to enter text

Ministry or agency completing this survey:

Click here to enter text

Date of completion:

Click here to enter text

CPS.2 Coordination and institutional responsibilities

Key ministries and agencies with responsibilities related to chemicals management:

Click here to enter text

Distribution of responsibilities (which authority is responsible for what):

Click here to enter text

CPS.3 Legal and policy context

Main legal instruments for chemicals management (legislation, regulations, decrees):

Click here to enter text

Current national priorities for chemicals management:

Click here to enter text

CPS.4 Sectors covered by existing chemicals management systems

Select all sectors currently covered:

- ☐ Industrial chemicals
- ☐ Pesticides / agrochemicals
- ☐ Biocides
- ☐ Pharmaceuticals
- ☐ Food additives and food contact materials
- ☐ Cosmetics

- ☐ Occupational / workplace safety
- ☐ Transport of dangerous goods
- ☐ Storage, warehousing and distribution of chemicals
- ☐ Environmental protection (pollution, waste, contaminated sites)
- ☐ Other: [specify]

CPS.5 Industrial and economic context

The following information supports interpretation of survey responses and planning of capacity-building activities. Please provide approximate or estimated information where precise data are unavailable.

CPS.5.1 Approximate national income classification: ▼

Options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

CPS.5.2 Main industrial sectors present in the country (select all that apply): ▼

- ☐ Manufacturing (general / light industry)
- ☐ Chemical manufacturing (bulk chemicals, specialty chemicals, agrochemicals)
- ☐ Mining and extractives
- ☐ Petroleum / petrochemicals / refining
- ☐ Pharmaceuticals / biotechnology
- ☐ Food and beverage processing
- ☐ Textile / leather / tanning
- ☐ Metal smelting / battery recycling
- ☐ Agriculture (large-scale)
- ☐ Other: [specify]

CPS.5.3 Primary role of the country in the chemicals supply chain (select all that apply): ▼

- ☐ Producer of bulk or commodity chemicals
- ☐ Formulator (produces finished chemical products from intermediates)
- ☐ Major importer of chemicals or chemical products
- ☐ Major exporter of chemicals or chemical products
- ☐ Primarily a downstream user (industry, agriculture, services)
- ☐ Transit country (significant transshipment of chemicals)

CPS.5.4 Approximate importance of chemicals-intensive industries to the national economy: ▼

Options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

CPS.5.5 Are there significant chemical manufacturing facilities (including agrochemical, pharmaceutical, or petrochemical production) operating in the country? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

If yes, briefly describe the main types of facilities:

[Click here to enter text](#)

CPS.5.6 Scale of SME (small and medium enterprise) participation in chemicals-related sectors: ▼

Options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

CPS.5.7 Does the country have major ports, industrial hubs or chemical distribution centres that represent key risk or control points? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

If yes, briefly describe:

Click here to enter text

CPS.5.7.a Are chemical storage, warehousing and distribution facilities (including those at the ports, industrial hubs and distribution centres identified above) subject to national regulatory oversight such as licensing, permitting or inspection? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

CPS.5.8 Any other contextual information that may help to interpret survey responses: ▼

Click here to enter text

CPS.5.9 Key strengths of the current national chemicals management system: ▼

Click here to enter text

CPS.5.10 Key challenges and gaps: ▼

Click here to enter text

PART 1 — Rapid Overview

Instructions for Part 1

Estimated time: approximately 30–45 minutes. Use the response options shown for each question to select the most appropriate option.

Countries may complete Part 1 only, or use it to identify areas for deeper analysis in Part 2.

Response options | Response scale:

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status questions): Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place.

B — Implementation (questions about operation in practice): Not applicable | Not operational | Early stages | Partially operational | Largely operational | Fully operational.

Use 'Partially in place' or 'Partially operational' where a system exists in some ministries, sectors or jurisdictions but national coverage is incomplete. Use 'Not in place' or 'Not operational' only where the function has not been established at all.

Building Block 1: Governance and enabling conditions

1.1 What is the overall status of the legal and institutional framework for chemicals management in your country? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

1.2 To what extent are governance functions operational in practice (active institutions, functioning coordination, enforcement)? ▼

B — Implementation (operational in practice) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Do the responses above vary across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions?

- ☐ Yes — national coverage is uneven (describe below)
- ☐ No — the responses apply nationally

Main constraints or priorities, and any differences across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions (optional):

Click here to enter text

Building Block 2: Information and transparency

2.1 What is the overall status of GHS implementation and application across sectors? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Note: GHS implementation may differ by sector and GHS revision adopted. Describe differences below if relevant.

2.2 What is the status of PRTR or equivalent systems for reporting on industrial chemical releases? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

2.3 To what extent are systems in place for transparency and disclosure of information on chemicals in products, supply chains or corporate reporting? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

2.4 To what extent are information and transparency functions operational in practice (hazard classification and labelling applied by industry, reporting actually received and processed, information accessible to authorities, workers and the public)? ▼

B — Implementation (operational in practice) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Do the responses above vary across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions?

- ☐ Yes — national coverage is uneven (describe below)
- ☐ No — the responses apply nationally

Main constraints or priorities, and any differences across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions (optional):

Click here to enter text

Building Block 3: Risk management and control

Part A: For each sector or product group, indicate the current level of regulatory development by ticking one box per row. Use the same scale as Part 2 (B — Implementation). Tick 'Not applicable' where the sector or product group does not exist in your country, and 'Partially operational' where a system operates in some ministries, sectors or jurisdictions but national coverage is incomplete.

Sector / product group	Not applicable	Not operational	Early stages	Partially operational	Largely operational	Fully operational
Industrial and consumer substances	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pesticides	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Biocides	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pharmaceuticals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Food additives / food contact materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cosmetics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other: [specify]	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Part B: For each cross-cutting control system, indicate the current level of implementation by ticking one box per row. Use the same scale as Part 2 (B — Implementation). Tick 'Not applicable' where the control system is not relevant, and 'Partially operational' where a system operates in some ministries, sectors or jurisdictions but national coverage is incomplete.

Control system	Not applicable	Not operational	Early stages	Partially operational	Largely operational	Fully operational
Occupational safety and health (OSH) — chemical safety	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC/BAT)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Chemical accident prevention and preparedness (CAPPR)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public health functions (poison centres, surveillance)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do the responses above vary across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions?

- ☐ Yes — national coverage is uneven (describe below)
- ☐ No — the responses apply nationally

Main constraints or priorities, and any differences across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions (optional):

Click here to enter text

Building Block 4: Legacy management and market transformation

4.1 What is the overall status of environmental and legacy chemical management (contaminated sites, obsolete chemicals, chemical waste)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

4.2 What is the status of systems to manage chemicals in products and supply chains (disclosure, restrictions, traceability)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

4.3 What is the status of policies or programmes to promote green and sustainable chemistry innovation? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework (status) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

4.4 To what extent are legacy management and market transformation functions operational in practice (chemical waste and contaminated sites actually managed, product and supply-chain measures applied, green chemistry programmes delivering)? ▼

B — Implementation (operational in practice) | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Do the responses above vary across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions?

- ☐ Yes — national coverage is uneven (describe below)
- ☐ No — the responses apply nationally

Main constraints or priorities, and any differences across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions (optional):

Click here to enter text

Cross-cutting priorities

What are the main constraints affecting chemicals management in your country? (Select up to 5)

- ☐ Gaps in legal frameworks
- ☐ Fragmented institutional mandates or weak coordination
- ☐ Limited enforcement and compliance capacity
- ☐ Insufficient or unreliable data on chemicals
- ☐ Limited technical or scientific capacity
- ☐ Insufficient and unsustainable financing
- ☐ Limited laboratory, waste management or monitoring infrastructure
- ☐ Limited access to international data, tools or expertise
- ☐ Language or communication barriers
- ☐ Other: [specify]

Which building blocks require the most urgent attention? (Select up to 3)

- ☐ Building Block 1: Governance, coordination and legal frameworks
- ☐ Building Block 2: Hazard information, data quality, transparency
- ☐ Building Block 3: Chemical regulation, workplace safety, accident prevention, public health
- ☐ Building Block 4: Legacy management, products, green chemistry

Describe one key priority action:

Click here to enter text

PART 2 — Full Assessment

Instructions for Part 2

For each building block, questions are organised around: (A) legal framework; (B) implementation in practice; (C) effectiveness; and (D) supporting information. Use the response options shown for each question. Use tick-boxes for multi-select questions. Use 'Not applicable' only where a function is genuinely not relevant in your national context.

Navigation boxes (shaded yellow) indicate when sections may be skipped. If A.1 of any building block is answered 'Not in place' or 'Not applicable' and no other A-level questions apply, you may proceed directly to the supporting information (section D). This general rule is supplemented by specific skip instructions within each section.

Response scale summary:

Legal framework (A-level questions): Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place.

Implementation (B-level questions): Not operational | Early stages | Partially operational | Largely operational | Fully operational.

Effectiveness (C-level questions): Limited | Moderate | Good | High. See the Guidance Note below for descriptors of effectiveness ratings.

Where a Yes/No scale is used, options are: No | Yes, to a limited extent | Yes, largely | Yes, fully.

Scale labels shown in each response box (A — Legal / regulatory framework, B — Implementation, C — Effectiveness) identify which response scale applies to that question. In a small number of sub-sections the internal section lettering differs from the scale label; where they differ, the scale label governs.

GUIDANCE NOTE — Effectiveness rating scale (applies to all C-level questions throughout this survey)

Limited: The mechanism exists or is partially in place but outputs are minimal, inconsistent or not yet visible. Implementation is irregular or confined to a small number of cases.

Moderate: The mechanism produces some tangible outputs in practice but coverage, consistency or quality are incomplete. Improvement is underway but significant gaps remain.

Good: The mechanism operates regularly, produces consistent outputs and contributes demonstrably to its intended objectives. Only minor gaps remain.

High: The mechanism is fully operational, producing sustained outcomes at scale. Performance is regularly monitored and there is clear evidence of impact on chemicals management outcomes.

Not assessable: Insufficient information is available to make a judgment on effectiveness.

Building Block 1: Governance and Enabling Conditions

This building block covers the legal, institutional and governance arrangements that provide the foundation for an effective national chemicals management system. These functions underpin all other building blocks.

1.1 Framework legislation/policy and institutional setup

Covers the existence of an overall legal or policy framework, the assignment of responsibilities across authorities, and the designation of a lead authority or coordination mechanism.

A — Legal framework

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

A.1 Has your country prepared a National Chemicals Profile or equivalent national baseline assessment of chemicals management? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

A.2 To what extent is there a national legal or policy framework covering chemicals across their life cycle? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.2 = 'Not in place', proceed directly to D (supporting information).

A.3 Does the framework clearly assign responsibilities for chemicals management across competent authorities? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation**B — Implementation | Response scale:**

Not applicable | Not operational | Early stages | Partially operational | Largely operational | Fully operational

B.1 To what extent is the framework operational in practice (institutions active, procedures defined, coordination functioning)? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 Is there a designated lead authority or formal coordination mechanism for chemicals management? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Effectiveness**C — Effectiveness | Response scale:**

Not applicable | Not assessable | Limited | Moderate | Good | High

C.1 To what extent is the framework applied in practice and contributing to its intended outcomes? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

1.2 Sustainable financing and economic viability

Covers financing mechanisms supporting long-term system sustainability: budget allocations, cost-recovery mechanisms, fees and levies.

A — Legal framework

A.1 To what extent are financing mechanisms for chemicals management established (budget lines, fees, levies, cost-recovery)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are financing mechanisms operational and generating resources for chemicals management? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 Are revenues or budget allocations earmarked or linked to SMC activities? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 To what extent are available financial resources adequate to maintain core chemicals management functions (staffing, enforcement, monitoring)? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent are financial mechanisms consistently implemented and contributing to system sustainability? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

1.3 International integration

Covers alignment with international frameworks and use of international data, assessments and regulatory approaches.

A — Legal and policy alignment

A.1 To what extent is the national system aligned with relevant international frameworks (GFC, Basel/Rotterdam/Stockholm/Minamata Conventions, GHS, ILO Conventions)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', section B.1 (technical cooperation) may still be relevant. Proceed to B.1 before deciding whether to skip to D.

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent does the country make use of international data, assessments or regulatory approaches for national decision-making? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

International tools and cooperation used (select all that apply):

- ☐ International hazard data (e.g. OECD eChemPortal, international SDS databases)
- ☐ International risk assessments (e.g. WHO, ECHA, regulatory decisions from other countries)
- ☐ Internationally adopted regulatory decisions (e.g. MEA listings, restriction decisions)
- ☐ Participation in international frameworks or cooperation platforms
- ☐ Technical cooperation projects related to SMC
- ☐ Has received international technical or financial assistance for chemicals management

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent does international integration contribute to improved efficiency or decision-making? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

1.4 Enforcement, compliance assurance and trade control

Covers legal and operational capacity for inspection, enforcement and compliance assurance. Customs and trade controls are a specialised enforcement function within this building block.

A — Legal framework

A.1 To what extent is there a legal basis for inspection and enforcement of chemicals-related obligations? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

A.2 To what extent are legal provisions in place to control the import, export or transit of chemicals? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are inspection and compliance systems operational in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Optional indicator: Approximate number of chemical-related inspections conducted annually (enter number or "unknown"):

Click here to enter text

B.2 To what extent are customs controls for chemicals operational? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent are enforcement actions taken in response to identified violations of chemicals-related obligations? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent do enforcement actions contribute to improved compliance with chemicals-related obligations? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.3 To what extent are non-compliant or illegal chemical shipments detected and addressed at borders? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Enforcement tools in use (select all that apply):

- ☐ Inspections and site visits
- ☐ Administrative penalties
- ☐ Criminal sanctions
- ☐ Compliance promotion (guidance, training for industry or SMEs)
- ☐ Integration of chemical nomenclature into customs classification (HS codes)
- ☐ Risk profiling systems for chemical shipments at borders
- ☐ Inspection of chemical storage, warehousing and distribution facilities
- ☐ Coordination between customs and chemicals / environment authorities
- ☐ Participation in international enforcement initiatives (e.g. INTERPOL, WCO programmes)

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

1.5 Governance and stakeholder coordination

Covers inter-agency coordination and engagement with industry, workers, civil society and academia.

A — Formal basis

A.1 To what extent are inter-agency or inter-ministerial coordination mechanisms formally established? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are coordination mechanisms functioning in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 To what extent are stakeholders outside government engaged in chemicals management? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 Does the national chemicals management system explicitly consider gender, age or other vulnerability factors in its design, monitoring or stakeholder engagement? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Stakeholders engaged include (select all that apply):

- ☐ Industry and business associations
- ☐ Workers and trade unions
- ☐ Government agencies across multiple sectors
- ☐ Academia and research institutions
- ☐ Civil society organisations and NGOs
- ☐ Populations potentially disproportionately affected by chemical risks

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent does coordination contribute to improved policy coherence and implementation? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

1.6 Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Covers systems for tracking progress, evaluating performance and using evidence to improve policies over time.

A — System in place

A.1 To what extent are monitoring and evaluation systems established for the national chemicals management system? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are indicators, review processes or reporting mechanisms used in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent are monitoring results used to inform policy decisions, priorities or resource allocation? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Key features in place (select all that apply):

- ☐ Defined set of indicators for chemicals management
- ☐ Regular internal progress reporting
- ☐ Public reporting (e.g. annual report, parliamentary report)
- ☐ Reporting under international frameworks (e.g. GFC, MEA reporting obligations)
- ☐ Feedback from monitoring results into revised policies or priorities

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 1

What are the main constraints affecting building block 1? (Select up to 5)

- ☐ Gaps or fragmentation in the legal framework
- ☐ Unclear or overlapping institutional mandates
- ☐ Weak or absent inter-agency coordination
- ☐ Limited enforcement and inspection capacity
- ☐ Insufficient financing
- ☐ Limited technical expertise
- ☐ Weak stakeholder engagement
- ☐ Other: [specify]

Which sub-components require the most urgent attention? (Select up to 3)

- ☐ 1.1 Framework legislation/policy and institutional setup
- ☐ 1.2 Sustainable financing
- ☐ 1.3 International integration
- ☐ 1.4 Enforcement, compliance assurance and trade control
- ☐ 1.5 Governance and stakeholder coordination
- ☐ 1.6 Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Describe the main priority action (optional):

Click here to enter text

Building Block 2: Information and Transparency

This building block covers systems through which reliable chemical hazard, use and release information is generated, communicated, accepted and made accessible. Strong information systems provide the foundation for risk assessment, risk management and public transparency.

2.1 Hazard classification and labelling: The GHS

Covers adoption and implementation of the GHS, including hazard classification, labelling and Safety Data Sheets (SDS). GHS implementation may differ by sector and GHS revision adopted. Where answers differ across sectors, complete this section separately for each sector.

Sector covered by this response:

- ☐ Workplace (occupational safety and health)
- ☐ Pesticides
- ☐ Consumer products
- ☐ Storage, warehousing and distribution
- ☐ Transport of dangerous goods
- ☐ Other: [specify]

A — Legal framework

A.1 To what extent is GHS implemented in national legislation for this sector? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', skip sections B and C and proceed to D (supporting information).

GHS revision adopted (if applicable):

Click here to enter text

Core requirements legally established (select all that apply):

- ☐ Hazard classification criteria for substances
- ☐ Hazard classification criteria for mixtures
- ☐ Labelling requirements (pictograms, signal words, hazard and precautionary statements)
- ☐ Safety Data Sheet (SDS) format and content requirements
- ☐ Self-classification obligations for manufacturers or importers
- ☐ Specific concentration limits or cut-off values defined

B — Implementation

B — Implementation | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not operational | Early stages | Partially operational | Largely operational | Fully operational

B.1 To what extent are GHS requirements applied in practice by manufacturers, importers and downstream users? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 Is GHS training provided to relevant parties (industry, workers, emergency services, customs)? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 Has GHS guidance or documentation been translated into national language(s)? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Enforcement

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not assessable | Limited | Moderate | Good | High

C.1 Are inspections or audits conducted to verify GHS compliance? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 Are penalties or corrective measures applied for non-compliance? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

If GHS implementation differs across sectors, complete a separate copy of section 2.1 for each additional sector.

2.2 Harmonised data quality and mutual acceptance of data (GLP, MAD)

Covers systems for ensuring reliability and quality of data used in chemical safety assessments, including Good Laboratory Practice (GLP) and OECD Mutual Acceptance of Data (MAD).

A — Legal framework

A.1 What is the status of your country's engagement with the OECD MAD system? ▼

Options | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not engaged | Exploring accession | Adherent (associate/observer) | Full adherent

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not engaged' or 'Not applicable', sections B.1–B.2 may focus on domestic GLP practices. If no domestic GLP programme exists, proceed to D (supporting information).

A.2 To what extent are GLP principles incorporated into national legislation or regulatory frameworks? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are GLP principles applied in practice in relevant test facilities? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 To what extent does the regulatory system rely on data generated under GLP or OECD Test Guidelines? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Enforcement

C.1 Is there a national GLP compliance monitoring programme or inspectorate? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 Are regular audits or inspections of test facilities conducted? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

2.3 Pollutant release and transfer registers (PRTR)

Covers systems for systematic collection and public reporting of information on releases and transfers of chemicals from industrial facilities.

A — Legal framework

A.1 What is the current legislative status of PRTR or equivalent facility-level reporting? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', skip sections B and C and proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 What is the frequency of PRTR or equivalent reporting? ▼

Frequency options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 To what extent is PRTR data publicly accessible? ▼

Accessibility options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 To what extent do facilities required to report do so consistently? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Optional indicator: Approximate number of facilities required to report under PRTR or equivalent (enter number or "unknown"):

Click here to enter text

C — Effectiveness

C.1 Are enforcement mechanisms for non-reporting or inaccurate reporting established in legislation or policy? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent are these enforcement mechanisms applied in practice? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.3 To what extent does PRTR data support transparency and regulatory decision-making? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

2.4 Transparency, disclosure and information systems

Covers systems and approaches improving the availability, accessibility and communication of information on chemicals across supply chains and product life cycles.

A — Legal and policy framework

A.1 To what extent are there legal or policy requirements for disclosure of information on chemicals in products, supply chains or corporate reporting? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are disclosure or product information systems operational in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 Are digital tools used to support chemical product information (e.g. product passports, traceability platforms)? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 To what extent are existing information systems (chemical inventories, PRTR data, trade statistics, surveillance data or international assessments) used to identify priority substances, sectors or exposure scenarios? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Types of information made available (select all that apply):

- ☐ Substance identity (name, CAS number)
- ☐ Hazard classification
- ☐ Safe use or handling information
- ☐ End-of-life or disposal guidance
- ☐ Environmental release or exposure data
- ☐ Sustainability or recyclability attributes

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent is disclosure or product information used by regulators to support decision-making? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent is this information used by companies or downstream users? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 2

What are the main constraints affecting building block 2? (Select up to 5)

- ☐ Limited availability of hazard data
- ☐ Limited technical or scientific capacity
- ☐ Weak or incomplete GHS implementation
- ☐ Limited access to or use of GLP/MAD
- ☐ No PRTR or equivalent system
- ☐ Limited laboratory or testing capacity
- ☐ Lack of disclosure requirements for chemicals in products
- ☐ Language barriers
- ☐ Other: [specify]

Which sub-components require the most urgent attention? (Select up to 3)

- ☐ 2.1 Hazard classification and labelling: The GHS
- ☐ 2.2 Harmonised data quality and mutual acceptance of data (GLP, MAD)
- ☐ 2.3 Pollutant release and transfer registers (PRTR)
- ☐ 2.4 Transparency, disclosure and information systems

Describe the main priority action (optional):

Click here to enter text

Building Block 3: Risk Management and Control

This building block covers regulatory and operational measures that actively manage and reduce chemical risks across the life cycle. Building Block 3.1 has two sub-components: 3.1.A covers product-based licensing or authorisation (e.g. pesticides, biocides); 3.1.B covers substance-based approaches for industrial and consumer chemicals.

3.1.A Regulation for chemical products for specific uses

Covers regulatory systems requiring chemical products (pesticides, biocides, and in some frameworks other categories) to be registered, licensed or authorised before market entry.

Product groups subject to registration, licensing or authorisation in your country (select all that apply):

- ☐ Pesticides (plant protection products, agrochemicals)
- ☐ Biocides (disinfectants, wood preservatives, rodenticides)
- ☐ Pharmaceuticals
- ☐ Food additives or food contact materials
- ☐ Cosmetics
- ☐ Other: [specify]

► **Navigation:** *If no product groups are selected above, proceed to section 3.1.B.*

For each product group selected above, complete the questions below. If answers differ across groups, complete a separate copy of this section for each group.

Product group covered by this response:

Click here to enter text

A — Legal framework

Type of regulatory requirement for this product group (select all that apply):

- ☐ Registration — a defined information package is submitted to the authority; depending on the system the authority may or may not have to approve or acknowledge it before market entry (see Working Definitions)
- ☐ Licensing or authorisation — prior approval required before market entry
- ☐ Negative or restricted list — some products or substances prohibited or restricted

A.1 Does your country maintain a list of products that have been authorised, registered or notified in this sector? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

A.2 To what extent do pre-market control mechanisms operate in practice for this product group? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** *If A.2 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information) for this sub-section.*

A.3 To what extent does the framework enable risk management measures (restrictions, bans, conditions of use)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are risk assessments conducted for registration or authorisation decisions? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Who develops or reviews risk assessments? (select all that apply)

- ☐ Government authorities
- ☐ Industry / applicants
- ☐ Independent or third-party assessors
- ☐ International or regional assessments used or adapted

C — Compliance

C.1 Is compliance with registration or authorisation requirements monitored? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 Are penalties or corrective measures applied for non-compliance? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

If answers differ across product groups, complete a separate copy of section 3.1.A for each group.

3.1.B Regulation for industrial and consumer chemical substances

Applies to substances not subject to product-specific authorisation under 3.1.A. Covers inventory/information systems, substance prioritisation, risk assessment and risk management.

A — Inventory and substance information

A.1 Does your country maintain a list or information system covering chemical substances manufactured, imported or used? ('Inventory' is used broadly here — see Definitions.) ▼

Response options | Response scale:

Not applicable | No | Yes, to a limited extent | Yes, largely | Yes, fully

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'No', proceed to section C (risk assessment) if relevant, or to D (supporting information).

Type of system in place (select all that apply):

- ☐ Statutory inventory (pre-existing substances list)
- ☐ Notification system — specified information is submitted and the activity may proceed without a prior approval decision (see Working Definitions)
- ☐ Registration system — a defined information package is submitted and the authority reviews, accepts or, in some systems, must approve it (see Working Definitions)
- ☐ Volume-reporting or declaration system

A.2 Which substances or products are currently covered? ▼

Click here to enter text

A.3 Is information from this system publicly accessible? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Optional indicator: Approximate number of chemical substances currently registered, notified or listed in the system (enter number or "unknown"):

Click here to enter text

B — Substance prioritisation

B.1 To what extent are mechanisms in place to prioritise substances for further assessment or risk management? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Criteria used for prioritisation (select all that apply):

- ☐ Hazard properties (e.g. CMR, PBT, endocrine disruption)
- ☐ Exposure potential (e.g. volume, use patterns, environmental release)
- ☐ International regulatory decisions or assessments
- ☐ National concern (e.g. specific occupational or environmental risks)

B.1.a Has the country produced a published list or documented register of priority substances or substances of concern identified for further assessment or risk management action? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 To what extent is the chemical information system (inventory, notification database or equivalent) actively maintained, updated and used to inform regulatory decisions or reporting? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Risk assessment

C.1 To what extent are risk assessments conducted for priority substances? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 Are national guidelines or methodologies for substance risk assessment in place? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Risk management

D.1 To what extent does the framework enable risk management measures (restrictions, bans, conditions of use, authorisation schemes)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D.2 To what extent have risk management measures been applied in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Types of risk management measures in use (select all that apply):

- ☐ Information requirements or updated SDS
- ☐ Conditions of use or application restrictions
- ☐ Use restrictions for specific sectors, populations or exposure scenarios
- ☐ Bans on specific substances or uses
- ☐ Substitution requirements or incentives
- ☐ Emission or occupational exposure limit values

E — Compliance

E.1 Is compliance with substance-based requirements monitored and enforced? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

F — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

3.2 Occupational safety and health (OSH) requirements

Covers legal requirements and practical measures for protecting workers from chemical risks in the workplace.

A — Legal framework

A.1 To what extent does OSH legislation address chemical hazards in the workplace (risk assessment, exposure limits, substitution, SDS access)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

A.2 To what extent are employers legally required to manage chemical risks? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are chemical risk management measures implemented in workplaces in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Measures implemented in practice (select all that apply):

- ☐ Workplace chemical risk assessments
- ☐ Occupational exposure limits (OELs) applied
- ☐ Substitution of substances of concern with safer alternatives
- ☐ Engineering and organisational controls
- ☐ PPE provision and use
- ☐ Worker information and training (including SDS use)
- ☐ Health surveillance of workers

C — Effectiveness

C.1 Are labour inspections addressing chemical safety conducted? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent do OSH measures contribute to protecting workers from chemical risks? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

[Click here to enter text](#)

3.3 Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness (CAPPR)

Covers legal requirements and practical measures to prevent and prepare for major chemical accidents at industrial installations. This sub-section also covers the prevention of, and preparedness for, chemical accidents at storage, warehousing and distribution facilities — including distribution centres, logistics facilities and the loading, unloading and transfer operations carried out at them — and the corresponding responsibilities of distributors, importers, wholesalers and logistics operators. Transport of dangerous goods in the strict sense remains governed by national transport law and the international modal regimes.

A — Legal framework

A.1 To what extent is there a legal framework addressing prevention and preparedness for chemical accidents at industrial installations? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

A.2 Does the framework require facilities handling hazardous chemicals to implement accident prevention and emergency preparedness measures? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

A.3 To what extent do legal requirements address the safe storage, warehousing and handling of chemicals at storage and distribution facilities (for example siting, segregation, containment and quantity thresholds), including the responsibilities of distributors, importers, wholesalers and logistics operators? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation

B — Implementation | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not operational | Early stages | Partially operational | Largely operational | Fully operational

B.1 To what extent are accident prevention measures implemented at facility level? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 To what extent are facility-level emergency preparedness plans developed and maintained? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 To what extent are off-site or community emergency response plans developed and maintained? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.4 To what extent are accident prevention and emergency preparedness measures applied in practice at chemical storage, warehousing and distribution facilities, including during loading, unloading and transfer operations? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Elements implemented in practice (select all that apply):

- ☐ Facility-level emergency plans
- ☐ Off-site or community emergency plans
- ☐ Coordination with local authorities and emergency services
- ☐ Emergency response teams and resources
- ☐ Public communication systems
- ☐ Regular training and simulation exercises
- ☐ Safe storage, segregation and containment arrangements at storage and distribution facilities
- ☐ Documented loading, unloading and transfer procedures
- ☐ Transfer of hazard and safe-use information by distributors (labels, SDS, national-language documentation)
- ☐ Training and competency requirements for warehouse and logistics personnel
- ☐ Coordination among transport, customs, labour, environment and emergency response authorities on storage and distribution sites

C — Effectiveness

C.1 Are inspections or audits conducted to verify accident prevention and preparedness? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 Are lessons learned from chemical incidents or near-misses used to improve policy and practice? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.3 Are chemical storage, warehousing and distribution facilities included in inspection programmes and in arrangements for reporting incidents (spills, fires, releases, loss of containment)? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

3.4 Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC/BAT)

Covers integrated permitting systems for managing routine industrial emissions of chemicals, typically based on Best Available Techniques (BAT).

A — Legal framework

A.1 To what extent is there legislation for integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC) or equivalent permitting? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent do permits incorporate BAT requirements or equivalent standards with periodic review? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Approximate scope of IPPC or equivalent permits in place (optional):

Click here to enter text

C — Effectiveness

C.1 Are compliance inspections carried out for permitted facilities? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent does the permitting system contribute to controlling industrial emissions? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

3.5 Public health management of chemicals

Covers public health functions related to chemical safety: poison centre services, chemical exposure surveillance and use of health data to inform regulatory priorities.

A — System and legal basis

A.1 To what extent are public health functions related to chemical safety established (poisoning response, surveillance, health risk assessment support)? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place' or 'Not applicable', proceed to D (supporting information).

A.2 Is there a poison centre or equivalent function providing expert toxicological advice? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Optional indicator: Approximate number of poison centre contacts or cases handled annually (enter number or "unknown"):

Click here to enter text

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are poison centre services used in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 Are systems in place to collect and analyse data on chemical exposures and poisonings? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 Are human health surveillance data (e.g. biomonitoring, occupational disease registries) used to inform chemicals management priorities? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Main sources of chemical exposure data used (select all that apply):

- ☐ Poison centre records
- ☐ Hospitals and healthcare facilities
- ☐ Occupational health systems
- ☐ Environmental monitoring

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent is public health data used to inform regulatory prioritisation and risk management? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 Are findings from poisoning incidents or surveillance used to improve prevention and policy? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 3

What are the main constraints affecting building block 3? (Select up to 5)

- ☐ Gaps in legal frameworks
- ☐ Limited coverage of sectors, uses or substances
- ☐ Limited capacity for risk assessment
- ☐ Limited use of prioritisation mechanisms
- ☐ Weak enforcement and compliance monitoring
- ☐ Limited inspection capacity
- ☐ Limited coordination across sectors
- ☐ Weak emergency preparedness
- ☐ Weak controls over chemical storage, warehousing and distribution
- ☐ Limited public health integration
- ☐ Other: [specify]

Which sub-components require the most urgent attention? (Select up to 3)

- ☐ 3.1.A Regulation for chemical products (registration and licensing)
- ☐ 3.1.B Regulation for industrial and consumer substances
- ☐ 3.2 Occupational safety and health (OSH)
- ☐ 3.3 Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness (CAPPR)
- ☐ 3.4 Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC/BAT)
- ☐ 3.5 Public health management of chemicals

Describe the main priority action (optional):

Click here to enter text

Building Block 4: Legacy Management and Market Transformation

This building block covers measures addressing long-term environmental contamination and legacy chemical risks, as well as upstream and market-based approaches to reduce future risks through safer product design, supply-chain measures and green chemistry innovation.

4.1 Environmental and legacy management

Covers environmental monitoring, identification and remediation of contaminated sites, and management of legacy chemicals including obsolete chemicals (see Definitions).

A — Legal and policy framework

A.1 To what extent are legal frameworks in place for the environmentally sound management of chemical waste? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

A.2 To what extent are frameworks in place to identify and manage contaminated sites? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

A.3 To what extent are legacy chemicals (obsolete stocks, POPs, chemicals no longer in active use) addressed in national policies or programmes? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1, A.2 and A.3 are all 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 To what extent are systems in place for collection, treatment and safe disposal of chemical waste? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 To what extent are contaminated sites identified, inventoried and managed? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.3 To what extent are legacy chemicals actively managed (safe storage, destruction, phase-out)? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Systems or approaches implemented (select all that apply):

- ☐ Hazardous waste collection systems
- ☐ Treatment and disposal facilities (e.g. incineration, co-processing)

- ☐ Import/export controls for hazardous waste (e.g. Basel Convention procedures)
- ☐ Contaminated site inventories
- ☐ Site remediation programmes
- ☐ Management of obsolete chemicals or legacy stockpiles
- ☐ Environmental monitoring for legacy pollutants

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent are waste and environmental controls enforced? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent do current systems contribute to reducing exposure to legacy chemical risks? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.3 To what extent are illegal disposal activities and illegal trade in hazardous waste detected and reported? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.4 To what extent are detected illegal activities investigated and sanctioned? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

4.2 Product and supply chain measures (product standards, circular economy)

Covers measures to reduce substances of concern in products and supply chains through disclosure, restrictions in articles, traceability and eco-design. ‘Substances of concern’ — see Definitions.

A — Legal and policy framework

A.1 To what extent are there legal requirements to disclose the presence of substances of concern in products or articles? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = ‘Not in place’, proceed to D (supporting information).

A.2 Does legislation enable authorities to restrict or prohibit substances of concern in products or articles? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

A.3 To what extent are supply-chain transparency or traceability requirements established? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B — Implementation

B.1 Are disclosure systems or chemicals-in-products information systems operational? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

B.2 Are digital tools used to support product chemical information (e.g. product passports, traceability systems)? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Types of product information made available (select all that apply):

- ☐ Substance identity (name, CAS number)
- ☐ Hazard classification
- ☐ Safe use or handling information
- ☐ End-of-life or disposal guidance
- ☐ Sustainability or recyclability attributes

C — Effectiveness

C.1 Are product-related restrictions on substances of concern enforced (market surveillance, customs)? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.2 To what extent is product or supply-chain information used by regulators? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C.3 To what extent is this information used by companies or downstream users? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

Click here to enter text

4.3 Green and sustainable chemistry innovation

Covers national policies, programmes and incentives promoting safer alternatives, substitution of substances of concern, sustainable production and innovation for safer chemicals and products.

A — Legal and policy framework

A.1 To what extent are national policies, strategies or programmes in place to promote green or sustainable chemistry? ▼

A — Legal / regulatory framework | Response scale:

Not applicable | Not in place | Under development | Partially in place | Largely in place | Fully in place

▼ Select an option

► **Navigation:** If A.1 = 'Not in place', proceed to D (supporting information).

B — Implementation

B.1 Are green or sustainable chemistry research, development or support programmes operational? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Mechanisms in place (select all that apply):

- ☐ Research and development programmes or funding for safer chemicals
- ☐ Incentives for substitution of substances of concern
- ☐ Support for sustainable business innovation (e.g. tax incentives, grants)
- ☐ Public procurement policies promoting safer chemicals or products
- ☐ Integration of green chemistry principles into education and training
- ☐ Collaboration between government, academia and industry

B.2 To what extent do green chemistry or safer alternatives initiatives engage relevant industries, SMEs or supply-chain actors in practice? ▼

B — Implementation | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

C — Effectiveness

C.1 To what extent are green chemistry activities contributing to safer chemicals or products in national markets? ▼

C — Effectiveness | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

D — Supporting information

Supporting information (optional): relevant legislation, policies, documents, URLs, or contextual notes.

[Click here to enter text](#)

Key Gaps and Priorities — Building Block 4

What are the main constraints affecting building block 4? (Select up to 5)

- ☐ Gaps in legal frameworks for products, waste or contaminated sites
- ☐ Limited infrastructure for waste treatment and disposal
- ☐ Limited capacity to manage contaminated sites
- ☐ Limited management of legacy chemicals (obsolete stocks, POPs)
- ☐ Weak enforcement (market surveillance, customs, waste)
- ☐ Limited green chemistry policies or programmes
- ☐ Limited coordination across sectors
- ☐ Other: [specify]

Which sub-components require the most urgent attention? (Select up to 3)

- ☐ 4.1 Environmental and legacy management
- ☐ 4.2 Product and supply chain measures
- ☐ 4.3 Green and sustainable chemistry innovation

Describe the main priority action (optional):

Click here to enter text

Final Section — Overall Assessment and Priority Needs

Please summarise the most important findings from your survey to identify overall priorities and capacity-building needs.

Three most urgent gaps or priorities

Priority 1:

Click here to enter text

Priority 2:

Click here to enter text

Priority 3:

Click here to enter text

Areas where technical assistance, capacity-building or financial support would be most helpful

Select all that apply:

- ☐ Legal and regulatory framework development
- ☐ Institutional capacity and coordination
- ☐ GHS implementation and hazard communication
- ☐ Risk assessment methodology and capacity
- ☐ Chemical substance or product regulation
- ☐ Inventory and information systems
- ☐ Occupational safety and health (chemical aspects)
- ☐ Integrated pollution prevention and control
- ☐ Chemical accident prevention and preparedness
- ☐ Safe storage, warehousing and distribution of chemicals
- ☐ Public health and poison centres
- ☐ Environmental monitoring and legacy chemical management
- ☐ Chemicals in products and supply-chain transparency
- ☐ Green chemistry and safer alternatives
- ☐ Enforcement and compliance systems
- ☐ Financing mechanisms
- ☐ Other: [specify]

Follow-up

F.1 Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up interview, workshop or regional consultation? ▼

Response options | Response scale:

▼ Select an option

Name:

Click here to enter text

Country:

Click here to enter text

Organisation:

Click here to enter text

Role / title:

Click here to enter text

Email address:

Click here to enter text

Thank you for completing this survey. Your responses will be used solely to support national planning and identify regional capacity-building needs. Results will not be used to rank, compare or evaluate individual countries against one another.

Readiness and Next Steps

This section identifies the country's preferred pathway for future support. Responses will help tailor technical assistance, capacity-building and financial support to national priorities and circumstances.

R.1 Areas for priority attention

Which areas should be prioritised for immediate attention and support? (Select up to 3)

- ☐ Baseline assessment or National Chemicals Profile
- ☐ Legal framework development
- ☐ Institutional coordination and governance
- ☐ Inventories and information systems
- ☐ Prioritisation mechanisms for substances and sectors
- ☐ Risk assessment capacity
- ☐ Risk management measures (restrictions, bans, conditions of use)
- ☐ Enforcement and compliance assurance
- ☐ Safe storage, warehousing and distribution of chemicals
- ☐ Financing mechanisms
- ☐ Chemicals in products and supply-chain transparency
- ☐ Green chemistry and safer alternatives

R.2 Type of support needed

What type of support would be most useful? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Policy advice and regulatory drafting support
- ☐ Technical training and capacity building
- ☐ Development of tools, methodologies or guidelines
- ☐ Peer-to-peer learning and exchange with other countries
- ☐ Financial support or co-financing for system development
- ☐ Expert secondment or embedded advisory support
- ☐ Access to international data, databases or risk assessment outputs
- ☐ Regional cooperation and harmonisation support

R.3 Most important next step

R.3 What would be the single most important next step in strengthening the national chemicals management system? ▼

Select the most important next step:

▼ Select an option

R.4 Additional comments on next steps

Please describe any additional priorities or preferred approach for future support (optional):

Click here to enter text

Appendix: Summary Score Sheet

Purpose:

Use this sheet to record and compare headline responses across all building blocks. Enter the overall rating for the Legal (A.1), Implementation (B.1) and Effectiveness (C.1) questions for each sub-component. Mark priority sub-components (1–3) for capacity-building planning. This sheet provides a structured overview suitable for sharing with national authorities or regional coordinators. Part 1 uses the same A and B scales as Part 2, so Part 1 responses may be recorded here directly. Where a rating is ‘Partially in place’ (PP) or ‘Partially operational’ (PO) because coverage differs across ministries, sectors or jurisdictions, note this in the Notes column. For 3.1.B, whose internal sections are lettered A–F, record A.1 under Legal, B.1 under Implementation and C.1 under Effectiveness.

Country:**Date:**

Sub-component	Legal	Impl.	Effect.	Priority (1–3)	Notes
Building Block 1: Governance and enabling conditions					
1.1 Framework legislation / policy and institutional setup					
1.2 Sustainable financing and economic viability					
1.3 International integration					
1.4 Enforcement, compliance assurance and trade control					
1.5 Governance and stakeholder coordination					
1.6 Monitoring, evaluation and learning					
Building Block 2: Information and transparency					
2.1 Hazard classification and labelling (GHS)					
2.2 Harmonised data quality and MAD (GLP)					
2.3 Pollutant release and transfer registers (PRTR)					
2.4 Transparency, disclosure and information systems					
Building Block 3: Risk management and control					
3.1.A Chemical product regulation (registration / licensing)					
3.1.B Industrial and consumer substance regulation					
3.2 Occupational safety and health (OSH)					
3.3 Chemical accident prevention and preparedness (CAPPR)					
3.4 Integrated pollution prevention and control (IPPC/BAT)					
3.5 Public health management of chemicals					
Building Block 4: Legacy management and market transformation					
4.1 Environmental and legacy management					
4.2 Product and supply chain measures					

Rating key:

Legal framework (A): NI = Not in place | UD = Under development | PP = Partially in place | LP = Largely in place | FP = Fully in place | NA = Not applicable

Implementation (B): NO = Not operational | ES = Early stages | PO = Partially operational | LO = Largely operational | FO = Fully operational | NA = Not applicable

Effectiveness (C): NA = Not assessable | LI = Limited | MO = Moderate | GO = Good | HI = High | N/A = Not applicable