

# Strengthening Interministerial Coordination for the Sound Management of Chemicals

Observations and Conclusions  
of an International Expert Meeting

---

Geneva, Switzerland  
29-30 August 2002

Final Report



# IOMC

**INTER-ORGANIZATION PROGRAMME FOR THE SOUND MANAGEMENT OF CHEMICALS**  
A cooperative agreement among UNEP, ILO, FAO, WHO, UNIDO, UNITAR and OECD

## **About the Series of Thematic Workshops on Priority Topics of National Chemicals Management Capacity Building...**

The Series of Thematic Workshops on Priority Topics of National Chemicals Management Capacity Building provides a forum to facilitate an exchange of experiences and to identify practical steps which interested countries can take to systematically address certain chemicals management priority topics. The series addresses priorities which have been identified by countries through National Profiles and in the context of National Programmes for the Sound Management of Chemicals and which have also been highlighted through the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS). Many of these topics (e.g. chemicals legislation) are inter-sectoral in nature and cut across the activities of various ministries and interested parties at the national level. For this reason, integrated and coordinated approaches, which take into consideration the perspective of all interested parties and build upon existing international experiences, are considered of great importance.

The workshops are coordinated by UNITAR and involve interested countries, IOMC Participating Organizations, industry, public interest groups, and other interested parties. Thematic workshops on the following topics have been held:

- \* Strengthening National Information Systems and Information Exchange for the Sound Management of Chemicals, September 1998
- \* Strengthening National Awareness Raising and Education for Chemicals Management, October 1998
- \* Developing and Strengthening National Legislation and Policies for the Sound Management of Chemicals, June 1999
- \* Strengthening National Capacities for Risk Management Decision-Making for Priority Chemicals, October 1999
- \* Strengthening National Capacities for Chemical Analysis and Monitoring for the Sound Management of Chemicals, November 2001

The reports of the workshops are meant to serve as practical inputs to country-based initiatives in the respective areas and may also highlight certain issues which may require further attention at the international level.

---

**This event was organised by UNITAR with funding provided by the Swiss Agency for Development and Co-operation (SDC).**

### **For additional information please contact:**

Training and Capacity Building Programmes  
in Chemicals and Waste Management  
UNITAR  
Palais des Nations  
CH-1211 GENEVE 10  
Switzerland

TEL +41 22 917 85 25  
FAX +41 22 917 80 47  
E-mail [cwm@unitar.org](mailto:cwm@unitar.org)  
Website: [www.unitar.org/cwm](http://www.unitar.org/cwm)

Z:\cwm.10\TWS-6\final report\TWS\_6\_Report (FINAL rev).doc

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary .....	i
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Perspectives of Countries and International Organisations .....	7
3. Challenges and Bottlenecks Identified by Countries .....	15
4. Summary of Discussions and Recommendations .....	17
Annex A: Workshop Agenda.....	25
Annex B: List of Participants.....	29



## Executive Summary

The thematic workshop on *Strengthening Interministerial Coordination for the Sound Management of Chemicals* was the sixth in a Series of Thematic Workshops on Priority Topics of National Chemicals Management Capacity Building. It took place in Geneva, Switzerland, from 29-30 August 2002. The event brought together some 21 representatives from more than 15 developing countries, countries with economies in transition, countries with advanced chemicals management capabilities and international organisations.

During the two days, country experiences were exchanged, major issues regarding interministerial coordination were examined and practical recommendations developed. The workshop concluded that important constraints faced by countries with regards to improving interministerial coordination included: a lack of information exchange between ministries; bureaucratic obstacles such as fragmented ministerial responsibilities; and a lack of resources, both financial and in terms of staff time and expertise.

The recommendations developed at the workshop, in addition to the general workshop proceedings, were designed to highlight the importance of interministerial coordination for national policy-makers and other interested parties. These general recommendations include, for example:

- all countries should consider establishing an overall coordination mechanism for implementing the sound management of chemicals, taking into account already available mechanisms so as to avoid duplication;
- careful consideration should be given to the process for establishing the mechanism, including the development of Terms of Reference;
- stakeholder participation from outside of ministries should be facilitated, either directly through participation in the mechanism or in a consultative manner; and
- criteria should be used to set priorities for establishing a mechanism(s) that reflect the requirements and circumstances of individual countries.

The workshop also identified a range of benefits related to interministerial coordination. These include:

- common positions on issues are identified and reinforced;
- synergies are created – work can take place in collaboration instead of in isolation, resulting in additional benefits to both (or several) parties;
- duplication of efforts is avoided where possible, freeing up scarce resources for other priority issues;
- gaps in chemicals management are identified; and
- understanding of divergent issues is increased, and thus the potential for misunderstanding is decreased.

In summary, participants concluded that the workshop provided a valuable opportunity to reflect on experiences, and to discuss key issues in the area of interministerial coordination. UNITAR was encouraged to widely distribute the report of the workshop, both electronically and on paper, to all interested parties.<sup>1</sup> The results of the workshop would also be integrated into a guidance document being developed for countries by UNITAR in support of their actions for interministerial coordination.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Electronic copies of this report are available on the UNITAR website at [www.unitar.org/cwm](http://www.unitar.org/cwm).

<sup>2</sup> This guidance document is entitled: *Interministerial Coordination for the Sound Management of Chemicals*. UNITAR Guidance Note (Working Draft, July 2001).

## 1. Introduction

**The workshop was organised in response to demand from countries for strategic guidance in the area of interministerial coordination.**

The thematic workshop on *Strengthening Interministerial Coordination for the Sound Management of Chemicals* was the sixth in a Series of Thematic Workshops on Priority Topics of National Chemicals Management Capacity Building. It took place in Geneva, Switzerland, from 29-30 August 2002. The event brought together some 21 representatives from more than 15 developing countries, countries with economies in transition, countries with advanced chemicals management capabilities and international organisations.

Workshop topics addressed recommendations included in Chapter 19 of Agenda 21<sup>3</sup> which were agreed upon as a basis for action in 1994 at the first session of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety (IFCS) and recently confirmed in the priorities adopted by the Forum at its third session in October 2000 in Salvador, Brazil.

This workshop was organised in response to demand from countries for strategic guidance in this area. Guidance and resource materials<sup>4</sup> have been developed for use in a three-country UNITAR/IOMC Programme, *Developing and Sustaining an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals*. The three project countries presently involved, Ecuador, Senegal and Sri Lanka, are currently testing this guidance, and were invited to share their experiences and lessons learned, along with presentations from a range of other countries and organisations.

### 1.1 Background

**Interministerial coordination can help to foster a comprehensive approach to chemicals management addressing all stages of the chemical life-cycle.**

Chemicals management encompasses a broad range of issues, each of which may be addressed by any of a number of governmental ministries, agencies or units, as well as parties outside of government. In order to achieve a more integrated national approach to chemicals management, a coordinating mechanism is desirable through which the various actors can exchange information, coordinate activities that are complementary or inter-related, and, in certain instances, make joint-decisions or, in the longer-term, develop national policy.

A well organised interministerial coordinating mechanism can help to increase transparency and collaboration amongst ministries, clarify the respective mandates and competencies of the various agencies, facilitate sharing of information and resources (e.g. databases, equipment), and foster a comprehensive approach to the management of chemicals that addresses all stages of the chemical life-cycle.

<sup>3</sup> Adopted by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.

<sup>4</sup> For example: *Interministerial Coordination for the Sound Management of Chemicals*. UNITAR Guidance Note (Working Draft, July 2001).

Effective coordination amongst the whole range of those who have responsibility for or a stake in chemicals issues means that all those involved:

- are familiar with each others' chemicals-related activities, priorities and positions, and the underlying reasons for each; and
- use that information to make better quality and more strategic decisions on chemicals issues.

While some countries had established interministerial coordination mechanisms for specific chemicals management issues, governments – through a series of recommendations starting with Agenda 21 and continuing with the work of the IFCS – have since recognised the need for collaboration to enhance interministerial dialogue and coordination, involving all parties. Forum III, in its centrepiece document, *Bahia Declaration on Chemical Safety*, commits participants to “Give greater emphasis to cooperation and coordination, seeking synergies through shared concerns and experience...”.<sup>5</sup> The participants of FORUM III also pointed out that: “By 2002, all countries should have...established an intersectoral coordinating effort”.<sup>6</sup>

## 1.2 Workshop Objectives

**The main objective of the workshop was to develop and test ideas for innovative approaches to interministerial coordination.**

The main objective of the workshop was to develop and test ideas for innovative approaches to interministerial coordination for the sound management of chemicals, consistent with national circumstances and priorities. Experiences to-date, existing guidance and other resources were discussed. Gaps and weaknesses were identified and solutions suggested.

Key questions addressed through the workshop included, *inter alia*:

- When are specific coordination mechanisms and tools more cost effective compared with formal mechanisms such as formal meetings?
- What are the appropriate secretarial arrangements for managing various coordination mechanisms and tools?
- What are the possible hindrances to the use of specific mechanisms and tools and how can they be overcome? What expertise is needed to operate these and how can human resources be appropriately trained?

---

<sup>5</sup> IFCS, *Forum III, Third Session of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety, Salvador de Bahia, Brazil, 15-20 October 2000 – Final Report*, p. 2.

<sup>6</sup> IFCS, *Priorities for Action Beyond 2000*, Programme Area E, p. 9.



- How can the necessary technical competence be assured for various coordinating mechanisms?
- How formal or informal should interministerial coordinating mechanisms be?
- What are key elements that should be addressed in a Terms of Reference (TOR) for a Coordinating Body?
- What are the international aspects of interministerial coordination (e.g. to meet international treaty obligations, and to ensure coordination of harmonised country positions in various international fora, including sectoral and regional)?
- How can joint ownership of an interministerial coordination mechanism be ensured and the dominance of individual ministries be avoided?
- What are the options for relationships between a coordinating mechanism and non-ministerial groups and stakeholders?
- What are the costs of various options for coordinating mechanisms and how could they be financed?
- What human resource training would be required for each mechanism? Is a secretariat required?

### 1.3 Introductory Presentations

**A series of recommendations suggesting countries strengthen capacities for interministerial coordination on chemicals issues exist at the international level.**

*Mr. Craig Boljkovac*, Acting Programme Coordinator, Chemicals and Waste Management Programme, UNITAR, welcomed participants to the workshop and thanked the Government of Switzerland for their financial support. He explained that a series of recommendations suggesting countries strengthen capacities for interministerial coordination on chemicals issues exist at the international level. These include Chapter 19 of Agenda 21, and a subsequent series of recommendations from the IFCS. He mentioned different possible definitions of interministerial coordination, and noted that a variety of chemicals-related activities can be enhanced through strengthened coordination. He concluded by citing guidance produced by UNITAR, in close cooperation with other IOMC participating organisations, to assist countries with this issue as they address priority topics of chemicals management. A review of a draft guidance note, provided as a background document for the workshop, would be one of the key tasks for participants.

*Mr. Peter Müller*, Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape, welcomed participants on behalf of the Government of Switzerland.

**The workshop provided an opportunity for participants to better understand the situations and challenges in various countries.**

*Mr. John Haines*, UNITAR Senior Special Fellow, presented on the background, objectives and methodologies for the workshop.

Following the opening and introductory remarks, Sessions 1-3 featured a series of panel presentations and discussions which provided an opportunity for participants to better understand the situations and challenges in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and to hear a range of views about interministerial coordination from the perspective of countries with advanced chemicals management capabilities, international organisations and convention secretariats (see Annex 1 for the Workshop Agenda).<sup>7</sup>

During Session 1, entitled *Situations and Challenges in Developing Countries and Countries with Economies in Transition*, representatives from Ecuador, Senegal, Slovenia, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Syria and Zambia gave brief presentations which highlighted the current situation in their countries with regard to interministerial coordination for sound chemicals management. Emphasis was placed on examples of successful approaches, practical problems faced, and issues which are particularly challenging.<sup>8</sup>

During Session 2, *Perspectives and Experiences of Countries with Advanced Chemicals Management Capabilities*, representatives from Germany, Canada and Switzerland made presentations sharing the experience gained over the past years with interministerial coordination. Emphasis was given to approaches that have worked well and/or which have been difficult to implement. Lessons learned, which may be of particular relevance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition, were also highlighted.

In Session 3, entitled *The Perspectives of International Convention Secretariats and International Organisations*, representatives of UNEP Chemicals and UNITAR provided brief overviews from the perspective of their respective organisations on how various programmes or initiatives at the international level shape or contribute to the development and strengthening of interministerial coordination.

## 1.4 Working Groups

In the second part of the workshop, important themes and challenges that emerged during the presentations were further addressed through working groups focusing on identifying appropriate ways and means to assist countries in their efforts, and on draft recommendations and conclusions of relevance both to countries and other participants. The first group considered *tools* for interministerial coordination (such as teleconferences and shared databases) and the second group discussed

---

<sup>7</sup> These presentations are outlined in more detail in section 2 of this report. Copies of presentations can be obtained from UNITAR upon request.

<sup>8</sup> Nigeria also submitted a paper regarding their situation and experiences.

interministerial coordination *mechanisms* (or overall frameworks for coordination). Each group examined the various issues involved and prepared a summary report for examination in Plenary in the final afternoon of the workshop. The recommendations of these groups are found in chapter 4 below.



## 2. Perspectives of Countries and International Organisations

This section of the report provides more detail regarding the existing situations in developing countries, countries with economies in transition and countries with advanced chemicals management capabilities concerning interministerial coordination, based on the presentations and discussion at the workshop.

### 2.1 Developing Countries and Countries with Economies in Transition

With experience gained from forming an interministerial coordination working group which developed Terms of Reference, Ecuador presented lessons learned.

Ms. Consuelo Meneses Moreno of the Ministry of Public Health in **Ecuador** highlighted the barriers still faced there with regard to interministerial coordination, as well as the progress made under the framework of their participation as a project country in the UNITAR/IOMC Programme, *Developing and Sustaining an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals*. With the experience gained from forming an interministerial coordination working group which developed Terms of Reference for this topic, Ms. Meneses Moreno presented the lessons learned. She outlined the types of institutions that have participated in past coordination activities, but noted that various weaknesses existed, including, *inter alia*:

- conflicts of interests and competition between institutions/ministries;
- each institution manages information in different formats and it is not always shared;
- past projects and institutional programmes did not have a follow-up and evaluation to measure their results, nor was the experience always shared with other institutions; and
- there was a low level of awareness about the importance of the topic at local levels.

However, in developing an “Inter-institutional Coordination Statute for Sound Chemicals Management in Ecuador”, it is envisioned that a permanent, formalised mechanism will be created focusing on cooperation and exchange of information.

Examples from Senegal included mechanisms involving relevant stakeholders, taking a “life-cycle” approach to chemicals management and ensuring linkages to increase synergies and reduce duplication.

Mr. Ousmane Sow of **Senegal’s** Ministry of Environment described their experience with the development of three mechanisms for interministerial coordination as a result of participating in the UNITAR/IOMC Programme, *Developing and Sustaining an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals*: (1) a Permanent Committee for Interministerial Coordination for Chemicals Management; (2) a National Committee for Chemicals Management; and (3) an Information Exchange Network for Chemicals Management. The Permanent Committee for Interministerial Coordination will include all ministries involved in chemicals management and elaborate a “charter” for the committee. The National Committee for Chemicals Management was created in February 2002 and is responsible for ongoing activities related to chemicals, such as development of

legislative and regulatory texts and implementation of international chemicals agreements. Lastly, the Information Exchange Network is designed to provide quick and easy access to information about chemicals management. All three of these mechanisms involve relevant stakeholders, take a “life-cycle” approach to chemicals management and are linked to increase synergies and reduce duplication. However, Mr. Sow noted that Senegal still requires reinforcement and resources for its coordination activities, in particular for communication and logistics.

**Slovenia outlined the functioning of their Intersectoral Committee on the Management of Dangerous Substances.**

Ms. Darja Bostjancic, Ministry of Health, **Slovenia**, outlined the functioning of their Intersectoral Committee on the Management of Dangerous Substances (ICMDS). Between its founding in 1996 and its transformation into a more permanent committee at the beginning of 2001, the ICMDS held 21 sessions with a goal to ensuring an efficient health and environmental protection system. The working method of the ICMDS was to find mutual solutions acceptable to all responsible and interested parties by their active engagement and through a democratic approach. Moreover, in all areas of its activities the ICMDS introduced a horizontal approach – making a comprehensive assessment of the situation and determining goals and priorities across all the vertical sectoral activities. The development of a comprehensive programme for achieving these goals is still planned within an intersectoral framework, and this programme will need to be realised through intersectoral activities.

Ms. Bostjancic highlighted that the general tasks of the ICMDS, and its subcommittees, were to:

- coordinate the work of sectors responsible for the area of dangerous substances;
- draw up a National Profile on the management of dangerous substances;
- draw up a national action programme for chemical safety and cooperation;
- draft a dangerous substances act which will also include the legal basis for good laboratory practice; and
- draft executive regulations for good laboratory practice.

Midway through the intersectoral committee’s existence, the new Chemicals Act (Zkem) issued in 1999 provided a new legislative context for its operation. On the basis of this act the intersectoral committee was re-established in 2001 and renamed the “Intersectoral Committee on the Sound Management of Chemicals” (ICSMC). Ms. Bostjancic concluded her presentation by stressing the importance of the “human element” in improving interministerial coordination.

Mr. Roland Hutapea of **Indonesia**’s National Agency for Drug and Food Control noted that no single agency or ministry can fully control the entire chemical life-cycle. In Indonesia, a cross-sectoral

**Existing challenges relate to a lack of reference materials, lack of adequate scientific information, and an inadequacy of existing legal instruments.**

coordinating mechanism has been established with the aim of harmonising perceptions regarding chemicals management and safety at all stages of the life-cycle. However, challenges exist related to a lack of reference materials, lack of adequate scientific information, and an inadequacy of existing legal instruments issued by various ministries and agencies concerned with chemicals management. He suggested that national strategies for chemicals management should therefore, *inter alia*: foster a coordinating mechanism dealing with integrated chemicals management; promote selected training for strengthening the capacity of staff both within and outside of government on risk assessment and management; and develop existing chemical information systems and networking facilities within concerned ministries and agencies. Mr Hutapea concluded by noting that coordination and cooperation amongst all stakeholders is key to achieving satisfactory outcomes.

Mr. K.G.D. Bandaratilake of **Sri Lanka**'s Central Environmental Authority stated that, at present, Sri Lanka does not have a formalised integrated mechanism for interministerial coordination regarding chemicals management. He explained that a few coordination mechanisms exist which are inadequate and should be improved further; most of them are informal and are not sustained for a long period due to a lack of commitment and financial and other constraints. Even with the necessary mandates for coordination and information exchange for chemicals management, several ministries and private institutions are unable to implement those due to their weak institutional capacities.

**The few coordination mechanisms which exist are inadequate and should be improved further; most are informal and are not sustained for a long period.**

He outlined that Sri Lanka has identified that a well organised interministerial coordination mechanism is essential to: help increase transparency and collaboration amongst ministries; clarify the respective mandates and competencies of the various agencies; facilitate the sharing of information and resources; and foster a comprehensive approach to the management of chemicals that addresses all stages of the chemical life-cycle. Through participation in the UNITAR/IOMC Programme, *Developing and Sustaining an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals*, Sri Lanka will develop an "Integrated National Action Plan for Interministerial Coordination" that will outline a process for the formulation of an effective interministerial coordinating body in which representatives of each relevant ministry would make joint-decisions on chemicals management activities in the country. Necessary resource requirements (including infrastructure, human resources, etc.) for the effective implementation of this coordinating body will be identified, followed by an assessment of institutional strengthening and capacity building requirements. Following a well-designed Action Plan, complemented with government funding, as well as the use of external assistance, would help to ensure that interministerial linkages are strengthened. Ensuring the support of decision-makers is also recognised as a key factor for its success.

**Syria suggested that a national network of information on hazardous substances would promote the exchange of information.**

Mr. Fouad El-O’K, Ministry of Environment, **Syria**, explained that the State Ministry of the Environment has the main coordinating role amongst concerned ministries and authorities in all environmental matters, with a view to establishing comprehensive and integrated systems for the sound management of chemicals including the safe disposal of waste. He noted the existence of many interministerial committees in Syria, with members representing all concerned authorities, such as: the national Committee for Chemical Safety located in the Ministry of the Environment; Committees of the Ministry of Health, such as the one dealing with Decree 67 concerned with chemicals used in industry; and the Committee for Pesticides in the Ministry of Agriculture. In addition, the Chamber of Industry has a Committee on Environment and Labour and technical committees exist, for example, for monitoring the use of medicines and for food and food additives. Mr. El-O’K highlighted that many ministries have links to different international organisations and developed countries for international and bilateral cooperation. However, many ministries do not have effective mechanisms to exchange information. He suggested that a national network of information on hazardous substances would promote the exchange of information.

He noted several weaknesses in the country’s national system, including, *inter alia*, a lack of:

- precise information on the quantities of chemicals used in Syria and especially in the quantities consumed and exported, as well as of hazardous industrial waste;
- efficient mechanisms for the exchange of knowledge between and within concerned bodies, or for informing others about the information available to them; and
- a national database on hazardous substances, and weakness in the use of existing international databases.

**Zambia outlined the number of groups that participated in National Profile development and how a new “working culture” had developed.**

Mr. Nelson Manda of the Environmental Council of **Zambia** (ECZ) outlined the background to interministerial coordination in that country, highlighting the following issues: the existence of fragmented responsibilities; that technical experts were often unknown to each other; the limited knowledge regarding the national chemicals management infrastructure; and undefined priorities. In 1994, previously fragmented chemical legislation was harmonised in the new pesticides and toxic substances regulations; and the preparation of a National Profile, undertaken in 1996, established a process of facilitating dialogue and information exchange amongst government ministries as well as groups outside of government (such as industry, labour and NGOs). He outlined the number of groups that had participated in National Profile development and how a new “working culture” had developed which was inclusive rather than exclusive, utilised broader consultation, increased the number of trained personnel and led to more positive attitudes by stakeholders.



Over the years, the large membership of the Committee hindered its effectiveness and sustainability.

In a paper submitted separately to the workshop, Mrs. Abiola Olanipekun of **Nigeria**'s Federal Ministry of the Environment explained how the history of interministerial coordination in Nigeria dated back to 1989, when the "Technical Advisory Committee on Notification of Toxic Chemicals in International Trade" was inaugurated by the former Federal Environmental Protection Agency (presently integrated into the newly established Federal Ministry of Environment). The Federal Ministry of Environment took the lead in convening and coordinating the activities of this Committee in line with its mandate as the nation's environment 'watchdog'. Over the years, however, the large membership of this Committee hindered its effectiveness and sustainability with respect to inadequate financial resources to convene meetings, sponsor attendance, prepare working documents and maintain an active line of communication and information exchange amongst members.

The Committee has been renamed several times and as a follow-up to the adoption of the Stockholm Convention on POPs and the obligation of Nigeria to undertake national inventories as part of its enabling activities under the POPs National Implementation Plan (NIP), the Committee was renamed "National Chemicals and Hazardous Wastes Management Committee" (NCHWMC). It is now charged with the overall mandate of developing Integrated National Action Plans for the sound management of both chemicals and hazardous wastes in Nigeria. Mrs. Olanipekun concluded by outlining some of the challenges faced by the nation regarding effective interministerial coordination, such as high communication costs, a large composition of members and inadequate financial resources, but emphasised that an important benefit has been the creation of a forum for cooperation and coordination which has served as a key tool in national efforts geared towards effective and integrated chemicals management.

## 2.2 Countries with Advanced Chemicals Management Capabilities

Due to the great number of existing authorities in Germany, harmonisation is necessary.

Mr. Jens Küllmer of the Federal Ministry for the Environment, **Germany**, presented a list of participating federal authorities in interministerial coordination for chemicals management in Germany, and also highlighted the large number of participating authorities/institutions with different levels of responsibility (e.g. regional authorities). He explained that due to the great number of existing authorities in Germany, harmonisation is necessary and has resulted in a high number of committees and working groups, of which the "Environment Ministers Conference" is particularly important. He presented three examples of such committees and outlined the variety of NGOs also involved. In conclusion, he suggested that the weaknesses in their system were complex procedures, multiple levels of responsibility and that it is staff and cost intensive. However, the benefits have been greater chemical security (fewer accidents), increased staff expertise and political/economic stability.

**The task of interministerial coordination is to consider all the relevant aspects of sustainability but also all the vital interests of stakeholders.**

Mr. Peter Müller, of **Switzerland's** Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape, explained the historical background to chemicals management in Switzerland. He noted that Switzerland was a multi-dimensional society that required multi-dimensional chemicals management. He suggested that the task of interministerial coordination was to consider all the relevant aspects of sustainability but also all the vital interests of stakeholders. He outlined the importance of coordination in crisis situations and described the Swiss procedures for chemicals management. He concluded by stating that Switzerland was: guided by sustainability; ready for urgent events; and organised to cope with "multi-dimensionality" in managing chemicals through the use of interactive and multi-disciplinary agencies.

**Interministerial interactions can: develop partnerships/integration; share contacts, research and lessons learned; adopt new technologies and products; and share best practices.**

Mr. Steve Clarkson, Health **Canada**, described Canada's management of toxic substances, including the roles of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) and the various national and provincial departments with toxics management responsibilities. He noted that interministerial interactions can: develop partnerships/integration; share contacts, research and lessons learned; adopt new technologies and products; and share best practices. He explained the various legislative acts in Canada related to chemicals management and used the regulation of pesticides as a case study to highlight the distribution of principal responsibilities. In the Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA), for example, management strategies for toxic substances are developed in consultation with all affected parties. He concluded by providing a number of relevant Internet references.

### **2.3 The Perspective of International Convention Secretariats and International Organisations**

Ms. María Cristina Cárdenas-Fischer of **UNEP Chemicals** discussed the implementation of the Stockholm Convention on POPs and stakeholder participation. She highlighted key articles from the Convention related to information exchange (designation of a focal point), public information awareness and education, and development of National Implementation Plans (NIPs). She stressed the importance of determining a multi-stakeholder national coordinating committee based on a stakeholder analysis, and identifying and assigning responsibilities amongst government departments and other stakeholders for the various aspects of POPs management. She concluded by outlining the benefits of implementing the Stockholm Convention through a NIP and reminded participants that coordinating mechanisms should be sustainable and lasting.

**Development of clear Terms of Reference can serve as "standard operating procedures".**

Mr. Craig Boljkovac of **UNITAR** presented a case study on coordination as represented by the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) and its Inter-Organization Coordinating Committee (IOCC). He explained how the development of clear Terms of Reference (TOR) for the IOCC and various issue-specific Coordinating Groups, which provide guidance on

matters such as chairing a coordinating group, the role of secretariat, use of resources, decision-making procedures, and membership, can serve as “standard operating procedures”. He outlined the TOR for the IOMC PRTR Coordinating Group and concluded by noting this can serve as a model for countries to consider when developing/strengthening their own coordination at the national level.



### 3. Challenges and Bottlenecks Identified by Countries

Commonly cited challenges and bottlenecks related to the further development and strengthening of interministerial coordination in developing countries and countries with economies in transition include: poor inter- and intra-ministerial communication; conflicting or competing mandates; gaps in expertise; a lack of resources; and low priority given to chemicals issues within a particular ministry(ies).

#### 3.1 Information Challenges

**There is often no standardised mechanism for information and knowledge exchange.**

Many countries highlighted challenges related to information in discussing barriers to interministerial coordination. Not all ministries or departments may collect similar types or quantities of information and there is often a lack of information exchange amongst relevant bodies, as well as no standardised mechanism for information and knowledge exchange. Different formats and systems are frequently used in different ministries, and not all countries yet have widespread access to the use of modern information technologies (such as email or electronic databases) that can facilitate information sharing. Moreover, technical experts in different departments may be unknown to each other, thus reducing the opportunity for networking and information sharing.

#### 3.2 Institutional Obstacles

**Different ministries have different mandates which may often be limited, thus giving the appearance that improved coordination with others is unnecessary.**

A number of difficulties were also cited with regards to “institutional obstacles”. For example, fragmented responsibilities – both horizontally across ministries and vertically amongst different levels of government – were seen as a major barrier to improving interministerial coordination. This can lead to a number of problems, such as lack of information sharing as outlined above, and duplication of activities. Additionally, different ministries have different mandates which may often be limited, thus giving the appearance that improved coordination with others is unnecessary. Various government bodies may also be resistant to share information fearing that it might weaken their areas of expertise or influence. Different attitudes to ideas such as “cooperation” and “hierarchy” can also hinder improving interministerial engagement. Finally, establishing a well functioning interministerial coordination mechanism is time- and often resource-intensive. Even in those countries where some form of mechanism exists, it was highlighted that unstable levels of participation from the various members often made it difficult to achieve results.

#### 3.3 Lack of Resources

Virtually all countries noted that lack of resources, both financial and in terms of staff time, availability and expertise, was a major challenge to both developing and sustaining an effective interministerial coordination mechanism. Large committee meetings can become expensive; for example, sponsoring attendance, preparation of

**Lack of resources, both financial and in terms of staff time, availability and expertise, is a major challenge.**

documents and maintaining open lines of communication and information amongst all the different participants can be resource-intensive activities, especially in countries or ministries with very limited funds. Modern information technologies (such as email or electronic databases) that can facilitate coordination require hardware (such as computers) and reliable communications infrastructure (such as phone lines) – all of which can place a strain on finite resources. Moreover, staff with experience in coordinating ministerial activities may require training and any ‘institutional memory’ that exists can be lost should a key person leave a post.

### **3.4 Legal Challenges**

**Rather than having a cohesive legal and regulatory framework for chemicals, many countries’ legislative requirements are dispersed under numerous sectoral laws.**

Another basic concern is a general lack of coordination amongst ministries as a result of the sometimes fragmented nature of legislation on chemicals in various countries. Rather than having a cohesive legal and regulatory framework for chemicals, many countries’ relevant legislative requirements are dispersed under numerous sectoral laws (e.g. transport, agriculture, health, environment, non-proliferation). This can make it difficult for both regulated parties to understand, and comply with, the various legal requirements, as well as for government ministries to avoid duplication of effort and inefficient use of resources. The problem of conflicting mandates between various ministries, discussed above in section 3.2, may even be the result of legislation that has not been designed in a coordinated way. Lack of clear definition of terminology and/or different interpretation of legal terminology can also complicate matters leading to inconsistencies in how the various ministries interpret, implement and enforce the laws.

## 4. Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations

As outlined in section 2.1, the main objective of the workshop was to develop and test ideas for innovative approaches to interministerial coordination for the sound management of chemicals, consistent with national circumstances and priorities. A number of specific issues and scenarios were therefore discussed by participants and further elaborated by working groups. These groups identified a number of key issues and developed a variety of practical suggestions and recommendations which may be of value for countries which are seeking to strengthen their national capacities for interministerial coordination for the sound management of chemicals.

Section 4.1 summarises the key issues and recommendations regarding mechanisms for interministerial coordination, while the key issues and recommendations related to tools for interministerial coordination are found in section 4.2. Section 4.3 presents a range of general issues to consider when undertaking efforts to strengthen interministerial coordination. Finally, section 4.4 provides a set of suggestions regarding organisational matters for planning and implementing an interministerial coordination mechanism.

### 4.1 Mechanisms for Interministerial Coordination

The starting point for deliberations in the working group dealing with interministerial coordination mechanisms is that such coordination is needed because: information is often scattered; there are competing or overlapping responsibilities in ministries; and resources are limited. It was considered that a good starting point or “template” for discussing mechanisms for interministerial coordination would be the “life-cycle approach”.

**Interministerial coordination mechanisms can have various structural differences, varying in degrees of formality and permanence.**

Four existing models – from Indonesia, Senegal, Slovenia and Zambia – were first considered, all of which had similar characteristics (e.g. a permanent committee, technical support from a secretariat, and 2-3 subcommittees), to establish common themes and challenges in order to make recommendations.<sup>9</sup> It was deemed important to consider the situation of stakeholders outside of government and their role in relation to government officials. It was also noted that interministerial coordination mechanisms can have various structural differences – varying in degrees of formality and permanence – such as a primary committee with one or more technical subcommittees, having co-chairs or rotating chairs, establishing a permanent or provisional secretariat, and mechanisms for engaging senior decision-makers. Workshop participants recalled that different cultures and levels of development can affect the efficacy of particular mechanisms.

<sup>9</sup> See section 2.1 above for respective country backgrounds.

### ***General Recommendations***

As a result of these deliberations, the working group made the following suggestions.

- all countries should consider establishing an overall coordination mechanism for implementing the sound management of chemicals, taking into account the mechanisms already available so as to avoid duplication;
- consideration should be given to establishing sub-committees to avoid overloading the work of one central committee (already existing technical advisory bodies could also be consulted);
- stakeholder participation from outside of ministries should be facilitated, either directly through participation in the mechanism or in a consultative manner;
- criteria should be used to set priorities for establishing a mechanism(s) that reflect the requirements and circumstances of individual countries;
- the degree of formality of the mechanism should reflect the needs and requirements of individual countries; not all mechanisms, for example, need decision-making authority and may have a stronger advisory and information exchange role;
- consideration should be given to the establishment of harmonised national positions in relation to international obligations to ensure that delegations appropriately reflect national positions;
- careful consideration should also be given to the process for establishing the mechanism, including the development of Terms of Reference;
- an evaluation mechanism (e.g. third party audits), independent in nature, could be used to provide feedback; and
- records should be kept of decisions taken related to coordination, keeping in mind the need to respect appropriate confidentiality (the importance of “institutional memory”).

## **4.2 Tools for Interministerial Coordination**

This working group initiated its work by having a brainstorming session on tools used for interministerial coordination, focusing mainly on practical experiences and the use of various tools under different socio-economic conditions, and also at different levels of the decision-making process.



### *Available Tools*

**This working group focused mainly on practical experiences and the use of various tools under different socio-economic conditions, and also at different levels of the decision-making process.**

A number of tools that could be used for interministerial coordination were identified, covering a range of areas such as communications, special situations, documents, meetings and legislation. These include:

- mail, fax, telephone, email;
- teleconferences;
- Intra- and Internet (up-to-date websites)<sup>10</sup>;
- password-protected electronic discussion fora;
- databases;
- organograms and directories showing responsibilities and focal points;
- secure lines of communications to be used in emergency situations;
- electronic “white” papers (living documents that are frequently updated);
- discussion papers;
- position papers;
- bulletins;
- reports;
- lists of participants;
- workshops;
- ad-hoc task groups;
- formal meetings (e.g. interministerial);
- informal meetings (e.g. working breakfast, receptions); and
- list of national, regional and international legislation, in both hard and electronic format that the country subscribes to.

For meetings, facilitators could be useful in catalysing mutual understanding.

### *Making Effective Use of Tools in Different Situations*

**Consideration should be given to a systematic review of available tools and the development of indicators to monitor their effectiveness.**

It was noted that different socio-cultural situations for different countries would influence the tools that may be used for specific purposes. This includes the routine modes of communication that may be used in individual countries, and therefore appropriate coordination tools should be selected. Motivated staff was considered as an essential driving force for the implementation of specific tools.

Other points of consideration for interministerial tools raised at the workshop included: consideration should be given to a systematic review of available tools (as listed above) for enhancing coordination; and indicators should be developed for monitoring the effectiveness of specific tools used in coordination (“learning lessons”).

<sup>10</sup> An “intranet” is an internal electronic information system solely for use within a company or organisation.

### 4.3 Issues to Consider

A variety of general issues to consider in strengthening interministerial coordination were discussed at the workshop and are presented below.

#### *Developing New Policies or Defining a National Position*

**Face-to-face meetings between relevant parties can “jump-start” the process.**

One approach to developing new policies or defining a national position, which can help to strengthen interministerial coordination, is to start with a face-to-face meeting between relevant parties to jump-start the process. This can help the participants become more familiar with each other and thus increase trust. Another approach suggested is to first provide written information, which would eventually be followed by a meeting at later stage (i.e. once all participants have been able to study the information).

It is important to keep in mind that large meetings can have significant budget implications, especially in large countries with federal systems in place. However, the need for such meetings was stressed as it could promote a sense of ownership of the final decision reached. Before convening any meeting, adequate written background information should be provided to participants.

#### *Implementation of Existing Policies and Regulations*

Implementation of established policies and existing regulations is often an ongoing process, requiring consultation amongst responsible authorities, usually with a need for coordinated technical inputs from various experts. The normal communication tools along with the regular collection of relevant harmonised data at the national and international levels are the most important means for ensuring the necessary coordination. While it may be useful for experts to meet to resolve difference of opinion in the interpretation of data, most work can be undertaken through electronic communication, for example, using password-protected discussion fora (if available).

#### *International Dimension: Coordination of Inputs to International Activities*

**It is important for countries to establish harmonised positions in relation to their international obligations to ensure that delegations appropriately reflect national positions.**

It is important for countries to establish harmonised positions in relation to their international obligations to ensure that delegations appropriately reflect national positions. Treaty obligations, whether international, regional or bi-lateral, require country action, often in the context of legislation and regulations. Countries should try first to harmonise their own policies in a multi-stakeholder process and ensure that these policies are implemented through their multilateral agreements and other treaty obligations; the agreed policy should be reflected in the deliberations of all the relevant international bodies, such as the UN specialised agencies, other intergovernmental organisations (IGOs), and

regional fora to which the country may belong. This calls for ensuring that national delegations to the various fora understand the coordinated positions of the country and reflect them appropriately.

In addition to communication used on a daily basis, regional workshops were deemed to be important for countries in a region to discuss new issues, with the aim of coming to a regional position. Bulletins and reports in printed form, including a complete list of participants, were also considered useful for coordinating this type of discussion.

### ***Emergency Preparedness and Response***

Prepared and regularly tested coordination is required for chemical emergency preparedness calling for specific tools. It can be important during emergency situations to have secure and guaranteed lines for communication, as well as a rapid response capability. Focal points (e.g. civil defense for natural disasters) should be designated for each type of situation, with clear lines of responsibility.

The following items should be considered for implementation of an emergency coordination process:

- crisis management team;
- information and coordination center;
- database access, especially in developing countries where the emergency services do not have advanced information systems;
- contingency plans; and
- mechanisms for coordination between different departments (e.g. in food contamination cases).

### ***Integrated Coordination of All Needs***

**Consider integrating existing mechanisms for different aspects of chemicals management into an overall coordination mechanism.**

Where countries already have existing mechanisms for aspects of chemicals management (e.g. in relation to vector control or food safety), it is important to integrate them into an overall coordination mechanism, which also ensures appropriate coordination with other inter-related policy areas. Clear terms of reference (TOR) are required as well as monitoring mechanisms.

### ***Benefits of Interministerial Coordination***

A range of benefits related to interministerial coordination were also identified and include:

- common positions on issues are identified and reinforced;
- synergies are created – work can take place in collaboration instead of in isolation, resulting in additional benefits to both (or several) parties;

- duplication of efforts is avoided where possible, freeing up scarce resources for other priority issues;
- gaps in chemicals management are identified; and
- understanding of divergent issues is increased, and thus the potential for misunderstanding is decreased.

#### 4.4 Organisational Issues

The discussion on various mechanisms for interministerial coordination was followed by a discussion on practical suggestions regarding: the process of establishing an interministerial coordination mechanism; development of TOR for the drafting group and the mechanism itself; and tasks of the secretariat. These issues are outlined below:

##### *Process of Establishing an Interministerial Coordination Mechanism*

The suggested process for establishing an interministerial coordination mechanism is that a small committee (or drafting group) develop a “blueprint” of what the mechanism should like look. This should include both an initial TOR to address the work of the drafting group itself, followed by TOR for the coordination mechanism (including a list of possible tasks for the secretariat of the mechanism). Once drafted, agreement on this blueprint should be obtained from senior decision-makers (e.g. ministers or cabinet) and the mechanism should be established.

##### *Terms of Reference for the Drafting Group*

TOR help to ensure that each member of the drafting group is in agreement concerning important administrative and organisational details relevant to its mandate and activities. In general, the TOR should be brief but sufficiently descriptive of the tasks involved.

The development of these TOR should be done in consultation with all relevant ministries at various levels (federal, regional and local, as appropriate) and outside stakeholders such as public interest NGOs, industry and academia. The drafting group itself should be as independent from political influence as possible, and consist of a small group of qualified individuals (e.g. 3-5 people). In the TOR, a budget should be established and a time frame for the completion of work should be given (e.g. approximately six months). Other possible items for consideration in the TOR are the workload amongst the various members (e.g. is there a chair or other “lead” author(s)? will most work be done electronically or will face-to-face meetings be required?). Lastly, the TOR should be adapted to fit the local situation or circumstances, as appropriate.

**TOR help to ensure that each member of the drafting group is in agreement concerning important administrative and organisational details.**

### ***Terms of Reference for an Interministerial Coordinating Mechanism***

It was suggested that the TOR for the coordinating mechanism itself, developed initially by the drafting group, contain the following items:

- the purpose and objective(s) of the mechanism;
- structure and membership;
- legal status;
- operating procedures;
- an outline of the responsibilities of members;
- appointment system for members/deputies;
- tools that may be used (see also list in section 4.2 above);
- roles and responsibilities of any sub-committees (ad-hoc or permanent) that are created;
- appointment (e.g. rotating or fixed) and responsibilities of chair and/or co-chairs;
- appointment, role and responsibilities of secretariat (see section below);
- provisions for information dissemination (e.g. are documents restricted or publicly available? will feedback to international level take place?); and
- financial provisions (e.g. how will the operation of the mechanism be paid for?).

### ***Tasks for Secretariat***

It was also recommended that, either in the TOR for the coordinating mechanism or in a separate TOR for the secretariat itself, the following items should be considered:

- the secretariat should be mandated to work in close cooperation with the chair of the mechanism;
- establish the secretariat on a permanent basis, if possible, and within a well-established ministry;
- incorporate the secretariat within a legislative context, if possible, including a budget and financial mechanism; and
- the secretariat should be responsible for: overall coordination of the mechanism; preparation of meeting agendas, minutes and documents; information collection, distribution, exchange and archiving; and maintenance of links with all relevant stakeholders and members of the committee.



## Annex A: Workshop Agenda

Thursday, 29 August 2002

### 09:00 Opening Ceremony

Statements by:

- Mr. Peter Müller, Government of Switzerland
- Mr. Craig Boljkovac, Acting Programme Coordinator, UNITAR

### 09:15 Introductory Presentation on Workshop Topic, Objectives and Methodology

- Mr. John Haines, UNITAR

### 09:30 Session 1: **Situations and Challenges in Developing Countries and Countries with Economies in Transition**, Moderator: Mr. John Haines, UNITAR

Representatives of developing countries and countries with economies in transition will give brief presentations (20 minutes, including questions), which highlight the current situation in their countries with regard to interministerial coordination. Emphasis will be placed on examples of successful approaches, practical problems faced, and issues which are particularly challenging. There will be a discussion at the end of the Session.

- Ms. Consuelo Meneses Moreno, Ministry of Public Health, Ecuador
- Mr. Ousmane Sow, Ministry of Environment, Senegal
- Ms. Darja Bostjancic, Ministry of Health, Slovenia

### 10:30 Coffee Break

### 11:00 Session 1 continued: (Brief 10 minute presentations)

- Ms. Abiola Olanipekun, Federal Ministry of Environment, Nigeria
- Mr. Roland Hutapea, National Agency for Drug and Food Control, Indonesia
- Mr. K.G.D. Bandaratilake, Central Environmental Authority, Sri Lanka
- Mr. Fouad El-O'K, Ministry of Environment, Syria
- Mr. Nelson Manda, Environmental Council of Zambia

### 11:50 Session 1 continued: Discussion of Country Presentations

### 12:30 Lunch Break

**13:30 Session 2: Perspectives and Experiences of Countries with Advanced Chemicals Management Capabilities, Moderator: Mr. Hans de Kruijf, UNITAR**

Representatives from countries with advanced chemicals management capabilities will give brief presentations (around 15 minutes) which share the experience gained over the past years regarding interministerial coordination. Emphasis will be given to approaches that have worked well and/or which have been difficult to implement. Lessons learned which might be of particular relevance to developing countries and countries with economies in transition will also be highlighted. There will be 5 minutes at the end of each presentation for questions and answers.

- Mr. Jens Küllmer, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Germany
- Mr. Steve Clarkson, Health Canada
- Mr. P.M. Müller, Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests and Landscape, Switzerland

**14:20 Session 3: The Perspective of International Convention Secretariats and International Organisations, Moderator: Mr. Jonathan Krueger, UNITAR**

Representatives from international organisations will provide brief overviews (around 15 minutes), from the perspective of their respective organisations, on how various programmes or initiatives at the international level may shape or contribute to the development and strengthening interministerial coordination. There will be 5 minutes at the end of each presentation for questions and answers.

- Ms. Maria Cristina Cardenas-Fischer, UNEP Chemicals
- Mr. Craig Boljkovac, UNITAR/IOMC

**15:00 Tea Break**

**15:30 Session 4: Introduction to Working Groups, John Haines, UNITAR**

Session 4 consists of two working groups focusing on identifying appropriate ways and means to assist countries in their efforts, and on draft recommendations and conclusions of relevance both to countries and other participants. Group 1 deals with the tools for Interministerial Coordination and Group 2 with the Mechanisms (see Guidance Notes for Working Groups). Each group will examine the various issues involved and prepare a summary report for examination in Plenary in the second part of Friday afternoon.<sup>11</sup>

**17:30 Close**

---

<sup>11</sup> Chairs and Rapporteurs should be chosen within each Working Group and will report back orally to Plenary. Working Group 1 will meet in Room 002 and Working Group 2 in Room 005.



Friday, 20 August 2002

**9:00 Working Groups continue**

**10:30 Coffee Break**

**10:50 Brief Progress Report by Chairs/Rapporteurs of Working Groups (in Plenary)**

**11:10 Working Groups continue**

**12:30 Lunch Break**

**13:45 Working Groups continue**

**15:00 Tea Break**

**15:15 Presentation of Working Group results and discussion in Plenary**

**16:15 Session 5: Review of Workshop Conclusions and Recommendations,**  
Moderator: Mr. Craig Boljkovac, UNITAR

The Secretariat will table the main observations and conclusions of the workshop for discussion and possible adoption by participants.

**17:00 Closing Ceremony**



## Annex B: List of Participants

### 1. Government Representatives

#### **ARGENTINA**

Ms Andrea Repetti  
 Permanent Mission of Argentina  
 10, route de l'Aéroport  
 1215 Geneva 15  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41 22 929 8600  
 FAX +41 22 798 5995  
 Email [asr@mrecic.gov.ar](mailto:asr@mrecic.gov.ar)  
[mission.argentina@ties.itu.int](mailto:mission.argentina@ties.itu.int)

#### **CANADA**

Mr Steve Clarkson  
 Director, Environmental Contaminants  
 Bureau  
 Health Canada  
 Room 111, EHC  
 Tunney's Pasture, AL0801B  
 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L2  
 Canada  
 TEL +1 613 957-3133  
 FAX +1 613 952 2206  
 Email [Steve\\_Clarkson@hc-sc.gc.ca](mailto:Steve_Clarkson@hc-sc.gc.ca)

#### **ECUADOR**

Dra Consuelo Meneses Moreno  
 Centro de Información toxicológico  
 (CIATOX) - UCI  
 Av. Colombia s/n y Yahuachi  
 Quito  
 Ecuador  
 TEL +593 2 290 5162  
 FAX +593 2 250 7913  
 Email [ciatox@andinanet.net](mailto:ciatox@andinanet.net)

#### **GERMANY**

Mr Jens Küllmer  
 Federal Ministry for the Environment  
 PO Box 120629  
 Bonn  
 53048  
 Germany  
 TEL +49 228 305 2744  
 FAX +49 228 305 3524  
 Email [Jens.Kuellmer@bmu.bund.de](mailto:Jens.Kuellmer@bmu.bund.de)

#### **INDONESIA**

Mr Roland Hutapea  
 Acting Director of Products and  
 Hazardous Substances Control  
 Directorate of Products and Hazardous  
 Substances Control  
 National Agency for Drug and Food  
 Control (NADFC)  
 Jl. Percetakan Negara No. 23  
 Jakarta 10560  
 Indonesia  
 TEL +62 21 424 5395 / 422 8921  
 FAX + 62 21 422 89 21  
 Email [roland5305@yahoo.com](mailto:roland5305@yahoo.com)

#### **SENEGAL**

Mr Ousmane Sow  
 Responsable de la Gestion des Produits  
 Chimiques  
 Direction de l'environnement  
 106, rue Carnot  
 Dakar  
 Senegal  
 TEL +221 821 07 25  
 FAX +221 822 62 12  
 Email [ousmane7@sentoo.sn](mailto:ousmane7@sentoo.sn)

#### **SLOVENIA**

Ms Darja Bostjancic  
 Coordinator  
 Intersectoral Committee on the Sound  
 Management of Dangerous Chemicals,  
 Ministry of Health  
 Breg 14  
 SI-1000 Ljubljana  
 Slovenia  
 TEL +386 1-478-6051  
 FAX +386 1 478 62 66  
 Email [darja.bostjancic@gov.si](mailto:darja.bostjancic@gov.si)

**SRI LANKA**

Mr K.G.D.Bandaratilake  
Deputy Director General  
(Envt. Pollution Control)  
Central Environmental Authority  
“Parisara Piyasa”  
No. 104, Robert Gunawardena Mw.  
Battaramulla  
Sri Lanka  
TEL +94 1 872415 or 872359  
FAX +94 1 872 605  
Email kgdband@sltnet.lk

**SWITZERLAND**

Mr Peter Müller  
Swiss Agency for the Environment,  
Forests and Landscape  
CH-3003 Berne  
Switzerland  
TEL +41 61 721 2339  
FAX +41 61 721 2317  
Email dr.p.m.mueller@swissonline.ch

**SYRIA**

Mr Fouad El-O'K  
Head, Chemical Safety Department  
Ministry of Environment  
Tolyani Street, PO Box 3773  
Damascus  
Syria  
TEL +963 11 333 6043 or 333 0510  
FAX +963 11 333 5645 or 333 6043  
Email ENV-Min@net.sy  
fa-ok@scs-net.org

**ZAMBIA**

Mr Nelson Manda  
Environmental Council of Zambia  
Box 35131  
Lusaka  
Zambia  
TEL +260 1 254130/1, 260 1 254023, 260  
1 254059  
FAX +260 1 254164  
Email nmanda@necz.org.zm

## 2. International Organisations

### ***ILO***

Mr Pavan Baichoo  
 Technical Officer, Occupational Safety  
 SafeWork, ILO  
 4 route des Morillons  
 CH-1211 Geneva 22  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41 22 799 6722  
 FAX +41 22 799 6878  
 Email [baichoo@ilo.org](mailto:baichoo@ilo.org)

### ***UNIDO***

Ms. Claudia Linke-Heep  
 POPs Project Manager  
 Cleaner Production and Environmental  
 Management Branch  
 UNIDO  
 P.O. Box 300  
 1400 Vienna,  
 Austria  
 TEL (43-1) 26026 3813  
 FAX (43-1) 26026 6819  
 Email [C.Linke@unido.org](mailto:C.Linke@unido.org)

### ***WHO/PCS***

Ms Nida Besbelli  
 International Programme on Chemical  
 Safety  
 World Health Organization  
 1211 Geneva 27  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41-22-791-4287  
 FAX : +41-22-791-4848  
 Email [Besbellin@who.int](mailto:Besbellin@who.int)

Ms Joanna Tempowski  
 International Programme on Chemical  
 Safety  
 World Health Organization  
 20, Avenue Appia  
 CH-1211 Geneva 27  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41 22 791 3571  
 FAX +41 22 791 4848  
 Email [tempowskij@who.int](mailto:tempowskij@who.int)

### ***UNEP CHEMICALS***

Ms María Cristina Cárdenas-Fischer  
 UNEP Chemicals  
 International Environment House  
 11- 13 chemin des anemones  
 CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneve  
 Switzerland  
 TEL (4122) 917 8635  
 FAX +41 22  
 Email [MCardenas@chemicals.unep.ch](mailto:MCardenas@chemicals.unep.ch)

### ***UNEP/SECRETARIAT OF THE BASEL CONVENTION (SBC)***

Mr Nelson Sabogal  
 Senior Programme Officer  
 Capacity Building/Training  
 Secretariat of the Basel Convention  
 United Nations Environment Programme  
 International Environment House  
 11-13 chemin des Anémones  
 CH-1219 Chatelaine  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41 22 917 82 12  
 FAX +41 22 797 3454  
 Email [nelson.sabogal@unep.ch](mailto:nelson.sabogal@unep.ch)  
 Website <http://www.basel.int>

### ***UNITAR***

Mr Craig Boljkovac  
 Acting Programme Coordinator  
 UNITAR  
 Palais des Nations  
 CH-1211 GENEVE 10  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41 22 917 84 71  
 FAX +41 22 917 80 47  
 Email [craig.boljkovac@unitar.org](mailto:craig.boljkovac@unitar.org)

Mr John Haines  
 Senior Special Fellow  
 UNITAR  
 Palais des Nations  
 CH-1211 GENEVE 10  
 Switzerland  
 TEL +41 22 917 84 70  
 FAX +41 22 917 80 47  
 Email [hainesj@eurospan.com](mailto:hainesj@eurospan.com)

Mr H.A.M. De Kruijf  
Senior Special Fellow  
UNITAR  
Ecoassistance  
Den Dam 10  
7084 BH Breedenbroek  
The Netherlands  
TEL + 31 315 330852  
FAX: + 31 315 330852  
Email [kruijf@ecoassistance.nl](mailto:kruijf@ecoassistance.nl)

Mr Jonathan Krueger  
Fellow  
UNITAR  
Palais des Nations  
CH-1211 GENEVE 10  
Switzerland  
TEL +41 22 917 8166  
FAX +41 22 917 80 47  
Email [jonathan.krueger@unitar.org](mailto:jonathan.krueger@unitar.org)



The United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) was established in 1965 as an autonomous body within the United Nations with the purpose of enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations through appropriate training and research. UNITAR is governed by a Board of Trustees and is headed by an Executive Director. The Institute is supported by voluntary contributions from governments, intergovernmental organizations, foundations and other non-governmental sources.

Since 1 July 1993, pursuant to General Assembly Resolution 47/227, UNITAR Headquarters have been transferred to Geneva. UNITAR has the following functions:

- To ensure liaison with organizations and agencies of the United Nations and with permanent missions accredited in Geneva, New York and other cities hosting United Nations Institutions and to establish and strengthen cooperation with faculties and academic institutions.
- To conduct training programmes in multilateral diplomacy and international cooperation for diplomats accredited in Geneva and the national officials, involved in work related to United Nations activities.
- To carry out a wide range of training programmes in the field of social and economic development which include:
  - a. Training Programme in Multilateral Diplomacy, Negotiations and Conflict Resolution;
  - b. Environmental and Natural Resource Management Training Programmes;
  - c. Training Programme on Debt and Financial Management with special emphasis on the Legal Aspects;
  - d. Training Programme on Disaster Control;
  - e. Training Programme on Peace-Keeping, Peace-Making, and Peace-Building.

Street Address:  
11-13 chemin des  
Anémones  
1219 Châtelaine  
Geneva  
SWITZERLAND

Postal Address:  
UNITAR  
Palais des Nations  
CH-1211 GENEVA 10  
SWITZERLAND

Tel.: +41 22 917 1234

Fax: +41 22 917 8047

Website: [www.unitar.org](http://www.unitar.org)