



Sustainable Chemistry – an NGO perspective

Alexandra Caterbow

WECF – Women in Engage for a Common Future

- International network with 150 member organisations in 50 countries
- Offices in D, NL, FR, CH, Georgia
- UNEP partner, ECOSOC status
- Co-Lead: Women Major Group UN SDGs





Why is Sustainable Chemistry important now?

- Germany started an international initiative to include Sustainable Chemistry in a "future SAICM"
- Several papers present the German position about SC
- Several side events were conducted by the German government at UNEA2, 1st Intersessional Meeting SAICM, Stockholm Convention (upcoming in April)
- ISC3 launch in May

Policy

- Green chemistry is mentioned e.g. in the Dubai Declaration "We are determined to realize the benefits for chemistry, including green chemistry, for improved standards of living, public health and protection of the environment."
- No reflection of Sustainable Chemistry in international policy on chemicals and waste

IPEN paper for SAICM post 2030



Beyond 2020: Green chemistry and sustainable chemistry

IPEN January 2017

Introduction

The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) addresses significant health and environmental harms caused by chemical exposure and makes a global political commitment to reform how chemicals are produced and used in order to minimize those harms. Heads of State at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg called for the development of SAICM. While the agreement is not legally binding, its basic texts represent a consensus of Environment Ministers, Health Ministers and other delegates from more than one hundred governments who attended the first International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM1), held in Dubai, February 2006.

Does Sustainable Chemistry help to achieve our goals as NGOs?

NGO interest

NGOs working on chemicals often focus on the following topics:

- Reduction of exposure (capacity building, public awareness raising, clean up)
- Phase out and ban of hazardous chemicals (regulation)
- Save substitution, safe non-chemical alternatives
- A precautionary system and strict regulation (regulation that includes polluter pays, reverse burden of proof, precautionary principle, right to know)

Goals	SC contribution	SC shortfalls
Exposure reduction	 Intrinsically safe chemicals should be used 	Timeframe?No chemical alternatives in the focusNo concept for clean up of hot spots
Capacity building	 Education, research 	- Role of CEIT and developing countries?
Public awareness raising		 No focus on transparency, right to know, labelling
Phase out, ban, regulation	- Only if fully implemented	No focus on regulatory systemNo mandatory elements
Save substitution	- Only if fully implemented	No mandatory elementsNo focus on chemical alternatives
Precautionary system, core		- Not mentioned
principles		www.wecf.eu

- SC has only been vaguely defined -> room for interpretation, including activities that do nothing to reduce harm
- SC is about the life cycle impacts of chemicals, it does not prioritize exposure and hazard reduction

- Trade offs against energy efficiency or other topics (e.g. mercury containing light bulbs, HBCD in insulation material)
- SC does not provide a solution for chemical legacy problems

- No mandatory elements are mentioned
- Voluntary self-declaration schemes of the chemical industry are not successful
- SC should not be a PR programme to promote what industry is already doing

Governance and regulatory component is missing:

A precautionary system (regulation that includes polluter pays, reverse burden of proof, precautionary principle, right to know) and strict regulation is needed

...to achieve a push for SC (R&D, incentives, substitution, early warning system)

- Precise definition of SC
- Exposure and hazard reduction should be top priority
- Strict regulation is key to achieve a transformation in chemical production
- Preserve Green Chemistry as a policy priority instead of Sustainable Chemistry

- Companies that make authentic moves to safer chemicals need to participate in policy discussions
- Resources for CEIT and developing countries not only to manage dangerous chemicals, but to avoid them and design better ones
- Research funding needs to be directed to e.g. green chemistry

- Non-chemical alternatives are equally important, e.g. agroecology
- Governments should create a real "level playing field" for industry
- We need ratings and benchmarks (e.g. GreenScreen) to assure that hazards are being reduced or avoided

 Internalization of cost: at the moment most of the cost from hazardous chemicals (health, environment, surveillance etc) lies with society and taxpayers

The global chemical industry has an annual turn-over of approximately USD \$1.5 trillion per year (trillion = thousand billion). If, for example, a global cost recovery scheme recovers USD \$1.5 billion annually, the total burden on the chemical producing industry would come to 0.1% of the industry's annual turnover – one cent for each ten dollars in sales.

Conclusions

- SC is not fit to function as overarching concept for a post SAICM policy framework
- Is SC just a trend, or a substantial concept that NGOs have to deal with in the future? Not clear, yet
- As NGOs we may want to develop a joint position to be ready for our advocacy work
- Until 2020 there will be more opportunities to present our joint position: ISC3 launch, SC side event at Stockholm COP8, 2nd intersessional meeting SAICM, OEWG SAICM

Thank you for your attention!

Contact:
Johanna Hausmann
johanna.hausmann@wecf.org