
**Second meeting of the Quick Start Programme
Executive Board**
Geneva
23-24 April 2007

Report of the second meeting of the Executive Board of the Quick Start Programme of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management

Introduction

1. In resolution I/4 adopted at its first session, the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) decided to establish a Quick Start Programme (QSP) to support initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) was requested to establish a voluntary, time-limited trust fund to provide seed money to support QSP objectives in accordance with resolution I/4.

2. Resolution I/4 also establish the QSP Executive Board, consisting of two government representatives of each of the United Nations regions and all the bilateral and multilateral donors and other contributors to the Programme. The Board reviews progress under the QSP on the basis of reports from the Trust Fund Implementation Committee¹ and other QSP participants, and provides operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the QSP. The first meeting of the Executive Board was held on 26-27 April 2006 in Geneva.

I. Opening of the meeting

3. The second meeting of the Board was held at International Environment House in Geneva, Switzerland, on 23 and 24 April 2007. The meeting was opened by Mr. Matthew Gubb, Coordinator of the SAICM secretariat. Mr. Gubb welcomed the representatives and thanked the donors who had pledged contributions towards the QSP and its trust fund.

II. Organizational matters

A. Attendance

4. The meeting was attended by the following government representatives of the five United

¹ The QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee comprises representatives of the participating organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The participating organizations of IOMC are the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), UNEP, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the World Health Organization (WHO).

Nations regions:

Africa:	Mr. Yves Uwarugira (Burundi)
Asia-Pacific:	Mr. Sayed Ali Mohammad Mousavi (Islamic Republic of Iran) Ms. Minquan Wichayarangsaridh (Thailand)
Central and Eastern Europe:	Ms. Irina Zastenskaya (Belarus) Ms. Nino Tkhilava (Georgia)
Latin America and the Caribbean:	Ms. Gillian Guthrie (Jamaica) Ms. Vilma Morales Quillama (Peru)
Western European and Others:	Mr. Jozef Buys (Belgium) Mr. John Shoaff (United States of America)

5. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following QSP trust fund donor Governments: Austria, Finland, India, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden and Switzerland.

6. The meeting was attended by representatives of contributors to the non-trust fund QSP: Japan, Canada, OECD, International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA), UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO. FAO attended as observer.

B. Election of officers

7. The representatives elected Ms. Gillian Guthrie (Jamaica) as the co-chair from the group of government representatives of the five United Nations regions and Mr. Jean-Louis Wallace (Canada) as the co-chair from the group of donors.

C. Adoption of the agenda

8. The representatives adopted the following agenda for the meeting on the basis of the provisional annotated agenda set out in document SAICM/EB.2/1/Rev.1:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Election of officers;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (c) Organization of work.
3. Rules of procedure.
4. Report of the secretariat on the status of the Quick Start Programme:
 - (a) Quick Start Programme Trust Fund
 - (b) Broader Quick Start Programme
5. Report of the Executive Board's Committee on the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund.
6. Definitions of and criteria for the assessment of multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation contributing to the SAICM Quick Start Programme, and the declaration form for such contributions.

7. Further development of operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the Quick Start Programme.
8. Consideration of a draft business plan for the Quick Start Programme.
9. Other matters.
10. Next meeting.
11. Adoption of the report
12. Closure of the meeting.

D. Organization of work

9. The Board agreed to meet from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 6 p.m. It agreed to set aside a portion of its time for the separate meeting of the regional representative and Trust Fund in accordance with rule 29 of its rules of procedure.

III. Rules of procedure

10. The Board had before it document SAICM/EB.2/2 which set out the rules of procedure, as adopted ad referendum, at its first meeting, as well as comments received after the meeting. The Board also considered document SAICM/EB.2/INF/1, the report of the first meeting of the QSP Executive Board and SAICM/EB.2/INF/6, an information document on voting mechanisms of selected Multilateral Environment Agreements and their subsidiary bodies. The co-chair introduced the item and invited participants to discuss the proposals, as contained in document SAICM/EB.2/2 and the possible resolution of outstanding items.

11. In the subsequent extensive discussion, no agreement could be reached on how decisions would be taken on matters of substance, absent consensus, and whether a decision-making procedure by consensus of Governments or by a voting procedure should be provided for in the rules. Participants nonetheless considered other suggestions for changes and agreed by consensus to adopt, ad referendum, the revised rules of procedure, including bracketed sections, as set out in annex A of the present report.

IV. Report of the secretariat on the status of the Quick Start Programme

12. The meeting noted document SAICM/EB.2/3, the report of the secretariat on the status of the QSP and its trust fund, which was introduced by the secretariat.

V. Report of the Executive Board's Committee on the Quick Start Programme trust fund

13. In accordance with ICCM resolution I/4 and rule 29 of the Executive Board's rules of procedure, during the meeting of the Board a committee, composed of the government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors who have made and/or pledged to make contributions to the QSP trust fund, was convened to consider the operation of the trust fund. Chaired by Ms. Gillian Guthrie (Jamaica), the committee took note of the information contained in the report of the secretariat on the QSP and its trust fund (document SAICM/EB.2/3) and the report of the secretariat on preparations for project execution (document SAICM/EB.2/4). The committee also addressed the issues for possible consideration in the further development of operational guidance for the QSP trust fund (document SAICM/EB.2/Rev.1). Ms Guthrie briefed the Executive Board on the conclusions of the committee, which are reflected in the present report under agenda item 7.

VI. Definitions of and criteria for the assessment of multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation contributing to the SAICM Quick Start Programme, and the declaration form for such contributions

14. The co-chair introduced document SAICM/EB.2/5, the draft QSP contribution declaration form, and SAICM/EB.2/INF/7, which contained all declared contributions to the QSP. She also reminded participants that during the teleconference held on 15 March 2007, participating Board members had discussed the need to revise the draft form and to develop criteria for the assessment of QSP declarations.

15. Board members discussed possible revisions to the draft declaration form and agreed that in-kind and/or financial contributions should be quantified, the geographical scope of the declared contributions should be indicated and that the form should further encourage specific reference to the QSP objective and strategic priorities. It was noted that the form would be revised and used for declaring future contributions. Board members, if they wished to do so, would be welcome to submit revised declarations based on the new form. Such revisions would eventually become necessary to facilitate up to date reporting on QSP contributions in preparation of the next session of the ICCM. The revised form is available in annex B of the present report. The Board agreed that FAO, which is in the course of agreeing internally on its QSP declaration and would submit the form shortly after the Board meeting, could use the original draft form.

16. The issue of eligibility for participation in the Board of both a donor to the QSP and of the executing agency of the project or programme financed by the same donor was raised. The Board decided that in such cases, both entities may be eligible for membership as long as their declared contributions to the QSP were recognised as such and were in line with the objective and strategic priorities of the QSP.

17. The Board decided to defer its decision on QSP contribution assessment criteria until the scope of enabling activities had been clarified. Such clarification would be sought in a process established by the Board for the development of operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the QSP which would include a review of submitted and approved QSP trust fund projects and a teleconference.

VII. Further development of operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the Quick Start Programme

18. The Executive Board had before it document SAICM/EB.2/6/Rev.1, setting out issues for possible consideration in the further development of operational guidance for the QSP trust fund. On the basis of the conclusions of the committee on the operation of the QSP trust fund, as referred to under agenda item 5, the Board noted the recommendations of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee concerning a definition of small companies; the financial limit and endorsement requirements for regional projects; endorsement requirements for civil society projects; and the acceptability of joint government/civil society applications.

19. Following an extensive initial discussion by the committee on the operation of the QSP trust fund, the Board concluded that for purposes of eligibility, the SAICM secretariat should take into consideration that most of the donors provide support to countries on the basis of the OECD DAC list, while other donors may also draw from the World Bank country classification list of low income and lower-middle income economies or may also designate other conditions to help inform eligibility. The Board also agreed that, in the process of approving projects, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee should, in accordance with ICCM resolution I/4, give priority to LDCs and SIDS, as identified in the United Nations lists of LDCs and SIDS, and should take into account other factors including geographical and sectoral representation. One regional representative indicated that although Bahamas was not included in the aforementioned OECD DAC and World Bank lists, it should nevertheless be considered eligible for assistance under the QSP as a SIDS. A donor representative suggested that other small countries in a similar position should also be given consideration.

20. Noting the definitional issues in relation to “enabling activities” which were raised during the EU-JUSSCANNZ meeting held in Barcelona from 20 to 22 November 2007, one participant felt that the QSP should also encompass and reflect the balance amongst implementation activities while others considered that it was intended to be restricted to enabling activities. The Board considered the definition used by the Global Environment Facility in some guidance documentation² although a number of Board members were of the view that this definition was too restrictive. The Board agreed that although the guidance provided by the QSP objective and strategic priorities set out in ICCM resolution I/4 was adequate for the time being, it would be appropriate to keep the matter under review. It requested the secretariat to prepare, by early June 2007, a summary of projects submitted and approved under the QSP trust fund in the first and second application rounds, which the Board would discuss in a teleconference in late June 2007.

21. In response to the observations of the secretariat contained in document SAICM/EB.2/6/Rev.1, the Board agreed that, spread over the lifetime of the QSP trust fund, it should be possible for a Government to participate in a multi-country and/or civil society project as well as receiving assistance for a national governmental project, provided that such projects did not involve duplication and that sufficient funds were available to the QSP trust fund, bearing in mind the need for equitable access to the trust fund among the eligible countries.

22. The Board endorsed the fee structure for the QSP trust fund following concerns expressed at its first meeting at the potential for excessive administration fees to be charged on contributions to the trust fund. The agreed fee structure comprises 5 per cent for UNEP as trustee and up to 8 per cent for project executing agencies, being a combined total of up to 13 per cent in accordance with ICCM resolution I/4. In addition, the Board confirmed that administration fees of up to 8 per cent could be built into project budgets not involving external executing agencies in order to cover the administration costs of the project proponents.

23. In response to a request for clarification by the Trust Fund Implementation Committee, the Board advised that project executing agencies whose rules required them to undertake an audit of projects needed to cover such costs from within their administration fee of up to 8 per cent and could not charge this as a separate and additional item in the project budget concerned. However, the Board advised that internal evaluation and audit activities undertaken by an executing agency could be regarded as an acceptable substitute for the “independent monitoring and evaluation required of the project proponent according to ICCM resolution I/4, thus avoiding duplication.

24. The Board concurred with the recommendation of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee that, notwithstanding that there was no requirement for project proponents to work with project executing agencies, this should nevertheless be encouraged in order to ensure appropriate reporting and avoid the risk of non-compliance with United Nations financial rules. The Board noted the Trust Fund Implementation Committee’s concern about maintaining financial accountability in the case of projects without executing agencies but considered that oversight of reporting by the secretariat and the inclusion of audit provisions in project agreements would be adequate. The Board noted the proposal of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee that reporting to the Board on project execution would be provided via the secretariat on the basis of reports from project executing agencies and, if no such agency was involved in a project, by the secretariat.

25. The representative of OECD, in his capacity as chair of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee, suggested that sections of the guidelines for applicants to the trust fund should be revisited by the secretariat in order to strengthen the provisions relating to the documentation of multi-sectoral coordination and engagement of all relevant sectors and the demonstration of linkages with work undertaken to implement multilateral environment agreements, as previously discussed by the Trust Fund Implementation Committee. The Board recommended that the secretariat work with the Committee to resolve these issues.

² See footnote 4 of document SAICM/EB. 2/6/Rev.1, Further development of operational guidance to the QSP trust fund.

VIII. Consideration of a draft business plan for the Quick Start Programme

26. The secretariat introduced document SAICM/EB.2/7/Rev.1 and the background to development of the business plan since the end of 2006. Participants commented on the plan in general and highlighted its usefulness as a working document and the need for it to be reconsidered at the next meetings of the Board. Some participants indicated that specific sections may require changes or clarification. The secretariat was invited by the meeting to bring forward section 6, the strategic action plan of the document, to provide more information on the QSP contributions and to annex background information on the QSP. Participants also wished that the nature of the business plan as a living and working document should be highlighted in the introduction. The revised version of the text with the agreed changes is set out in annex C of the present report.

27. When considering the options for fundraising targets for the QSP trust fund, several participants indicated their preference for option C of the draft, which provided for an annual growth in contributions of 10 per cent over the 2006 achievement of approximately \$6 million, including through the progressive broadening of the donor base. Another representative was uncomfortable with a set target and invited the meeting to consider agreeing to a range, as provided for in option B in which an average annual growth in a range between 5% and 10% over the 2006 achievement of approximately \$6 million was suggested. The meeting agreed by consensus to endorse option B and to highlight the need to meet the upper objective of 10% of this range.

28. Several meeting participants, representing the vast majority of contributions, requested that the meeting report record their concerns with this approach, as they strongly favoured option C from among the five options presented by the secretariat. Moreover, they signalled concerns about the inconsistencies of proposals to lower the funding targets of the business plan, while at the same time seeking to broaden the scope of the QSP. They shared with other meeting participants their view that option B was a conservative option.

IX. Other matters

29. The meeting considered document SAICM/EB.2/INF/8 containing a letter from the Government of Canada to the Executive Board co-chairs inviting the nomination of a representative of the Board to serve on the international steering committee for the Canadian-led project to develop modalities for reporting on progress in SAICM implementation. Following a discussion on the matter, the Board agreed that the co-chairs should write to the Government of Canada to seek clarification as to the purpose of the committee and the expected role of the nominee. Further to the distribution of the response of the Government of Canada to all QSP Executive Board members, a teleconference would be organized in order for the Board to agree upon a nomination.

X. Adoption of the report

30. The Board adopted the present report on the basis of the draft report contained in document SAICM/EB.2/L.1 on the understanding that the co-chairs would be entrusted with its finalization, in consultation with the secretariat.

XI. Next meeting

31. The Board noted that the default location for its annual meeting was Geneva, the seat of the secretariat, and that it would be desirable for the Board to meet after the fifth meeting of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee. It invited the secretariat coordinate dates in relation to those of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee meeting and to consult the Board on options for the Board meeting.

XII. Closure of the meeting

32. The co-chairs thanked the secretariat for the preparation and servicing of the meeting. In their closing remarks, the co-chairs also noted that it would be useful if the provisional agenda for the next meeting could clearly identify the items on the agenda that are to be addressed by the committee on the QSP trust fund before being presented to the wider Board for discussion. The second meeting of the Board was declared closed at 5.20 p.m. on 24 April 2007.

Annex A

Rules of procedure of the QSP Executive Board

At its first meeting, held in Geneva on 25 and 26 April 2006, the Executive Board agreed, ad referendum, on the rules of procedure, with certain options bracketed on the understanding that representatives could submit comments* on the rules and that any proposed amendments would be discussed at the next meeting of the Board. At its second meeting, held in Geneva from 23 and 24 April 2007, the Board further discussed the submitted comments and agreed by consensus to revise the text of the rules of procedures, as follow.

I. Objective

Rule 1

These rules of procedure shall apply to meetings of the Executive Board of the Quick Start Programme of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) and are agreed on the basis of the specific nature of the Programme, in particular recognising the role, alongside Governments, regional economic integration organizations and intergovernmental organizations, played by the private sector, including industry, foundations, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders, as donors and contributors to the Programme.

II. Representation

Rule 2

1. The Executive Board shall be composed of the following:

(a) Two national government representatives of each United Nations region. The term of the representatives shall continue until such date as new representatives are appointed by the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its next session. If a government representative is unable to attend meetings of the Executive Board, the Government from which the representative is nominated shall provide an alternative representative, subject to confirmation by the next session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management.

(b) Bilateral and multilateral donors or other entities¹ that have made or pledged to make a financial contribution to the Quick Start Programme during the period between the most recent and next session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management. Each such donor or entity shall be represented by a representative, whose name shall be submitted to the secretariat before the meeting. The Board shall, before its next meeting, determine whether new contributions qualify as contributions to the Quick Start Programme according to the objective of the Programme set out in resolution I/4 adopted by the Conference at its first session.

(c) Entities² that have made or pledged to make in-kind or other contributions to the Quick Start Programme during the period between the most recent and next session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management. Each contributor or grouping of contributors shall be represented by a representative, whose name shall be submitted to the secretariat before the meeting. The Board shall, before its next meeting, determine whether new contributions qualify as contributions to the Quick Start Programme according to the objective of the Programme set out in resolution I/4 adopted by the Conference at its first session. Such entities shall not be entitled to vote in relation to matters concerning the review of the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund³.

* Comments on the rules of procedure are reflected in document SAICM/EB.2/2.

¹ In accordance with paragraph 5 of resolution I/4 of the International Conference on Chemicals Management at its first session, "entities" include Governments, regional economic integration organizations, intergovernmental organizations, the private sector, including industry, foundations, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders.

² Ibid.

³ This provision is subject to agreement on a decision-making procedure. See rule 23.2

2. Each representative above may be accompanied by one adviser, who may participate in the meeting as an observer.

III. Venue, dates and notice of meetings

Rule 3

1. Meetings of the Executive Board shall normally be held annually back to back with other relevant meetings at a place where such relevant meetings are held.
2. The secretariat, in consultation with the co-chairs of the Board, shall make appropriate arrangements for meetings of the Executive Board.

Rule 4

The secretariat shall notify all participants of the venue and dates of a meeting at least eight weeks before it is due to commence.

IV. Agenda

Rule 5

1. The secretariat shall, in consultation with and under the guidance of the co-chairs, prepare a provisional agenda for each meeting. Any representative may request the secretariat to include specific items in the provisional agenda.
2. The provisional agenda shall be communicated to representatives at least eight weeks before the meeting is due to commence.
3. Between the date of communication of the provisional agenda and the date of adoption of the agenda by the Executive Board, representatives may propose supplementary items for inclusion in the agenda.

Rule 6

At the beginning of each meeting, the Executive Board shall adopt the agenda for the meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda and any supplementary items proposed in accordance with rule 5.

Rule 7

During a meeting, the Executive Board may revise the agenda for the meeting.

V. Officers

Rule 8

1. At the commencement of its first meeting in a period between sessions of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, the Executive Board shall elect two co-chairs, one of whom shall be from a developing country, taking into account geographical distribution, as follows:
 - (a) One from among the government representatives of the five United Nations regions;
 - (b) One from among the representatives of the donors.
2. The term of the co-chairs shall continue until the election of new co-chairs at the commencement of a meeting of the Executive Board held in the next year. Thereafter, the election of the co-chair shall take place

on an annual basis at the commencement of a subsequent meeting in the following year. No one shall serve as a co-chair for more than two consecutive terms.

Rule 9

1. In the absence of consensus, elections of the co-chairs shall be decided by secret ballot.
2. If, when a co-chair is to be elected, no candidate obtains in the first ballot a majority of the votes cast by the [representatives][government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors] present and voting, a second ballot restricted to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes shall be taken. If in the second ballot the votes are equally divided, the co-chair shall be decided by drawing lots between the candidates.
3. In the case of a tie in the first ballot between three or more candidates obtaining the largest number of votes, a second ballot shall be held. If a tie results between more than two candidates, the number shall be reduced to two by lot and the balloting, restricted to them, shall continue in accordance with the procedure set out in paragraph 1.

Rule 10

1. In addition to exercising the powers conferred upon them elsewhere in these rules, the co-chairs shall:
 - (a) Declare the opening and closure of each meeting;
 - (b) Preside at meetings of the Board;
 - (c) Ensure the observance of these rules;
 - (d) Accord representatives the right to speak;
 - (e) Put questions for decision and announce decisions;
 - (f) Rule on any points of order; and
 - (g) Subject to these rules, have complete control over the proceedings and maintain order.
2. The co-chairs may also propose:
 - (a) The closure of the list of speakers;
 - (b) A limitation on the time to be allowed to speakers and on the number of times a participant may speak on an issue;
 - (c) The adjournment or closure of debate on an issue; and
 - (d) The suspension or adjournment of a meeting.
3. The co-chairs, in the exercise of their functions, remains at all times under the authority of the Executive Board.

Rule 11

If a co-chair resigns or is otherwise unable to complete his or her term or the functions, a replacement shall be elected by the Executive Board from amongst the representatives of the five United Nations regions or from the representatives of the donors, as the case may be.

VI. Secretariat

Rule 12

1. The SAICM secretariat, provided by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, shall provide services for the functioning of the Executive Board.
2. In carrying out the task specified in paragraph 1 above, the secretariat shall, as necessary, consult the co-chairs.

Rule 13

The Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, in providing the secretariat of SAICM, shall be responsible for convening meetings and for making all the necessary arrangements for meetings, including the preparation and distribution of documents at least eight weeks in advance of the meetings.

Rule 14

The secretariat shall, in accordance with these rules:

- (a) Receive, reproduce and distribute the official documents for the meetings;
- (b) Make publicly available reports presented by the secretariat to the Executive Board;
- (c) Prepare and make publicly available a report of each meeting;
- (d) Arrange for the custody and preservation of the documents of each meeting in the archives of the secretariat; and
- (e) Perform such other tasks as the Executive Board may require in relation to its functions.

VII. Conduct of business

Rule 15

The co-chairs may declare a session of the meeting open and permit debate to proceed when at least one-third of the representatives participating in the meeting are present, including representatives from each of the groups identified in rule 2. The presence of two-thirds of the representatives so participating shall be required for any consensus decision to be taken.

Rule 16

1. No one may speak at a session of the meeting without obtaining the permission of the co-chairs. Without prejudice to rules 17, 18, 20 and 21, the co-chairs shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak. The secretariat shall maintain a list of speakers. The co-chair may call a speaker to order if the speaker's remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.
2. The Executive Board may, on a proposal from the co-chair or from any representative, limit the time allowed to each speaker and the number of times each representative may speak on a question. Before a decision is taken, two representatives may speak in favour of and two against a proposal to set such limits. When the debate is limited and a speaker exceeds the allotted time, the co-chairs shall call the speaker to order without delay.

Rule 17

During the discussion of any matter, a representative may at any time raise a point of order which shall be decided immediately by the co-chairs in accordance with the present rules. A representative may appeal against the ruling of the co-chairs. The appeal shall be put to the vote immediately and the ruling shall stand unless overruled by a majority of the [representatives][government representatives of the five United Nations

regions and the representatives of the donors] present and voting. A representative may not, in raising a point of order, speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Rule 18

Any motion calling for a decision on the competence of the Executive Board to discuss any matter or to adopt a proposal or an amendment to a proposal shall be decided upon before the matter is discussed or a vote is taken on the proposal or amendment in question.

Rule 19

Proposals and amendments to proposals shall normally be introduced in writing by a representative and handed to the secretariat, which shall circulate copies to the representatives. As a general rule, no proposal may be decided upon at any meeting unless copies of it have been circulated to the representatives before the proposal is debated.

Rule 20

1. Subject to rule 17, the following motions shall have precedence in the order indicated below over all other proposals or motions:

- (a) To suspend the session;
- (b) To adjourn the session;
- (c) To adjourn the debate on the question under discussion;
- (d) To close the debate on the question under discussion.

2. Permission to speak on a motion falling within paragraph 1 (a) to (d) shall be granted to the proposer and, in addition, to one speaker in favour of and two against the motion, after which it shall be put immediately to a vote.

Rule 21

A proposal or motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has begun, provided that the proposal or motion has not been amended. A proposal or motion thus withdrawn may be reintroduced by any other representative.

Rule 22

When a proposal has been adopted or rejected, it may not be reconsidered at the same meeting, unless the Executive Board by a two-thirds majority of the [representatives][government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors] present and voting decides in favour of reconsideration. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to the mover and one other supporter, after which it shall be put immediately to a vote.

VIII. Adoption of decisions

Rule 23⁴

1. The Executive Board shall make every effort to reach agreement on all matters of substance by consensus. [If all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted and no agreement has been reached, the decision shall, as a last resort, be taken by a double majority; that is, an affirmative vote representing both two-thirds of the Executive Board Members that are government representatives of the five United Nations regions and two-thirds of the other Executive Board Members.] [If consensus among Board Members is not achieved,

⁴ Note: The following additional rules may need to be adjusted in the light of the eventual resolution of rule 23.1 with respect to consensus or a voting procedure: rule 9.2, 17, 22, 23.2, 23.3, 25, 26, 28 & 32. Insertion of a cross-reference to rule 23.1 may be a sufficient approach.

the decision shall be taken, as a last resort, by consensus among government representatives.]

2. The Executive Board may decide on a matter of procedure by a majority vote of the [representatives][government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors] present and voting.⁵

3. Where there is disagreement as to whether a matter to be voted on is a substantive or procedural matter, the issue shall be decided by a two-thirds majority of the [representatives][government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors] present and voting.

Rule 24

If two or more amendments to a proposal are moved, the Executive Board shall first decide on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal, then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom, and so on until decisions have been made on all the amendments.

Rule 25

Voting on a single proposal shall normally be by show of hands. A roll-call vote shall be taken if one is requested by any [representative][government representative of the five United Nations regions or a representative of the donors]. It shall be taken in order as determined by lot drawn by the co-chairs.

Rule 26

The vote of each [representative][government representative of the five United Nations regions and each representatives of the donors] in a roll-call vote shall be recorded in the report of the meeting.

Rule 27

After the co-chairs have announced the beginning of voting, no representative shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting. The co-chairs may permit representatives to explain their votes, either before or after the voting, and may limit the time allowed for such explanations.

Rule 28

Each [representative][government representative of the five United Nations regions and each representative of the donors] shall have one vote.

Rule 28 bis

In cases where a representative or his or her Government or organization has an interest that could call into question his or her impartiality, objectivity or independence regarding a subject to be discussed by the Board, that representative must disclose the interest to the Board in advance of the discussions. Following any such disclosure and where appropriate after consultations with the secretariat, the representative may participate in the discussion but not in the making of any decision with regard to the subject.

IX. Committee on the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund

Rule 29

1. During a meeting of the Executive Board, a committee, composed of government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors⁶ who have made and/or pledged to make

⁵ Should the Board agree to include provision for voting, it may wish to add a rule to address equally divided votes.

⁶ "Donors" refers to those entities invited to make contributions to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund in paragraph 4 of the Trust Fund terms of reference set out in Appendix II of resolution I/4 of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, namely Governments, regional economic integration organizations, the private sector, including industry, foundations and other non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders.

contributions to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund, shall be set up to consider the operation of the Trust Fund. This committee shall review reports from the Trust Fund Implementation Committee on project execution, review reports from the Executive Director of UNEP on the financial resources and administration of the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund, and provide guidance and take decisions thereon.

2. The committee shall elect its chair. Rules 15 to 28 of the present rules of procedure shall be applied as appropriate in the proceedings of the committee.

X. Public and private meetings

Rule 30

Meetings of the Executive Board shall be held in public unless the Board decides otherwise.

XI. Language

Rule 31

Meetings of the Executive Board shall be held in English.

XII. Amendments to rules of procedure

Rule 32

Amendments to these rules of procedure shall be adopted by consensus of the [representatives][government representatives of the five United Nations regions and the representatives of the donors].

Annex B

Declaration of multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation contributing to the SAICM Quick Start Programme

Guidelines and declaration form

Background

The International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), at its first session, which was held in Dubai, United Arab Emirates, from 4 to 6 February 2006, finalized and adopted the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). SAICM will provide a global policy framework to support achievement of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation aim that, by 2020, chemicals are used and produced in ways that lead to the minimization of significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment.

SAICM aims to encourage governments and other stakeholders to address chemical safety more effectively in all relevant sectors such as agriculture, environment, health, industry and labour. To this end, SAICM will promote capacity building for developing countries and countries with economies in transition and better coordination of international efforts to improve chemicals management.¹

The Quick Start Programme (QSP)

Pursuant to the goals of the Strategic Approach, the ICCM in Resolution I/4 established a Quick Start Programme (QSP) to support activities that enable initial capacity-building for environmentally sound chemicals management. The QSP includes a trust fund and multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation.

The objective of the Quick Start Programme is to support activities to enable initial capacity-building and implementation in developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing States and countries with economies in transition consistent with their national priorities for the implementation of the Strategic Approach objectives as set out in section IV of the Overarching Policy Strategy. It will build upon the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building and facilitate environmentally sound chemicals management. Additionally, the QSP should help to identify and pave the way for activities that can be assisted by the private sector, including industry, and other non-governmental organizations, through bilateral and multilateral cooperation, for example technical assistance and the sharing of knowledge and experience. Additionally, the programme will seek to enhance synergies with processes initiated under relevant chemicals and wastes multilateral environmental agreements. While aimed primarily at the country level, the QSP should allow for, and encourage, regional and global approaches.

The QSP will invite bilateral and multilateral public and private cooperation and national government financing. It will benefit from a voluntary, time-limited Quick Start Programme Trust Fund administered by the United Nations Environment Programme. Activities financed through bilateral and multilateral cooperation will be implemented in accordance with the arrangements made by participants in that cooperation.

The QSP objective and strategic priorities

The QSP will mobilize resources for national priority initial enabling activities, in keeping with the work areas set out in section IV of the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, in particular for the following strategic priorities:

(a) Development or updating of national chemical profiles and the identification of capacity needs for sound chemicals management;

¹ For additional information on SAICM, please visit www.chem.unep.ch/saicm

(b) Development and strengthening of national chemicals management institutions, plans, programmes and activities to implement the Strategic Approach, building upon work conducted to implement international chemicals-related agreements and initiatives;

(c) Undertaking analysis, interagency coordination, and public participation activities directed at enabling the implementation of the Strategic Approach by integrating – i.e., mainstreaming – the sound management of chemicals in national strategies, and thereby informing development assistance cooperation priorities.

Declaration of Contribution to the SAICM Quick Start Programme

In resolution I/4, the ICCM decided to establish the Quick Start Programme Executive Board, consisting of two government representatives of each of the United Nations regions and all the bilateral and multilateral donors and other contributors to the Programme.

At its first meeting on the 26th and 27th of April 2006, the Board decided that bilateral, multilateral and other contributors to the QSP participating in the Executive Board would be understood to comprise representatives of bilateral and multilateral donors and other entities that have made or pledged to make financial or in-kind contributions to the QSP².

Provision was made for the Board, before each meeting, to determine whether new contributions qualified as contributions to the QSP according to the objective of the QSP set out in ICCM Resolution I/4. In that regard, and with the exception of government representatives of the five United Nations regions and donors to the QSP Trust Fund whose status is already clear, entities that consider themselves to be contributors to the QSP should submit a statement outlining their contribution to the QSP via the secretariat.

Further to the development and use of a draft declaration form on an interim basis, the QSP Executive Board at its second meeting held on 23 and 24 April 2007 reviewed and revised the QSP declaration form. The present form includes the changes made by the Board to the form.

² See rule 2 of the rules of procedure agreed ad referendum by the Executive Board.

Declaration of “Multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation contributing to the QSP”		<i>Please note that this information will be made public and will a) enable the QSP Executive Board to determine whether new contributors qualify as contributors to the QSP*, and; b) be used for purposes of reporting on contributions to the QSP.</i>	
Government/Organization:		Contact Person: Mr. <input type="checkbox"/> Ms. <input type="checkbox"/>	Is this person the official SAICM focal point for the Government or the Organization? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Address:		Functional Title:	
		Department / Section:	
Phone:	Fax:	Email:	

QSP contribution description: (Add pages as necessary)			
Relation to QSP objective and strategic priorities: (Add pages as necessary)		QSP objective and strategic priorities addressed: Overall QSP objective <input type="checkbox"/> Priority A <input type="checkbox"/> Priority B <input type="checkbox"/> Priority C <input type="checkbox"/>	
Relation to broader SAICM implementation beyond the objective and strategic priorities of the QSP (optional):		OPS objective addressed: Risk reduction <input type="checkbox"/> Knowledge and information <input type="checkbox"/> Governance <input type="checkbox"/> Capacity building <input type="checkbox"/> Illegal international traffic <input type="checkbox"/>	
Geographical coverage of the contribution: National <input type="checkbox"/> Regional <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-country <input type="checkbox"/> Global <input type="checkbox"/> Country(ies) and/or region(s):		Type and value of the contribution: Cash <input type="checkbox"/> Value in US\$ of financial contribution: In-kind <input type="checkbox"/> Value in US\$ of in-kind contribution:	
Date or period of contribution:		Please sign and return to the SAICM secretariat: 11-13 Chemin des Anémones CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 86 31 Fax: +41 22 797 34 60 E-mail: saicm@chemicals.unep.ch	
Signature:	Date:		

* It is not necessary to complete this form in the case of financial contributions made directly to the QSP trust fund, as the status of such contributions in relation to the QSP is already clear.

Annex C

Business plan for the SAICM Quick Start Programme

Table of contents

1. Executive summary.
2. Introduction.
3. Strategic action plan.
 - 3.1 Introduction
 - 3.2 Phased fund-raising targets for the trust fund and broader QSP
 - 3.3 Fund-raising strategy and targets for the trust fund and broader QSP
 - 3.4 Outreach and equitable delivery strategies and targets for the trust fund and broader QSP
 - 3.5 Performance indicators
 - 3.6 Budgeting for resources to enable the SAICM secretariat to support the QSP
 - 3.7 Reporting and monitoring of implementation of the
 - 3.8 Completion of the QSP business plan

Annex

- A1. Background.
 - A1.1 Introduction
 - A1.2 Origins of the QSP
 - A1.3 Main elements of the QSP
 - A1.4 QSP objective and strategic priorities
 - A1.5 QSP stakeholders
- A2. Current status.
 - A2.1 Introduction
 - A2.2 Initial actions to launch the QSP
 - A2.3 Contributions to the QSP trust fund and other contributions as of April 2007
- A3. The financial context in which the QSP operates.
 - A3.1 Introduction
 - A3.2 The financing role of the QSP
 - A3.3 Demand for QSP assistance
 - A3.4 Demand for QSP trust fund assistance
 - A3.5 Other forms of support or programmes relating to the sound management of chemicals
 - A3.6 Tables of demand for QSP trust fund assistance of the first and second rounds of applications and of first round approved projects

1. Executive summary

1.1 The present Quick Start Programme (QSP) business plan was suggested in late 2006 by the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) during regional meetings and was developed in February and March 2007 in a consultative process involving QSP stakeholders. The business plan sets out a resource mobilization strategy to help ensure the sustainability of the QSP, including through the replenishment of its trust fund on a steady and equitable basis by as broad a donor group as possible. The plan also stipulates performance indicators to guide the effective delivery of the QSP and, in its annex, provides information on the background of the QSP, its current status and its broader financial context. The business plan is a living document and working tool which will be regularly updated and reconsidered at future Board meetings.

1.2 The strategic action plan of the business plan outlines a strategy to provide sustainable resources for the QSP and to ensure its effective performance. The Executive Board decided that the fundraising target for the trust fund is to achieve average annual growth of 5% to 10% over the 2006 achievement of approximately \$6 million. Furthermore the Board agreed to aim for the upper end of this range, and to pursue fund-raising strategies and targets designed to broaden its donor base and ensure the long term sustainability of the QSP trust fund. Additional strategies and targets are highlighted for outreach and adequate allocation of support. As part of the fundraising strategy, the secretariat will seek the further involvement in the QSP of all potential sources of support, including through development assistance cooperation, the private sector, the Global Environment Facility, the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and national Governments. The secretariat will provide the Board with reports and data relating to performance indicators, including for the securing of funding, allocation of assistance for and implementation of projects. The resources needed by the secretariat to operate the QSP and its trust fund are estimated at \$200,000 per annum.

1.3 Taking into account that the QSP trust fund will stop operating in November 2013, QSP stakeholders are invited to reflect on the completion of the QSP. A reporting and monitoring schedule provides for the business plan to be considered and updated by the QSP Executive Board at its annual meetings from 2008 to 2013 and for the Board to report to the second and third sessions of the ICCM, in 2009 and 2012 respectively.

1.4 Taking into account the provisions of resolution I/4 of the first session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), the plan provide, in annex, an overview of the institutional and governance mechanisms of the QSP and its trust fund, including its objective and three strategic priorities. The QSP is also described as a market, with stakeholders forming its demand and supply sides.

1.5 The annexed report on the current status on the QSP reviews the establishment of and contributions to the QSP. In 2006, the trust fund received \$5,968,000 from 15 Governments and, as of April 2007, its balance is \$4,154,000. In addition, it sets out contributions made by 12 Governments and organizations undertaken under the non-trust fund QSP.

1.6 The financial section of the annex recalls that the QSP and its trust fund were not intended by the ICCM to be a comprehensive financial mechanism to support the implementation of SAICM. Its main purpose is to “support initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities” and the trust fund’s role is to provide “seed money”. The assessment of demand for QSP assistance will, over time, be a key factor in setting targets for the mobilization of resources. Tables on the rounds of applications to the trust fund aim to assess demand in relation to geographical and sectoral balance, as well as to the QSP strategic priorities and Overarching Policy Strategy objectives. The predominance of the African region and of the environment sector in the first round of trust fund applications is underlined by this data. Comparative information is

also provided on the purposes, resources and procedures of other support programmes relating to the sound management of chemicals.

2. Introduction

2.1 The Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) is a voluntary global policy framework for efforts to achieve the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation goal that, by 2020, chemicals are produced and used in ways that minimize significant adverse impacts on human health and the environment. SAICM represents a renewed international focus on the cross-cutting issue of chemical safety. It recognizes, on the one hand, the vital contribution of chemicals to the global economy and modern societies, and, on the other hand, their potential to undermine sustainable development if not soundly managed.

2.2 The development of SAICM was initiated by the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in 2002 and endorsed by Heads of State in Johannesburg in 2002 and New York in 2005. SAICM was adopted by the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM) in Dubai on 6 February 2006, after a three-year consultative process involving stakeholders from Governments, non-governmental organizations and intergovernmental organizations representing diverse sectors with an interest in chemical safety, including agriculture, development, environment, health, industry and labour.

2.3 SAICM comprises the *Dubai Declaration on International Chemicals Management* (political commitment), the *Overarching Policy Strategy* (scope, needs, objectives, principles, finance and institutional arrangements) and the *Global Plan of Action* (suggested activities and targets). The ICCM adopted the Dubai Declaration and Overarching Policy Strategy and recommended the use and further development of the Global Plan of Action as a working tool and guidance document.

2.4 Implementation of SAICM is the collective responsibility of individual stakeholders. The Overarching Policy Strategy foreshadows the possibility of commencing with an enabling phase to build necessary capacity, as appropriate, with relevant stakeholder participation, a national SAICM implementation plan, taking into consideration existing elements such as legislation, national profiles, action plans, stakeholder initiatives and gaps, priorities, needs and circumstances. The Overarching Policy Strategy furthermore acknowledges that the extent to which developing countries, particularly least developed countries and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition can make progress towards reaching the 2020 goal for the sound management of chemicals depends, in part, on the availability of financial resources provided by the private sector and bilateral, multilateral and global agencies or donors.

2.5 Initial SAICM implementation activities in developing countries are being supported by a “Quick Start Programme” (QSP) comprising a UNEP-administered trust fund and multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation. The trust fund will provide seed money to support the objective and strategic priorities of the programme. It is open for contributions for five years from 1 December 2006 and in 2006 received initial pledges of approximately \$6 million. While only one of several avenues of financial support envisaged in the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy, the QSP is clearly the subject of high expectations as the only new and specifically SAICM-related financial mechanism available to developing and transition economy countries. Such expectations will have been reinforced by decisions of the Conferences of the Parties to international agreements on chemicals and hazardous wastes encouraging Governments to look to the SAICM QSP for support in implementing the Conventions.¹ It may be assumed that when, at its second session in 2009, the ICCM addresses its obligation to “evaluate the performance of the financing of SAICM” the responsiveness of the QSP will be scrutinized closely. The perceived success of SAICM itself will be closely, though not exclusively, linked to the sustainability, financing and accountability of the QSP of which the trust fund is a core element.

2.6 In order to ensure adequate and sustainable funding for this important preliminary support mechanism for SAICM implementation, the secretariat proposed in late 2006 to develop the

¹ See section A1.5.3 below.

present QSP business plan in consultation with stakeholders. The business plan is a working document which sets out a strategic action plan to secure appropriate resources and ensure that the programme performs effectively. It also provides information on the background, current status and financial context of the QSP. The business plan was endorsed by the QSP Executive Board on 24 April 2007. Board members highlighted its status as a living document, as well as the need for it to be regularly updated and reconsidered at future Board meetings.

3. Strategic action plan

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Taking account of the objective and current status of the QSP and the financial context in which it operates, the present section of the business plan sets out a strategic action plan to secure adequate and sustainable resources for the QSP and to ensure its effective performance. It establishes phased fund-raising targets, sets out a fund-raising strategy, performance indicators, secretariat resource needs and a reporting and monitoring schedule, and notes the timeframe for completion of the QSP.

3.2 Phased fund-raising targets for the trust fund and broader QSP

3.2.1 The life-span of the QSP can be broken down into a hierarchy of phases as set out in Table A below. These phases, corresponding to the ICCM intersessional periods, calendar years and QSP trust fund application rounds, are referred to in the various fundraising and assistance targets below.

Table A. Phases during the life-span of the QSP

ICCM sessions	Calendar years	6-monthly trust fund rounds (according to application deadlines)
Phase 1: between ICCM1 and ICCM2: February 2006 to May 2009 <i>Includes:</i> - 11 months preparation; and - 29 of the 60 months for which the QSP trust fund is open for contributions.	2006 <i>Start-up phase in readiness for the opening of the trust fund on 1 December 2006.</i>	Round 1: 18 August 2006
	2007	Round 2: 16 April 2007 Round 3: 14 September 2007
	2008	Round 4: April (?) 2008 Round 5: October (?) 2008
Phase 2: between ICCM2 and ICCM3: May 2009 to June (?) 2012 <i>Includes:</i> - 31 of the 60 months for which the QSP trust fund is open for contributions; and - 6 of the remaining 24 months during which disbursements from the QSP trust fund will continue.	2009 <i>Projects approved in round 1 of the trust fund due for completion in early 2009, just before ICCM2.</i>	Round 6: April (?) 2009
		Round 7: October (?) 2009
	2010	Round 8: April (?) 2010 Round 9: October (?) 2010
	2011 <i>NB Trust fund closes for contributions on 30 November 2011.</i>	Round 10: April (?) 2011 Round 11: October (?) 2011
Phase 3: between ICCM3 and ICCM4: June (?) 2012 to November (?) 2015. <i>Includes:</i> - 18 of the last 24 months during which disbursements from the QSP trust will continue.	2012	Round 12: April (?) 2012 <i>New projects limited to 18 months' duration.</i>
		Round 13: October (?) 2012 <i>New projects limited to one year in duration.</i>
	2013 <i>NB Final trust fund disbursements to be completed by 30 November 2013. All trust fund projects to be completed soon afterwards.</i>	Round 14: April (?) 2013 <i>New projects limited to six months' duration.</i>

3.2.2 Overall fundraising target range for the QSP trust fund

The fundraising target for the trust fund is to achieve, including through the progressive broadening of the donor base, an average annual growth in a range between 5 and 10% over the 2006 achievement of approximately \$6 million. Fund raising will aim to achieve funding at the higher end of this range. This would entail the following annual funding targets:

[2006:	\$ 6,000,000]
2007:	\$ 6,300,000 - \$ 6,600,00
2008:	\$ 6,615,000 - \$ 7,260,000
2009:	\$ 6,945,750 - \$ 7,986,000
2010:	\$ 7,293,038 - \$ 8,784,600
2011:	<u>\$ 7,657,689 - \$ 9,663,060</u>
Total:	\$ 40,811,477 - 46,293,660²

3.2.3 Fundraising targets for the broader (non-trust fund) QSP

- a) The overall target for contributions to the broader QSP is to increase the number of confirmed contributors (both financial and in-kind) by 10 per cent for each of the years for which the programme is in operation;
- b) The fundraising target for the broader QSP is to increase confirmed financial contributions by 10 per cent per year for each of the years for which the programme is in operation.

3.3 Fund-raising strategies and targets for the trust fund and broader QSP

3.3.1 In order to meet the above targets for funding and other contributions, and in an effort to address the needs expressed by SAICM stakeholders³, it will be necessary to attract greater resources from a broader group of donors. This will require an enhanced commitment on the part of potential donors and the SAICM secretariat.

3.3.2 The present fundraising effort comprises an annual official letter from the Executive Director of UNEP in his capacity of being responsible for the SAICM secretariat and the QSP trust fund, supplemented by regular funding updates for and liaison with donors by the secretariat. Taking into account the needs and demands identified in sections A3.3 and A3.4 of the present document, elements of a strategy for reaching more funding decision-makers and presenting a more compelling case include:

- a) A voluntary and informal committee of SAICM stakeholders will be established to undertake proactive advocacy in order to raise funds, for example by approaching peers to encourage contributions and making fundraising presentations at relevant events such as SAICM regional meetings and sub-regional coordination meetings⁴.
- b) Subject to the availability of resources, the SAICM secretariat will engage the occasional services of a professional fundraiser.
- c) As assistance under the QSP begins to deliver results, the SAICM secretariat will publicize positive outcomes with a view to encouraging further donor support for the QSP.

² A maximum of between \$5,305,492 and \$ 6,018,176 could be allocated to administrative costs.

³ See in particular section A3.3 and A3.4: Demand for QSP and QSP trust fund assistance

⁴ The SAICM secretariat and the voluntary and informal committee of SAICM stakeholders will together identify relevant events and plan advocacy and fund raising activities. Relevant events may include meetings of the Conferences of Parties of chemicals-related conventions.

- d) The SAICM secretariat will further publicize the contributions made by donors to the QSP, using media such as the SAICM newsletter and web site, and will develop a framework for official recognition and awards to be considered by the QSP Executive Board for possible recommendation to the ICCM at its second session.
- e) Active SAICM stakeholders will collaborate to ensure that official calls for support to the QSP are adopted by all relevant forums such as the ICCM, governing bodies of intergovernmental bodies and funding mechanisms with a role in promoting the sound management of chemicals, bearing in mind the provisions of paragraph 19 of the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy.
- f) The SAICM secretariat, supported as appropriate by relevant SAICM stakeholders, will research potential funding sources, develop information and presentation materials and make targeted approaches to potential new donors, such as non-contributing Governments of OECD member countries, newly industrialized countries and major chemical manufacturing countries, the private sector and charitable foundations⁵.
- g) QSP stakeholders will seek to ensure that QSP support be used as seed money with the aim of leveraging additional resources.

3.3.3 The following targets will be pursued:

- a) By ICCM2, the initial 15 Government donors⁶ to the QSP trust fund should be joined by at least 10 other Governments and 5 non-governmental donors, such as industry and foundations.
- b) By the time the trust fund closes for contributions on 30 November 2011, there should have been at least 30 Government donors and 10 non-governmental donors to the QSP trust fund.
- c) By ICCM2, 60 per cent of donors should have made repeat contributions, preferably as multi-year contributions committed in advance.⁷
- d) QSP seed money will be used to leverage additional resources with an annual target of at least 30 per cent over and above the trust fund's own income, for example by facilitating projects that are supported in partnership with other funding sources.⁸

3.4 Outreach and equitable delivery strategies and targets for the trust fund and broader QSP

3.4.1 In order to meet the overall objective of the QSP, taking into account the needs and demands identified in sections A3.3 and A3.4 of the present document, the SAICM secretariat and SAICM stakeholders will further publicize the existence of the QSP and its trust fund and provide the necessary assistance for interested stakeholders. The following strategies will be

⁵ See also section A2.3.3, table 2: selected international groups and breakdown of contributions by member Governments to the QSP Trust Fund in 2006.

⁶ The initial 15 Government donors to the trust fund in 2006 included 11 OECD countries. A further 19 OECD member countries did not contribute. In addition to the 12 OECD country donors, one of the eight member States of the European Union which are not OECD members contributed to the trust in 2006 fund. Two of the 16 newly industrialized countries contributed to the trust fund. Three of the 145 countries on the OECD list of aid recipient contributed to the trust fund in 2006.

⁷ In 2006, only one donor, the Government of Slovenia, made a multi-year commitment to support the trust fund (20,000 Euros per annum from 2006 to 2010).

⁸ In the light of section A3.2 below, this is a potentially key objective. However achievement of even the modest proposed target may be difficult to monitor. For example, a QSP project on mainstreaming of sound chemicals management may not generate access to development cooperation funds until some years later and the causal link may be difficult to demonstrate.

pursued:

- a) The SAICM secretariat, supported as appropriate by relevant SAICM stakeholders, will increase the involvement of regions under-represented in the QSP, taking into consideration the particular needs of Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States by encouraging applications from such regions.
- b) The SAICM secretariat, supported as appropriate by relevant SAICM stakeholders, will increase the involvement of all relevant sectors in the QSP, including in projects submitted and approved for trust fund support by encouraging applications from under-represented sectors.
- c) The SAICM secretariat will support the trust applications process by responding to all information requests and by providing advisory functions for the development of project proposal.
- d) Civil society networks applying to the trust fund will receive adequate support from the SAICM secretariat.

3.4.2 The following targets will be pursued:

- a) Subject to the availability of complete and eligible project proposals and the need, in the long term, to maintain an overall geographical and sectoral balance and provide assistance as a matter of priority to Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States, the Trust Fund Implementation will aim to disburse 100 per cent of available funds⁹ in each funding round, with the provision that, should any residue nevertheless be accumulated, this will be disbursed progressively in the final rounds, 12 to 14, after the trust fund closes for contributions.
- b) Subject to the submission of complete and eligible project proposals that meet the “exceptional circumstances” criteria, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee should aim to approve projects for civil society networks valued at up to 10 per cent of the funds available in each of the 14 rounds of the trust fund.
- c) Subject to the submission of complete and eligible project proposals by the countries concerned, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee should aim, eventually, to approve at least one project for at least 75 per cent (57) of the 76 Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States.
- d) Subject to the submission of complete and eligible project proposals by the countries concerned, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee should aim, eventually, to approve at least one project for 65 per cent (95) of the 145 developing and transition economy countries on the OECD DAC list of aid recipients.
- e) Subject to the submission of complete and eligible project proposals by the countries and organisations concerned, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee should aim, to approve projects from at least four different sectors in each applications round for example from the agriculture, development, environment, health, industry, labour and transport sectors.

3.5 Performance indicators

3.5.1 In order for the Board to monitor the effectiveness of the Quick Start Programme, the secretariat will provide annual reports including data relating to the following performance

⁹ That is to say, funds actually paid into the trust fund account (and not just pledged).

indicators:

3.5.2 *Securing funding*

- a) Quantitative fundraising and contribution targets are achieved or exceeded.
- b) The donor base is sustained and broadened in accordance with the above fund-raising targets.
- c) Pledges by donors are paid promptly.
- d) The fund-raising target, above, for additional resources to leveraged using QSP seed money is achieved or exceeded.

3.5.3 *Provision of project assistance*

- a) The SAICM secretariat meets all requests for assistance in the initiation of project proposals.
- b) Geographical and sectoral balance is maintained among approved projects.
- c) Assistance is provided to Least Developed Countries and Small Island Developing States in accordance with the above targets.
- d) Approved QSP projects, collectively, address all three of the QSP strategic priorities to a reasonably even extent.

3.5.4 *Administration*

- a) The work of the Executive Board and the Trust Fund Implementation Committee is efficiently serviced by the SAICM secretariat, e.g. through the timely preparation of all necessary documentation and follow-up to decisions, and the timely completion of logistical arrangements.
- b) Invoices are promptly dispatched by UNEP administration to facilitate payment of pledges.

3.5.5 *Project implementation*

- a) The SAICM secretariat in conjunction with UNEP administration promptly concludes implementation agreements with project proponents and executing agencies following the approval of project proposals by the Trust Fund Implementation Committee.
- b) Project funds are disbursed in a timely fashion by UNEP administration in accordance with agreed schedules and appropriate verifications.
- c) Agreed project activities are effectively implemented and reporting obligations are fulfilled by project implementers.
- d) Timely, adequate and high quality reporting on project implementation is provided for the QSP Executive Board by the Trust Fund Implementation Committee, project executing agencies, SAICM secretariat and UNEP administration.

3.6 Budgeting for resources to enable the SAICM secretariat to support the QSP

3.6.1 Supporting the operation of the QSP has significant resource implications for the SAICM secretariat. The secretariat's QSP-related functions, including assisting stakeholders in the initiation of project proposals, screening trust fund project proposals for completeness and eligibility, facilitating meetings of the QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee (TFIC) and QSP Executive Board, providing administrative support to the QSP trust fund, facilitating reporting on QSP implementation to the Executive Board and ICCM and undertaking additional monitoring for projects not supported by an executing agency, are performed by one professional officer in cooperation with the coordinator of the secretariat.

3.6.2 The position of the QSP professional officer, currently filled on a temporary consultancy basis, corresponds to the P-3 professional post included in the indicative secretariat staff structure agreed in ICCM resolution I/1. In addition to the salary costs of the P-3 post, other QSP support costs for which the secretariat needs to budget include travel by up to eight developing country participants to the annual meeting of the QSP Executive Board, translation of guidance materials and partial salary costs for the secretariat coordinator and the secretary, and staff travel. At the end of 2006, the European Commission generously agreed to provide 150,000 Euros (approximately \$200,000) to cover the secretariat's QSP support cost for 12 months, not including the partial salary costs of the coordinator and secretariat which will be covered from other sources. The programme support costs of UNEP as trustee of the QSP trust fund are also covered separately by charging a 5 per cent fee on trust fund expenditures. Base funding of approximately \$200,000 per annum will be required to sustain the secretariat's QSP support services during the seven-year life-span of the trust fund, 1 December 2006 to 30 November 2013. Should the volume of applications for assistance, number of projects and volume of resources continue to grow, it may be necessary, over time, to budget for some additional staff capacity to assist the P-3 programme officer.

3.6.3 As referred to in 6.3.2 above, the secretariat will engage the occasional services of a professional fundraiser for specific outreach campaigns as funds permit. A nominal annual budget of \$20,000 is suggested for this purpose.

3.7 Reporting and monitoring of implementation of the business plan

3.7.1 The QSP Executive Board will monitor progress in implementing the business plan at its annual meetings from 2008 to 2013.¹⁰ The Board will make periodical adjustments to the business plan, including fundraising targets, in the light of progress, and will provide guidance to the secretariat as required. Strategies may require revisiting in the event that targets are not being fulfilled.

3.7.2 The Board will report to the ICCM at its second and third sessions, in 2009 and 2012, on implementation of the QSP and on the operation of its trust fund. The ICCM may wish to provide further guidance in the light of such reporting, bearing in mind its function of evaluating the performance of the financing of SAICM.

3.7.3 The Board will ensure that reporting on the QSP will contribute to the wider reporting to the ICCM on SAICM implementation as a whole. The ICCM may wish to ensure that the global reporting mechanism is compatible with reporting on the QSP.

3.8 Completion of the QSP

3.8.1 The QSP trust fund and, by inference, the programme as a whole, has a life-time of five

¹⁰ Although the QSP trust fund will have closed for contributions in November 2011, disbursements will continue until November 2013.

years, from 1 December 2006 to 30 November 2011.¹¹ This means that by the time of the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management, expected to take place in early May 2009, the trust fund will be almost exactly half-way through its life (29 months out of 60), and that by the time of the third session of the Conference, in 2012, it will have recently closed for contributions.

3.8.2 The QSP Executive Board will report to the second session of the ICCM on the progress achieved to date. It is outside the scope of the business plan to address financial considerations other than those relating to the QSP. Some regional groups have already discussed financial matters in preparation of the second session of the ICCM.

¹¹ ICCM resolution I/4 provides in its Appendix II (terms of reference of the trust fund) that the trust fund will be open to receive voluntary contributions for five years from the date it is established by the Executive Director of UNEP and that funds may be disbursed for a maximum of seven years from that date. The trust fund was officially established on 1 December 2006 in readiness for implementation of the decisions taken by the Trust Fund Implementation Committee on the first round of applications at its meeting on 18 October 2006.

Annex

A1. Background

A1.1 Introduction

A1.1.1 The present section of the business plan describes the origins of the QSP, its main elements and guiding principles, objective and strategic priorities, and the QSP stakeholders.

A.1.2 Origins of the QSP

A.1.2.1 “Financial considerations” were a key negotiating issue during the SAICM development process. A study on this subject was prepared to assist discussion at the third session of the Preparatory Committee on the Development of SAICM in Vienna in September 2005.¹ While the principle that developing countries and transition economies would need financial assistance in order to implement SAICM was generally accepted, there were varying viewpoints as to how such resources should be mobilized and delivered. Ultimately, a multi-faceted approach to financial considerations was agreed in paragraph 19 of the SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy. It provides that “financial arrangements for SAICM include, among other things:

- a) actions at the national or sub-national levels to support financing of SAICM objectives;...
- b) enhancing industry partnerships and financial and technical participation in the implementation of SAICM objectives;...
- c) integration of SAICM objectives into multilateral and bilateral development assistance cooperation;...
- d) making more effective use of and building upon existing sources of relevant global funding, including by inviting the Global Environment Facility and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer and its Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol within their mandates to consider whether and how they might support implementation of appropriate and relevant SAICM objectives and to report;...
- e) supporting initial capacity-building activities for the implementation of SAICM objectives by establishing a programme to be called the Quick Start Programme. The Quick Start Programme will contain a voluntary, time-limited trust fund and may include multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation...
- f) inviting Governments and other stakeholders to provide resources to enable the SAICM secretariat to fulfil [its] tasks...”

A1.2.2 Arrangements for the QSP were further elaborated by the ICCM in its resolution I/4, which sets out the objective and strategic priorities of the QSP, together with governance and administrative arrangements and terms of reference for the trust fund, as described below.

A1.3 Main elements of the QSP

A1.3.1 In its resolution I/4, the ICCM called for the QSP to include a UNEP trust fund and multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation. It invited Governments in a position to do so, regional economic integration organizations, intergovernmental organizations, the private sector,

¹ Document SAICM/PREPCOM.3/INF/28. Available on the SAICM web site: www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/

including industry, foundations, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders, to contribute to the QSP.

A1.3.2 Appendix II of ICCM resolution I/4 contains the terms of reference of the trust fund. The trust fund is administered by UNEP and the SAICM secretariat provides administrative support to it. The terms of reference provide that the trust fund will be open to receive voluntary contributions for five years from the date established by the Executive Director of UNEP and may disburse funds for a maximum of seven years from that date². The trust fund was officially established on 1 December 2006.

A1.3.3 With regard to the QSP “multilateral, bilateral and other forms of cooperation”, i.e. those contributions apart from financial donations to the trust fund, the QSP Executive Board (see below), decided at its first meeting that declarations of such support, either or financial or in-kind, would be reviewed by the Board members to determine if such contributions qualified as contributions to the QSP according to the objective of the programme set out in ICCM resolution I/4.

A1.3.4 ICCM resolution I/4 established two main oversight bodies for the QSP and the trust fund:

a) The QSP Executive Board consists of two government representatives of each of the United Nations regions³ and all the bilateral and multilateral donors and other contributors to the programme. The Board meets once a year to review progress under the programme on the basis of reports from the Trust Fund Implementation Committee and programme participants, as well as other relevant information provided to them on implementation of the programme. The Board also provides operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the programme and advises on other relevant matters as required. The Board will report to the ICCM at its second and third sessions on the implementation of the QSP. During each meeting of the Board, a committee comprising the regional representatives and trust fund donors meets to consider the operation of the trust fund. That committee reviews reports from the Trust Fund Implementation Committee on project execution and from UNEP on the financial resources and administration of the trust fund. It provides guidance and takes decisions thereon.

b) The QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee consists of representatives of participating organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC)⁴ and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The Committee meets twice a year to review and appraise project proposals seeking funding through the trust fund. The Committee also makes recommendations on the trust fund application procedures and project management to the Executive Board. The Committee reports to the Executive Board’s sub committee comprising regional representatives and donors to the trust fund.

² The existence of the broader QSP was not time-limited by the ICCM. The QSP Executive Board or the ICCM at its next session may take this matter into consideration and provide guidance.

³ Nominations for regional representatives for the Executive Board were coordinated in March 2006 by the Governments whose representatives formerly served on the bureau of the SAICM Preparatory Committee and the bureau of the ICCM.

⁴ The participating organizations of IOMC are the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), UNEP, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the World Health Organization (WHO).

A1.4 QSP objective and strategic priorities

A1.4.1 ICCM resolution I/4 provides that “building upon the outcomes of the International Conference on Chemicals Management and the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building, the objective of the QSP is to support activities to enable initial capacity-building and implementation in developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing States and countries with economies in transition consistent with their national priorities for the implementation of the SAICM objectives as set out in section IV of the Overarching Policy Strategy.”

A1.4.2 The QSP strategic priorities defined by the resolution 1/4 highlight that “the QSP should mobilize resources for national priority initial enabling activities⁵ in keeping with the work areas set out in the strategic objectives of section IV of the Overarching Policy Strategy, in particular:

- a) Development or updating of national chemical profiles and the identification of capacity needs for sound chemicals management;
- b) Development and strengthening of national chemicals management institutions, plans, programmes and activities to implement the Strategic Approach, building upon work conducted to implement international chemicals-related agreements and initiatives;
- c) Undertaking analysis, interagency coordination, and public participation activities directed at enabling the implementation of the Strategic Approach by integrating – i.e., mainstreaming – the sound management of chemicals in national strategies, and thereby informing development assistance cooperation priorities.”

A1.4.3 The objective of the QSP trust fund is to “provide seed money to support the objective and strategic priorities of the programme.”

A1.4.4 ICCM resolution I/4 also stipulated that, in its overall approach, the QSP “will take fully into account the characteristics of the SAICM process and its institutional arrangements. It will build upon the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building and facilitate environmentally sound chemicals management. The QSP should help to identify and pave the way for activities that can be assisted by the private sector, including industry, and other non-governmental organizations and through bilateral and multilateral cooperation, for example technical assistance and the sharing of knowledge and experience. The programme will seek to enhance synergies with processes initiated under relevant chemicals and wastes multilateral environmental agreements. While aimed primarily at the country level, the QSP should allow for, and encourage, regional and global approaches.”

A1.5 QSP stakeholders

A1.5.1 The stakeholders involved in the QSP form its “client base”. Amongst the stakeholders, a broad distinction can be made between contributors to and recipients of assistance. Contributors to the QSP, including trust fund donors as well as other financial and in-kind contributors, form the “supply” side of the QSP “market”. They include, potentially, Governments, regional economic integration organizations, intergovernmental organizations and the private sector, including industry, foundations, and non-governmental organizations. Potential recipients of QSP assistance, i.e.

⁵ A definition of “enabling activities” was not included in ICCM resolution I/4. A number of stakeholders raised the issue at the EU-JUSSCANNZ meeting on SAICM held in Barcelona from 20 to 22 November 2006. At its second meeting, the QSP Executive Board agreed that although the guidance provided by the QSP objective and strategic priorities set out in ICCM resolution I/4 was adequate for the time being, it would be appropriate to keep the matter under review.

Governments of developing and transition economy countries and civil society networks, are the “demand” side of the QSP market. Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are designated priority clients.

A1.5.2 The ICCM in its resolution I/1 on implementation arrangements "commended SAICM to the attention of the governing bodies of relevant intergovernmental organizations and encouraged them to endorse or otherwise appropriately acknowledge the SAICM with a view to incorporating its objectives into their programmes of work within their mandates and to report thereon to the ICCM." In 2006, the governing bodies of FAO, ILO, UNEP and UNITAR, endorsed SAICM, while the World Health Assembly formally noted it. Intergovernmental organizations may be involved in the QSP as providers of technical assistance in the development and execution of trust fund projects, or as contributors or channels for contributions to the non-trust fund QSP. UNDP, UNEP and UNITAR were associated with trust fund projects approved in the first applications round. Several organizations have declared activities related to the QSP objective as contributions to the non-trust fund QSP. Some organizations have provided in-kind resources for the development of QSP trust fund applications or for the execution of projects. Conversely, some organizations have received QSP contributions directly from donor Governments in order to undertake projects for the benefit of developing and transition economy countries.

A1.5.3 The QSP has been identified by the Conferences of the Parties of certain international chemicals and hazardous waste conventions as a possible source of assistance in the implementation of their respective conventions. In its decision RC-3/5, the Conference of the Parties to the Rotterdam Convention⁶ recommended that individual developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition propose projects under the QSP that will build foundational capacities in sound chemicals management necessary for their adequate implementation of the Rotterdam Convention or propose projects under the QSP that will support activities directed at enabling the implementation of sound chemicals management objectives by mainstreaming them into national development strategies, noting that this type of enabling activity is among the strategic priorities of the QSP. In its decision VIII/34, the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention⁷ recommended that individual developing country Parties and Parties with economies in transition propose projects to the QSP that relate to chemical wastes and wastes consisting of, containing or contaminated with persistent organic pollutants.

⁶ Decision RC-3/5 of the Conference of the Parties of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade at its third meeting held in Geneva from 9 to 13 October 2006.

⁷ Decision VIII/34 of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal at its eight meeting held in Nairobi from 27 November to 1 December 2006.

A2. Current status

A2.1 Introduction

A2.1.1 The present section of the business plan describes initial actions to launch the QSP, including staffing of the secretariat, establishment of the UNEP trust fund, fundraising and the development of guidance materials for the trust fund and the broader QSP, and records the status of the QSP as of April 2007, including trust fund resources, approved projects and declarations of contributions to the broader QSP.

A2.2 Initial actions to launch the QSP

A2.2.1 Further to the adoption of SAICM by the first session of the ICCM in February 2006, one of the first priorities of the secretariat was for the QSP and its trust fund to be established and become operational. The secretariat convened the first meeting of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee on 19 April 2006 and the first meeting of the Executive Board on 26 and 27 April 2006. The Board considered and endorsed the recommendations of the Committee and established the application procedures and project management arrangements for the trust fund.

A2.2.2 Taking into account the guidance provided by the Board and the Committee, the secretariat finalised application forms and guidelines and launched in May 2006 the first round of applications to the trust fund on a trial basis. The first round closed on 18 August 2006 and the Committee approved the first projects at its second meeting on 18 October 2006. The second round for applications to the trust fund was opened in November 2006 and closed on 16 April 2007.

A2.2.3 Further to the approval of the internal project formally establishing the SAICM secretariat within UNEP in November 2006, the SAICM QSP trust fund was officially opened on 1 December 2006⁸. Pending the creation of the secretariat professional position (P-3 level) provided for by ICCM resolution I/1, a consultant supports the work of the secretariat for the QSP. In December 2006, the European Commission pledged €150,000 (approximately \$200,000) to fund the secretariat's QSP support role for 12 months⁹.

A2.3 Contributions to the QSP trust fund and other contributions as of April 2007

A2.3.1 In 2006, the QSP trust fund received pledges totalling approximately¹⁰ \$5,968,000 from 15 Governments, as per Table 1, below:

Table 1. Pledges to the QSP trust fund in 2006

Donor	Local currency	United States dollar amount
Austria	100,000 Euros	128,000
Belgium	40,000 Euros	50,000
Finland	200,000 Euros	255,000
France	100,000 Euros	128,000
India		100,000
Netherlands	100,000 Euros	128,000
Nigeria		50,000

⁸ As provided for in ICCM resolution I/4, the trust fund will be open to receive contributions until 30 November 2011 and will disburse funds until 30 November 2013. The establishment of the trust fund was noted and approved by UNEP Governing Council in its decision 24/10 of 9 February 2007.

⁹ Further details of resource requirements in this regard are provided in section 3.6.2., above.

¹⁰ US dollars figures are estimates in the case of pledges in other currencies that have not yet been paid (and converted to US dollars).

Norway	3,000,000 NOK	485,000
Slovenia	20,000 Euros	24,000
South Africa		100,000
Spain	100,000 Euros	128,000
Sweden	25,000,000 SEK	3,650,000
Switzerland	200,000 CHF	166,000
United Kingdom	215,000 pounds	375,000
United States		200,000
TOTAL		5,968,000

A2.3.2 As of 23 April 2007, the secretariat had received three pledges in 2007 for the QSP trust fund, being €100,000 (\$128,000) from the Government of Austria, €200,000 (\$255,000) from the Government of Finland and €20,000 (\$24,000) from the Government of Slovenia. Since, in the first round of applications, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee approved projects valued at a total of \$1,966,262, the approximate balance of the trust fund,¹¹ as of 23 April 2007, is \$4,409,000.

A2.3.3 The 15 donors to the QSP trust fund in 2006 included a number of Governments which had not previously contributed to SAICM and four from outside the traditional donor base (members of the OECD). Notwithstanding this encouraging broadening of the donor base, it may also be noted that the list donors included no non-governmental organizations, private sector entities or foundations and that a relatively small number of Governments belonging to the prime groups of potential donors contributed to the trust fund. Table 2 provides a breakdown of contributions according to group membership.

Table 2. Selected international groups and breakdown of contributions by member Governments to the QSP Trust Fund in 2006*

Groups	Number of members	Members who have contributed to QSP trust fund in 2006	% of total amount contributed in 2006*	Amount pledged in USD (2006)
G8	8	3	11.8	703,000
EU	27	9	81.5	4,866,000
JUSSCANNZ	7	3	14.3	851,000
OECD	30	11	95.4	5,693,000
OPEC	12	1	0.8	50,000
NIC**	16	2	3.4	200,000
OECD DAC aid recipients	145	3	4.2	250,000

* Certain donors are members of more than one group in the above table.

** Newly Industrialized Countries.

A2.3.4 At its first meeting, the Board requested the secretariat to draft, for its consideration, a reporting form for contributions to the non-trust fund QSP. The draft form was used to assist reporting on 2006 QSP contributions and was also to be relevant in relation to determining participation in meetings of the Executive Board. As provided for the Board's rules of procedure, the Board shall, before its next meeting, determine whether new contributions qualify as contributions to the Quick Start Programme according to the objective of the Programme set out in resolution I/4 adopted by the Conference at its first session. The form was finalized by the Board at its second meeting on 23-24 April 2007.

¹¹ Calculated on the basis of *pledges*, some of which have not yet been paid into the trust fund account.

A2.3.5 As of 15 March 2007, contributions to the non-trust fund QSP had been declared by the Governments of Canada, Japan, Switzerland, Sweden and the United Kingdom, as well as by ICCA, OECD, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO¹².

A2.3.6 In a teleconference held on 15 March 2007, Executive Board members reviewed the declaration forms and decided that all the declared contributions qualified as contributions to the QSP, as set out in Table 3, below:

Table 3. Declared contributions to the non-trust fund QSP as of 15 March 2007

Contributor	Declared QSP Contribution	Strategic priority(ies) addressed	Type of contribution	Indicated value
Canada	- Projects through Canada POPs trust fund -World Bank project building upon categorisation of 23,000 chemicals - Development of SAICM reporting proposal, including QSP aspects	a), b) & c)	Financial and in-kind	- \$18,000,000 (Cdn \$ 20,000,000) - \$98,000 - \$90,000 (Cdn \$100,000)
Japan	-Support to development of national implementation plans in Asia-Pacific -Support to SAICM regional meeting -Specific project support in East Asia (metals or POPs)	b)	Financial and in-kind	- \$50,000 - \$70,000
Sweden	-Support to UNEP Chemicals for workshop on infrastructures - Support to Basel Regional Centre in South Africa for SAICM implementation -Project for non-toxic environment in South East Asia -UNDP guidance on mainstreaming	a), b) & c)	Financial and in-kind	
Switzerland	- Support to SAICM Pilot Project in 5 countries with UNITAR & IOMC	a), b) & c)	Financial	- \$2,750,000
United Kingdom	-SAICM implementation integrated programme in Mexico	a), b) & c)	Financial	- \$130,000 (£65,000)
ICCA	Capacity building programme for: - the implementation of the Responsible Care Global Charter, of the Global Product Strategy and of the GHS - Activities in support of GPA work areas - Cross cutting activities - Collaboration with IOMC participating organizations	b)	Financial and in-kind	-\$30,000 & \$300,000 (in-kind)
OECD	-Development of chemicals management and assessment guidelines, guidance, manuals and data systems -Free dissemination and availability of materials	b) & c)	In kind	

¹² All QSP declaration forms are available on the SAICM website at the following page : www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/fundraising/qsp.htm

UNDP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Development and implementation of UNDP-UNEP partnership for sound chemicals management and mainstreaming -Development of UNDP strategic approach for SAICM implementation in relation with Millennium Development Goals - Development of sound chemicals management guidance resources/tools - Assistance for the development of QSP trust fund applications 	b) & c)	In kind	
UNEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Development and implementation of UNDP-UNEP partnership for sound chemicals management and mainstreaming -Organization of a symposium on illegal international traffic in hazardous chemicals - Organization of a workshop on chemicals infrastructures - Development of a comprehensive plan for SAICM implementation within UNEP's environment constituency - Assistance for the development of QSP trust fund applications 	b) & c)	In kind	
UNIDO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Project on Cleaner Production and Chemical Leasing in Egypt, Russia and Mexico in collaboration with National Cleaner Production Centres (NCPC) and the support of Austria - Capacity-building and implementation of cleaner production and sound chemicals management practices in companies, through 40 NCPC 	b)	In kind	
UNITAR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -National Implementation Programmes in 4 pilot countries with the support of Switzerland - Development and implementation of QSP trust fund projects in 15 countries -Development of guidance material for SAICM activities and on line National Chemical Profiles collection -Specific support for capacity building (POPs, PRTRs or GHS) 	a), b) & c)	In-kind	
WHO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of a comprehensive plan including 14 areas of activities for health sector engagement in SAICM, including for enabling activities coordinated by WHO headquarter and regional offices 	a) & b)	In kind	

A2.3.7 Noting the difficulty of assessing declared contributions to the non-trust fund QSP, Executive Board members agreed during the 15 March 2007 teleconference that criteria for the assessment of QSP contributions should be developed at the Board's second meeting. During the meeting, the Board decided to defer its decision on QSP contribution assessment criteria until the scope of enabling activities had been clarified. Such clarification would be sought in a process established by the Board for the further development of operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the QSP, which would include a review of submitted and approved QSP trust fund projects and a teleconference.

A3. The financial context in which the QSP operates

A3.1 Introduction

A3.1.1 The present section provides an assessment of demand for QSP assistance, including observations on the financing role of the QSP trust fund, estimated total demand until 2009, geographical, sectoral and government/civil society balance, and the estimated timing of future demand, and briefly describes other key support programmes relating to the sound management of chemicals.

A3.2 The financing role of the QSP

A3.2.1 It is important to recall that the QSP and its trust fund were not intended by the ICCM to be a comprehensive financial mechanism to support the implementation of SAICM in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. Rather, the QSP is but one of six elements in the SAICM financial arrangements set out in paragraph 19 of the Overarching Policy Strategy. Its purpose is to “support initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities.” The overall approach of the programme is to “pave the way for activities that can be assisted by the private sector, including industry, and other non-governmental organizations and through bilateral and multilateral cooperation.” The trust fund is one, time-limited element within the broader QSP and its specific objective is to provide “seed money to support the objective and strategic priorities of the programme.”

A3.2.2 Bearing in mind the above, the financing role of the QSP may be characterized as catalytic and intended to have a “multiplier” effect. This is reflected in the three QSP strategic priorities, particularly the third, which relates to the mainstreaming of sound chemicals management in national strategies, and thereby informing development assistance cooperation priorities. In other words, funding provided through the QSP would be intended to assist those responsible for chemicals management in developing and transition economy countries to gain access to the more substantial resources available through national development cooperation channels by helping them make the case for appropriate planning priority to be given to chemicals issues. Similarly, the use of QSP resources in support of the development or updating of national profiles and identification of capacity needs, as referred to in the first QSP strategic priority, should provide a basis for follow-on projects financed from other sources. Finally, QSP support for the broad range of activities referred to in the second strategic priority should build upon work conducted to implement international chemicals-related agreements and initiatives.

A3.2.3 In its decision 24/3 II of 9 February 2007, UNEP Governing Council encouraged the SAICM secretariat to “explore ways to make more effective use of the funding provisions of the Overarching Policy Strategy... to identify those areas that can support implementation of appropriate and relevant objectives of SAICM.” In the QSP context, the secretariat interprets this request *inter alia* as a reiteration of the need to utilize the QSP’s leveraging potential, for example by assisting in the development of projects that use QSP “seed money” to unlock more substantial sources of assistance, including development assistance cooperation, the private sector, the Global Environment Facility, the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol and national Governments. This will require the pro-active collaboration of these other stakeholders, if the secretariat’s initiatives are to bear fruit.

A3.3 Demand for QSP assistance

A3.3.1 Taking into account the broad scope of SAICM and its objectives, as defined by the Overarching Policy Strategy, and the great diversity in country situations, it is not feasible to quantify financial needs for SAICM’s implementation. Within the context of the QSP objectives and strategic priorities, as defined in ICCM resolution I/4, the task of assessing demand can only be undertaken by analysing the *expressed* needs of stakeholders. The following paragraphs provide

some initial indications of demand based on requests for assistance under the QSP in 2006 and early 2007.

A3.3.2 During the first session of the ICCM, the Swiss Government announced a contribution to the QSP of CHF 3 million (approximately \$2.5 million) for projects to develop an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste in three developing countries and one transition economy country facilitated by UNITAR, in cooperation with participating organisations of the IOMC, the World Bank, UNDP, as well as the Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons and the Secretariat of the Basel Convention¹³. Following an invitation to submit expressions of interest, Belarus, Panama, Pakistan and Tanzania were selected as the four pilot countries from among 44 applicants. The tables below provide information on the regional and sectoral breakdown of the applications received:

Table 4. Applications received in June 2006 for the Swiss-UNITAR Pilot Country project by region

Geographical balance	Total	Africa	Asia –Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing Countries	37	22	6	9	-
Economies in transition Countries	7	-	3	-	4
Total	44	22	9	9	4

Table 5. Applications received in June 2006 for the Swiss-UNITAR Pilot Country project by sector

Sectoral balance*	Total	Environment	Health	Education & Science	Development and Planning
Developing Countries	37	34	1	1	1
Economies in transition Countries	7	5	1	1	-
Total	44	39	2	2	1

* The sector identified represents the lead Ministry or Organization in the applications process and not the scope of proposed projects, which often were multisectoral.

A3.4 Demand for QSP trust fund assistance

A3.4.1 In the first round of applications to the QSP trust fund similar trends were identified. The first round was launched in May 2006 and closed on 18 August 2006. The secretariat received 44 applications, involving 33 Governments¹⁴ and 12 civil society networks and seeking total funding of \$8,504,593. Tables 13 to 17 of section A3.6 provide information on the geographical and sectoral balance among applicants and applications¹⁵ and the balance among QSP strategic priorities and objectives of the Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS) addressed.

A3.4.2 Out of the 44 applications received in the first round, 33 were considered complete and eligible and were brought to the attention of the QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee. The Committee approved three projects and conditionally approved another five projects,¹⁶ with a

¹³ Switzerland later announced an additional contribution of \$250,000 as partial support for an additional pilot project in another country.

¹⁴ In the first round, the secretariat received 32 Government applications. However, the total of applications received does not reflect the number of Governments involved because a number of Governments submitted several proposals, while others jointly submitted multi-country applications.

¹⁵ Some applications involved more than one applicant.

¹⁶ All the provisionally approved projects subsequently fulfilled remaining requirements for full approval.

combined value of \$1,966,262. The eight approved or conditionally approved projects related to seven Government applications and one civil society application and involved activities in 20 countries, including eight least developed countries and one small island developing State. Tables 18 to 22 of section A3.6 provide information on the geographical and sectoral balance among funding recipients, QSP strategic priorities and OPS objectives addressed.

A3.4.3 One of the notable features of the first round was the difference between the demand for funding (\$8,504,953) and the funding available in the trust fund at the time (\$4,742,000)¹⁷. Another feature was the predominance of the Africa region and of the environment sector, in particular in Government applications.

A3.4.4 In the second round of applications which closed on 16 April 2007, the secretariat received 34 applications, 29 from Governments and 5 from civil society organisations, seeking total funding of \$4,574,998¹⁸. Tables 13 to 17 of section A3.6 provide information on the geographical and sectoral balance among applicants and applications and the balance among QSP strategic priorities and objectives of the Overarching Policy Strategy (OPS) addressed.

A3.4.5 The following tables aim to provide an overview of the initial evolution of demand for assistance the trust fund¹⁹.

Table 6. QSP trust fund demand (number of applicants)

Applicants	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Round 5
Developing & Economies in transition Countries	33	30			
Civil society networks	12	5			
Totals	45	35			

Table 7. QSP trust fund demand (funding requested)

Funding requested	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Round 5
Developing & transition economy countries	\$6,546,445	\$3,680,674			
Civil society networks	\$1,958,508	\$964,824			
Totals	\$8,504,953	\$4,645,498			

¹⁷ See report on the establishment of and contributions to the QSP Trust Fund (SAICM/TF.2/INF/2), in the documents of the second meeting of Trust Fund Implementation Committee:
www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/qsp/qsp_tf2/qsp_tf2.htm

¹⁸ The secretariat's assessment of completeness and eligibility of second applications had not been completed at the time of drafting of the present document.

¹⁹ As noted in section 3.7.1, the business plan will be reviewed and updated for and at each meeting of the Executive Board. For example, while only two rounds of applications had been completed at the time the current business plan was adopted, four rounds will have been completed before the next meeting of the Executive Board.

Table 8. QSP trust fund demand (number of Government applications by region)

Government regional breakdown	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Round 5
Africa	19	12			
Asia-Pacific	5	9			
Latin America & the Caribbean	5	8			
Central and Eastern Europe	4	1			
Totals	45	30			

Table 9. QSP trust fund demand (number of civil society applications by region)

Civil society regional breakdown	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Round 5
Africa	4	2			
Asia-Pacific	5	1			
Latin America & the Caribbean	2	2			
Central and Eastern Europe	1	0			
Totals	12	5			

Table 10. QSP trust fund demand (by QSP strategic priority)

Applications and strategic priority(ies)	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4*	Round 5*
Totals applications	44	35			
a) Profiles – needs assessment	23	24			
b) Programmes, plans, etc. building upon international initiatives	38	16			
c) Mainstreaming chemicals in development priorities	10	3			

Table 11. QSP trust fund demand (by OPS objective)

Applications and OPS objectives addressed	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3	Round 4	Round 5
Totals applications	44	35			
Risk reduction	31	11			
Knowledge & information	26	29			
Governance	23	29			
Capacity building	21	12			
Illegal trafficking	0	0			

A3.4.6 From the first to the second round of applications, two key indicators show a decrease: the number of applicants and the total amounts requested. While this may be interpreted as a decrease of demand, it may also be explained by a shift in a more *realistic* expression of demand. The decrease in the number of applicants can be explained by the large decrease of submission of civil society applications. This may be explained by the additional requirements set for civil society which are funded under “exceptional circumstances” only. It may also be the capacities of civil society

organizations to develop and submit applications, and to ensure endorsements by national focal points.

A3.4.7 The other feature is the reduction of the amounts requested by projects, while in the first round projects requested an average funding of \$200,000, in the second round, the average cost of a project was of \$135,000. This might be explained by less ambitious approach of applicants, which have in the second round focused on smaller activities.

A3.4.8 Another key evolution between both rounds is the more even geographical balance of applicants. While demand in Africa and in Eastern and Central Europe decreased, demand in the Asia Pacific and Latin America increased²⁰.

A3.5 Other forms of support or programmes relating to the sound management of chemicals

A3.5.1 The present section of the business plan provides brief comparative information on the purposes, resources and procedures of other support programmes relating to the sound management of chemicals, namely those of the Global Environment Facility, the Multilateral Fund for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the World Bank, the Basel Convention Technical Cooperation Trust Fund, and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals, the chemicals industry and public interest civil society groups.

A3.5.2 The *Global Environment Facility* (GEF) is an independent financial organization that provides grants to developing countries for projects that benefit the global environment and promote sustainable livelihoods in local communities. GEF projects address complex global environmental under six focal areas: biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer and persistent organic pollutants (POPs). The GEF Council is currently considering a new cross-cutting strategy on chemicals aimed at enhancing the effective use of the above existing focal areas to support the sound management of chemicals. Since 1991, the GEF has provided \$6.2 billion in grants and generated over \$20 billion in co-financing from other sources to support over 1,800 projects that produce global environmental benefits in 140 developing countries and countries with economies in transition. GEF projects are managed by GEF Implementing Agencies: UNEP, UNDP and the World Bank. Seven other international organizations, known as GEF Executing Agencies, contribute to the management and execution of GEF projects. The GEF's mandate as a financial mechanism for multilateral environmental agreements related to chemicals (in particular, the Stockholm Convention, and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change), and also its support for regional seas and other agreements via its international waters focal area mean that it has considerable compatibility with the subject matter of SAICM. In August 2006, 32 donor countries pledged \$3.13 billion to the fourth GEF Replenishment, which will fund operations between 2006 and 2010. This includes a projected provision of 10 % or \$310 million for the POPs focal area. Commitments of the GEF during its third replenishment (July 2002 to June 2006) amounted an estimated \$218 million for projects in the POPs focal area. The GEF POPs allocation has leveraged more than US\$ 153 million in co-financing to bring the total value of the GEF POPs portfolio to over US\$ 370 million. According to the GEF secretariat, projects under preparation that are expected to be considered for approval by the GEF Council during 2007 would amount to approximately US\$ 80 million (including agency fees). A comparable level of effort is anticipated for 2008. As noted in paragraph A1.2.1 above, the GEF was included in paragraph 19 of the SAICM OPS in one of the elements of the financial arrangements for SAICM implementation ("making more effective use and building upon existing sources of relevant global funding")²¹. Although no GEF contribution has

²⁰ For example, table 15 of section A3.6 below shows that the funding sought by the Africa region decreased from 58% in the first round to 39.5% in the second round.

²¹ Some participants in the first session of the ICCM, and subsequently, the African and Central Eastern European regions, signalled their interest in discussing the possibility of the GEF opening a new chemicals focal area to support longer term SAICM implementation. See the reports of the first session of the ICCM and

been declared, it may be possible for the GEF to contribute to the QSP through co-financing of QSP trust fund projects or through a standalone GEF project which is declared and recognised as a contribution to the non-trust fund QSP.

A3.5.3 The *Multilateral Fund (MLF) for Implementation of the Montreal Protocol* assists eligible developing country Parties to comply with the control measures of the Protocol. The MLF, established in 1993, is the only example of a dedicated multilateral fund for a multilateral environment agreement. It meets the agreed incremental costs of compliance activities for elimination of ozone-depleting substances (e.g., financial and technical cooperation, and technology transfer). The Fund is also used to finance clearinghouse activities and to finance the Fund Secretariat operations and support costs. As at April 2006, the historical contributions made to the Multilateral Fund by some 49 industrialized countries (including Countries with Economies in Transition or CEIT countries) totalled over US \$ 2 billion. Parties to the Protocol approve a notional budget every three years with contributions based on the UN assessment scale. The total budget for the 2006-2008 triennium is US \$470 million. The Fund is managed by an Executive Committee assisted by the Fund Secretariat. In delivering financial and technical assistance, the Executive Committee works with four implementing agencies: the World Bank, UNEP, UNDP and UNIDO, and also a number of bilateral government agencies. Funds are provided on a grant or concessional basis based on an "Indicative List of Categories of Incremental Costs" developed by the Parties, with funding predicated on the principle of additionality. Up to 20% of a donor's total contributions may be provided bilaterally in the form of projects approved by the fund's Executive Committee for implementation by a donor country. Article 5 parties are eligible to request and receive funding for developing their Country Programs when they indicate their intention to ratify the Montreal Protocol. Such types of projects can range between US \$30,000 to US \$500,000. As noted in paragraph A1.2.1 above, the MLF was included in paragraph 19 of the SAICM OPS in one of the elements of the financial arrangements for SAICM implementation ("making more effective use and building upon existing sources of relevant global funding"). Although no MLF contribution has been declared, it may be possible for the MLF to contribute to the QSP through co-financing of QSP trust fund projects or through a standalone MLF project which is declared and recognised as a contribution to the non-trust fund QSP.

A3.5.4 The *World Bank* is a major source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world. It is owned by its member governments, which subscribe to its basic share capital, with votes proportional to shareholding. The World Bank consists of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), established in 1945 and currently with 184 member governments, and the International Development Association (IDA), with 165 members. The World Bank supports country-led poverty reduction strategies, including strategies to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Together, the IBRD and IDA (i.e., World Bank) constitute the world's largest source of development assistance for global and local environmental problems. The World Bank also provides approximately US\$3 billion in trust fund support (basically grant financing) to support sustainable development, including economic, social, health and environmental aspects of sustainable development. Of these, only the \$18 million²² Canada Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Fund has an explicit chemicals orientation. As of mid-2005, approximately half of the \$18 million had been allocated in support of more than 70 projects. In addition the World Bank is involved in chemicals-based projects and activities as an implementing agency for the GEF and the MLF, in developing analytical work assessing country needs in sectors and in developing chemical management-based guidance.

A3.5.5 The *Basel Convention* is supported by a voluntary Technical Cooperation Trust Fund, which finances programme activities undertaken to implement the Convention, particularly for technical assistance, training and capacity-building; Basel Convention Regional/Coordinating

of the first meetings of the African and Central Eastern European regions, on the SAICM web site: www.chem.unep.ch/saicm.

²² 20 million Canadian dollars.

Centres; appropriate participation of the representatives of developing countries Parties and of Parties with economies in transition; and cases of emergency and compensation for damage resulting from incidences arising from transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and other wastes and their disposal. The Conference of the Parties budgeted \$12,297,011 for the trust fund in 2006, but this was later revised to \$2,223,489 according to funds actually received.²³ The trust fund's 2007 budget is \$4,296,915 and its 2008 budget is \$3,683,800.²⁴ Because most contributors to the Technical Cooperation Fund earmark their contributions, and because all contributions are voluntary, the Fund does not have a dependable stream of discretionary financial resources available. Accordingly, the secretariat has not instituted a formal procedure for submitting project proposals. Rather, the secretariat approaches project grants on an ad hoc basis. The secretariat either identifies and implements projects based on needs expressed by parties, or provides funds in response to a project proposal submitted by a party. Projects are distributed equitably according to regional and national diversities and specificities as appropriate. QSP and Basel co-financing of projects may be a possibility, though as yet no proposal has been made in this regard by stakeholders.

A3.5.6 The *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons* is the secretariat for the Chemical Weapons Convention, which is an international treaty banning the development, production, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical weapons, and also stipulating their timely destruction. International cooperation and assistance are provided in areas such as chemical research and improving laboratory capacity, specialised internships and training in the implementation of the Convention, and safe chemicals management. The 2007 budget for this international cooperation and assistance is 5,184,448 Euros (approximately \$6,846,000).²⁵

A3.5.7 *The Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC)* is a joint programme grouping seven participating organizations and two observers²⁶, all active on chemical safety issues. It aims to strengthen international cooperation in the field of chemicals and to increase the effectiveness of the organizations' international chemicals programmes. It promotes coordination of policies and activities, pursued jointly or separately, to achieve the sound management of chemicals in relation to human health and the environment. The overall contribution of the IOMC is achieved through both the individual work programmes²⁷ of its participating organizations, as well as through coordinated or joint activities²⁸. The IOMC does not have a separate funding mechanism but its participating organizations and UNDP play a role in the implementation of SAICM through their organizations' work programmes and activities. They are closely involved in the QSP, since they form the QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee. In addition, some of the participating organizations have made recognized contributions to the non-trust fund QSP²⁹.

²³ UNEP/CHW.8/INF/23, Information on financial matters, prepared for the eight meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention, Nairobi, 27 November-1 December 2006.

²⁴ Decision VIII/33 of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention, Nairobi, 27 November-1 December 2006.

²⁵ C-11/DEC.11, decision on the programme and budget of the OPCW for 2007, 11th session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention, The Hague, 5-8 December 2006.

²⁶ The participating organizations of IOMC are FAO, ILO, OECD, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO. UNDP and the World Bank are observers.

²⁷ For example, UNIDO, through the implementation of the Cleaner and Sustainable Production projects and programmes, supports the industry sector in sound chemicals management to prevent emissions of dangerous chemicals to the environment, reduce waste loads and promote cleaner treatment and disposal. The resources allocated in 2006 for this amounted to \$6,000,000. In 2007 the target figure equals to US \$ 10,434,670 through direct support from the Organization to governments, research institutions and industries.

²⁸ At the technical level, specific coordinating groups have been or are in the process of being established, such as harmonization of classification of chemicals and assessment of existing chemicals and pollutants. These groups provide a means for all interested bodies working in the respective areas to consult with each other on programme plans and activities, and to discuss ways and means of ensuring that the activities are mutually supportive.

²⁹ See section A2.3.6 on the declarations of QSP contributions.

A3.5.8 *The chemicals industry* has no overall dedicated fund to support SAICM implementation. Neither does the private sector make systematic contributions to the trust funds of chemicals-related Multilateral Environment Agreements. Nonetheless, chemicals industry associations are active in voluntary partnerships, programmes and activities, which contribute to the sound management of chemicals.

a) The *International Council of Chemical Associations (ICCA)*, representing 75% of global chemical manufacturing operations, launched in 2006 two new initiatives to enhance the industry's health, safety and environmental performance, particularly in the area of product stewardship: the Responsible Care Global Charter, strengthening and expanding the scope of Responsible Care globally and the Global Product Strategy³⁰. There is no information available on the percentage of funding that the industry members collectively contribute to implementation of the programmes, or figures regarding specific or overall accomplishments (e.g., tonnes of various types of pollutants eliminated or reduced, for example as a result of improved process changes). However, according to ICCA, the first steps in the process are education and training for members of the industry on the programmes and developing guidance materials and tools to help build the capacity throughout the industry. To date, the industry has invested approximately \$30,000 (US) in direct cost and at least 10 times that in in-kind contributions from companies to develop these initial materials and to begin the process of outreach to the associations and companies³¹.

b) The *International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM)*, representing leading international mining and metals companies, has developed a Material Stewardship Policy which would enhance management of metals and related guidance for implementation. The metals industry has also issued a Declaration on Recycling Principles. The declaration aims to work towards the establishment of an accurate understanding of metals recycling and the objectives of sustainable development. No financial or other quantitative information is available on the means for the development and implementation of such initiatives, nor on their impact in developing countries.

c) *CropLife International*, a global federation representing the plant science industry and a network of regional and national associations in 91 countries, works on ensuring the safety of chemicals used in agriculture and public health. The industry stresses its work to combat weeds, crop diseases and pests and the importance of making regulatory decisions based on sound science, taking into account risk management options, to ensure that the benefits of pesticide use could be realized at an acceptable level of risk. CropLife has worked with the FAO on the Code of Conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides and provides technical support to the FAO implementation process. CropLife is also making a substantial financial and technical contribution to the Africa Stockpiles Programme³².

d) The *World Economic Forum (WEF)* has recently added the chemicals sector to its list of industry groups or "communities"³³. SAICM was presented to chemical industry leaders during the annual meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, at the "Chemical Industry Governors Meeting" in January 2007. The chief executive officers of

³⁰ The Global Product Strategy unites several current stewardship initiatives through the Responsible Care® program, and is intended to drive stewardship best practices in 52 (representing more than 85% of chemicals sales by volume), many of which are developing countries with a significant number of small and medium sized enterprises.

³¹ See ICCA's declaration of QSP contribution, available on the SAICM web site: www.chem.unep.ch/saicm/fundraising/qsp.htm

³² See footnote 34 below.

³³ Such groups engage on issues of importance to their respective sectors, whether industry-specific, cross-industry or global corporate citizenship related, and provide intellectual stewardship to the Forum's initiatives.

chemicals companies were urged to consider ways in which they could contribute to SAICM's implementation, such as expanding current voluntary initiatives and providing resources and technical expertise. Participants agreed that the Forum and UNEP should jointly explore with industry possible options for it to support SAICM implementation, such as the pursuit of public-private partnership projects and the provision of technical assistance and resources.

A3.5.9 *Public interest civil society groups*, representing a variety of different entities such as foundations, non-governmental organizations, labour unions, advocacy groups or professional associations, should also be taken into account when assessing resources available and activities undertaken for the sound management of chemicals.

a) *Private foundations* have been seen as a possible funding solution, although very limited funding is dedicated to the sound management of chemicals. No study seems to be available to assess this group's contributions to the sound management of chemicals. Foundations may nevertheless be a potential source of funding, especially if projects are linked to major development and/or poverty alleviation goals of interest to some of the large foundations.

b) *Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)* addressing environmental sustainability issues internationally or at the national level represent a very small proportion of NGOs as a whole. For many environmental and public health NGOs, work on sound management of chemicals is a peripheral activity arising out of their main area of expertise. NGOs typically have limited funding available for the sound management of chemicals. They may however bring significant in-kind contributions and expertise for the successful implementation of projects in partnership with intergovernmental organisations and Governments³⁴.

A3.5.10 The various other sources of support for the sound management of chemicals referred to above have not all been quantified. Table 12 nevertheless provides a partial summary of the resources and contributions mentioned in section A3.5.

Table 12. Summary of quantified funding mechanisms for the sound management of chemicals

Source	Amounts \$USD
GEF POPs allocation (3 rd replenishment 2002-2006)	\$218,000,000
GEF POPs co-financing (3 rd replenishment 2002-2006)	\$153,000,000
MLF trust fund budget (2006-2008 triennium)	\$470,000,000
World Bank Canada POPs Fund	\$18,000,000
Basel convention technical trust fund (2006 contributions)	\$2,223,489
OPCW budget for international cooperation and assistance	\$6,846,000
ICCA guidance material development and outreach	\$30,000

³⁴ The African Stockpiles Programme, which was launched as a project funded by the GEF POPs focal area, bilateral donors and the private sector and aimed at elimination of pesticide stockpiles in Africa, is an example of successful partnership with a chemicals orientation, having raised most of the US\$60 million required for its initial phase. The International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN) in 2006 completed a global project to help countries prepare for implementation of the Stockholm Convention, the International POPs Elimination Project (IPEP), in which more than 350 NGOs in 65 developing and transition countries participated in activities of direct relevance to SAICM Global Plan of Action. Such projects demonstrate that with adequate support, partnerships can provide meaningful results.

(financial contribution)	
ICCA guidance material development and outreach (in-kind contribution)	\$300,000

A3.6 Tables of demand for QSP trust fund assistance of the first and second rounds of applications and of first round approved projects

The section provides complementary information and statistics supporting the assessment of QSP trust fund demand, as highlighted in section A3.4 above. Tables 13 to 17 provide an overview of the on the geographical and sectoral balance among, funding requests, QSP strategic priorities and OPS objectives addressed. Tables 18 to 22 provide similar information for projects approved in the first round of applications.

Table 13. Applicants by trust fund applications round and by region

Round 1

Geographical balance of applicants	Total	Africa	Asia –Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing & transition economy countries	33 (100%)	19 (57.5%)	5 (15.2%)	5 (15.2%)	4 (12.1%)
Civil society networks	12 (100%)	4 (33.3%)	5 (41.7%)	2 (16.7%)	1 (8.3%)
Total	45 (100%)	23 (51.1%)	10 (22.2%)	8 (17.8%)	4 (8.9%)

Round 2

Geographical balance of applicants	Total	Africa	Asia –Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing & transition economy countries	30 (100%)	12 (40%)	9 (30%)	8 (26.7%)	1 (3.3%)
Civil society networks	5 (100%)	2 (40%)	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Total	35 (100%)	14 (40%)	10 (28.6%)	10 (28.6%)	1 (2.8%)

Table 14. Applicants by trust fund applications round and by sector

Round 1

Sectoral balance of applicants*	Total	Environment	Health	Labour	Agriculture	Other
Developing & transition economy countries	33	30	3	-	-	-
Civil society networks	12	7	2	2	1	-
Total	45	37	5	2	1	-

* The sector identified represents the leading Ministry or Organization in the applications process and not the scope of proposed projects, which often were multisectoral

Round 2

Sectoral balance of applicants*	Total	Environment	Health	Labour	Agriculture	Other
Developing & transition economy countries	30	27	1	1	1	-
Civil society networks	5	2	2	1	-	-
Total	35	29	3	2	1	-

* The sector identified represents the leading Ministry or Organization in the applications process and not the scope of proposed projects, which often were multisectoral

Table 15. Funding demand by trust fund applications round and by region

Round 1

Funding sought by applicant	Total	Africa	Asia – Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing & transition economy countries	\$6,546,445 (100%)	\$4,308,361 (65.8%)	\$644,175 (9.8%)	\$747,250 (11.4%)	\$846,659 (12.9%)
Civil society networks	\$1,958,508 (100%)	\$626,473 (32%)	\$609,083 (31.1%)	\$483,952 (24.7%)	\$239,000 (12.2)
Total	\$8,504,953 (100%)	\$4,934,834 (58%)	\$1,253,258 (14.7%)	\$1,231,202 (14.5%)	\$1,085,659 (12.8%)

Round 2

Funding sought by applicant	Total	Africa	Asia – Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing & transition economy countries	\$3,680,674 (100%)	\$1,526,321 (41.5%)	\$952,846 (25.9 %)	\$951,557 (25.8%)	\$249,950 (6.8%)
Civil society networks	\$964,824 (100%)	\$309,000 (32%)	\$199,854 (20.7%)	\$455,970 (47.3 %)	\$0 (0%)
Total	\$4,645,498 (100%)	\$1,835,321 (39.5%)	\$1,152,700 (24.8%)	\$1,407,527 (30.3%)	\$249,950 (5.4%)

Table 16. Applications by trust fund applications round and by QSP strategic priority

Round 1

Strategic priorities addressed by project proposals**	Applications ***	a) Profiles – needs assessment	b) Programmes, plans, etc. building upon international initiatives	c) Mainstreaming chemicals in development priorities
Developing & transition economy countries	32	19	26	7
Civil society networks	12	3	12	3
Total	44	23	38	10

** The project proposals figure relate to the applications instead of the applicants because some applicants have submitted more than one project proposal.

*** In many cases, project proposals have addressed more than one priority.

Round 2

Strategic priorities addressed by project proposals**	Applications ***	a) Profiles – needs assessment	b) Programmes, plans, etc. building upon international initiatives	c) Mainstreaming chemicals in development priorities
Developing & transition economy countries	30	23	11	3
Civil society networks	5	1	5	-
Total	35	24	16	3

** The project proposals figure relate to the applications instead of the applicants because some applicants have submitted more than one project proposal.

*** In many cases, project proposals have addressed more than one priority.

Table 17. Applications by trust fund applications round and by OPS objective

Round 1

OPS objectives addressed by project	Applications*	Risk reduction	Knowledge & information	Governance	Capacity building	Illegal trafficking
Developing & transition economy countries	32	15	19	19	14	-
Civil society networks	12	6	7	4	7	-
Total	44	31	26	23	21	-

* In many cases, project proposals have addressed more than one OPS objective.

Round 2

OPS objectives addressed by project	Applications*	Risk reduction	Knowledge & information	Governance	Capacity building	Illegal trafficking
Developing & transition economy countries	30	7	24	26	9	-
Civil society networks	5	4	5	3	3	-
Total	35	11	29	29	12	-

* In many cases, project proposals have addressed more than one OPS objective.

Table 18. QSP trust fund 1st round funding recipients by region

Geographical balance of funding recipients	Total	Africa	Asia –Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing & transition economy countries	19	9 (6 LDCs)	2	4 (1 SIDS/LDC)	4
Civil society networks	1	1			
Total	20	10	2	4	4

Table 19. QSP trust fund 1st round funding recipients by sector

Sectoral balance of funding recipients **	Total	Environment	Health	Labour	Agriculture	Other
Developing & transition economy countries	19	18	1	-	-	-
Civil society networks	1	-	-	1	-	-
Totals	20	18	1	1	-	-

** The sector identified represents the leading Ministry or Organization in the applications process and not the scope of proposed projects, which often were multisectoral

Table 20. QSP trust fund 1st round funding approved by region

Funding provided	Total	Africa	Asia – Pacific	Latin America & Caribbean	Central & Eastern Europe
Developing & transition economy countries	\$1,725,262 (100%)	\$829,850 (48.1%)	\$99,318 (5.8%)	\$398,873 (23.1%)	\$397,221 (23%)
Civil society networks	\$241,800 (100%)	\$241,800 (100%)	-	-	-
Totals	\$1,966,262 (100%)	\$1,071,650 (54.5%)	\$99,318 (5%)	\$398,873 (20.3%)	\$397,221 (20.2%)

Table 21. QSP trust fund 1st round approved projects by QSP strategic priority

Strategic priorities addressed by project	Approved project*	a) Profiles – needs assessment	b) Programmes, plans, etc. building upon international initiatives	c) Mainstreaming chemicals in development priorities
Developing & transition economy countries	7	6	4	4
Civil society networks	1	-	1	-
Total	8	6	5	4

* Project proposals in many cases have addressed more than one priority.

Table 22. QSP trust fund 1st round approved projects by OPS objective

OPS objectives addressed by project	Approved project **	Risk reduction	Knowledge & information	Governance	Capacity building	Illegal trafficking
Developing & transition economy countries	7	3	7	4	3	-
Civil society networks	1	1	1		1	-
Total	8	4	8	4	4	-

** Approved project in many cases have addressed more than one OPS objective.