
**Sixth meeting of the Quick Start Programme
Executive Board**
Geneva
13-14 September 2011
Adoption of the report of the sixth meeting of the Board

Report of the sixth 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 decided to establish a Quick Start Programme (QSP) to support initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities for the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) 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 established 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 Committee* 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 and 27 April 2006 in Geneva. The second meeting of the Board was held on 23 and 24 April 2007, the third meeting took place on 6 and 7 May 2008, the fourth meeting was held on 23 and 24 April 2009 and the fifth meeting took place on 19 and 20 June 2010.

3. In 2009, the Board introduced a practice to hold a separate meeting of the Quick Start Programme Executive Board Committee prior to the meeting of the Executive Board. The Committee is composed of donor countries and the representatives of the five United Nations regions. The Committee held its current meeting on the morning of Tuesday 13 September. The outcome of the Committee's deliberations is included under section III of the current report.

I. Opening of the meeting

* 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), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank.

4. The sixth meeting of the Board was held at the International Environment House in Geneva, Switzerland, on 13 and 14 April 2011. The meeting was opened by Ms. Leonor Alvarado, coordinator of the SAICM secretariat, who welcomed the participants.

II. Organizational matters

A. Organization of work

5. The Board agreed to meet from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. The Board decided to hold the separate meeting of the Executive Board's Committee on the QSP Trust Fund composed of regional representative and trust fund donors from 9.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m. on 13 September 2011 as indicated in the annotated agenda SAICM/EB.6/1/Add.1.

B. Attendance

6. The meeting was attended by the following regional representatives or their designated replacements: Ms. Anahit Aleksandryan (Armenia), Ms. Natalie Burke (Barbados), Ms. Antoinette Macumi (Burundi), Mr. Matti Nissinen (Finland), Mr. Nassereddin Heidari (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Marin Kocov (the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia), Mr. Supat Wangwongwatana (Thailand), Ms. Gabi Eigenmann (Switzerland) and Mr. Fabio Di Cera Paternostro (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela).

7. The meeting was attended by the following donor representatives: Ms. Jill Hanna, Mr. Peter Maxson and Ms. Helen McCarthy (European Commission), Mr. Gordo Jain (Germany), Mr. Rajiv Gauba (India), Mr. Yong-Sang Ji, Mr. Chang Heum Lee and Ms. Hyein Chang (Republic of Korea), Mr. Henrik H. Eriksen (Norway), Mr. Reginald Hernaus (Netherlands), Ms. Marta Ciraj (Slovenia), Mr. Teboho Sebege (South African), Mr. Jose Ignacio Contreras (Spain), Ms. Sara Stenhammar and Ms. Johanna Lissinger-Peitz (Sweden) and Ms. Sezaneh Seymour (United States of America).

8. The meeting was attended by the following contributors: Mr. Yusuke Honda and Mr. Tsutomu Mizutani (Japan), Mr. Michael Gribble (International Council for Chemical Associations), Mr. David Azoulay (International POPs Elimination Network), Mr. Kaj Madsen (United Nations Environment Programme), Mr. Jan Gajowski (United Nations Industrial Development Organization), Mr. Jonathan Krueger (United Nations Institute for Training and Research) and Ms. Carolyn Vickers (World Health Organization).

C. Election of officers

9. The participants agreed that Mr. Nassereddin Heidari (Islamic Republic of Iran) would serve as the co-chair from the group of Government representatives of the five United Nations regions and Mr. Gordo Jain (Germany) would serve as the co-chair from the group of donors.

D. Adoption of the agenda

10. The representatives adopted the following agenda for the meeting on the basis of the provisional annotated agenda set out in document SAICM/EB.6/1/Rev.1 and SAICM/EB.6/Add.1. One participant requested that a progress report on the Consultative Process on Financing Options on Chemicals and Wastes lead by the Executive Director of UNEP be provided to the meeting under agenda item 9 on other matters.

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Election of officers;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (c) Organization of work.

3. Report of the Executive Board's Committee on the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund
4. Mid-term review of the Quick Start Programme.
5. Review of implementation of the Quick Start Programme business plan.
6. Status of the Quick Start Programme:
 - (a) Quick Start Programme and its Trust Fund;
 - (b) Non-trust fund Quick Start Programme.
7. Further development of operational guidance on the implementation of the strategic priorities of the Quick Start Programme.
8. Update on the Senior Expert Resource Group (SERG).
9. Other matters.
10. Adoption of the report.
11. Next meeting
12. Closure of the meeting

III. Report of the Executive Board's Committee

11. Mr. Jain, chair of the Committee, made a summary presentation of the outcome of discussions during the meeting of the Executive Board Committee on the QSP Trust Fund that had taken place during the morning of Tuesday, 13 September as follows. He noted that the meeting had been well attended by representatives of donor and recipient countries and that discussion had centred on the report of the QSP Mid-term Review.

12. At the meeting of the Committee, the representative of the secretariat had provided a summary of the process followed for preparing the Mid-term Review of the QSP. She indicated that while the report had suffered from important shortcomings, it did contain relevant information on the projects undertaken under the QSP in support of the implementation of SAICM. The challenges in recruiting one consultant from a developing country had led the secretariat to establishing an ad hoc advisory group of chemical experts to comment on the review and advise the secretariat on completion of the report.

13. In the ensuing discussion the following was noted:

- Participants acknowledged there was much useful information and data on the QSP projects however it was noted that the report did not reflect the reality of project outcomes, notably the Executive Summary and the recommendations.
- The overall analysis and recommendations presented in the review were considered disappointing owing for the most part to the lack of insight from stakeholders. Drawing firm conclusions on the Mid-term Review was hampered by a lack of information from implementers at the national level who had not been sufficiently consulted.
- Concern was raised as to why the review had not begun in 2010, but it was recognized that this was a challenge to be addressed by the Executive Board and UNEP Chemicals and not by the SAICM secretariat.
- There was also concern regarding one of the consultants who was considered to be not the ideal candidate to prepare the Mid-term Review report.

- It was suggested that the future of the QSP Trust Fund influenced the future of the QSP itself and the wider chemical community was looking to the Executive Board to make recommendations on the future of the programme.
- The Committee questioned the role and conformation of the ad hoc advisory group of chemical experts.
- The role of the Board as the submitter of the report to the third session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management was stressed. It was suggested that the Board prepare a recommendation on the way forward to improve and complete the report in time for the third session of the Conference.
- The Executive Board stressed the importance of holding its next meeting in time to prepare reports for the next session of the Conference.

14. The Committee requested the Board to determine if recommendations based on the Mid-term Review should be developed at the current meeting or at an additional meeting to be held prior to the third session of the Conference. It was also requested that the Board decide whether it would be politically correct to say that the Board had not completed the Mid-term Review. The Committee had suggested that the Terms of Reference for preparation of the Mid-term Review be re-examined to identify what information from the report could be used to make a decision.

15. The Board took note of the report of the Committee.

IV. Mid-term Review of the Quick Start Programme

16. The Board had before it documents SAICM/EB.6/7 on the mid-term evaluation of the QSP. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that the Mid-term Review was developed in response to resolution II/3 of the second session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management that, inter alia, requested the Board to evaluate the QSP and report on its effectiveness and the efficiency of its implementation. She provided a detailed presentation of the process followed for engaging the consultants who prepared the review and an indication of how they developed the review.

17. She noted that the information in the review was mostly based on a desk study. She said that while the secretariat had not been completely satisfied with the final product the review, as it is currently stood, did contain valuable and relevant information on the projects undertaken under the QSP in support of the implementation of SAICM. Given the sometimes conflicting information presented in the conclusions of the individual sections developed by each consultant, the secretariat had deemed it advisable to prepare a compilation report of the main findings of the review, including information from the available project progress reports and final reports. She emphasized the success of the QSP that, to date had supported projects in 103 countries and the Programme was able to mobilize resources for a total of approximately USD 115 million and provided a detailed presentation on the QSP.

18. She provided a breakdown of the types of projects that had been submitted and the geographical proportions of the submitting regions. She described the functioning of the secretariat in handling the applications as well as the administrative operational and technical problems which included lack of awareness of SAICM that had, on occasion, hindered multi-stakeholder buy-in. She added details on the challenges faced in the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation, the implementation arrangements and the lessons learned. She concluded by noting items that could be improved.

19. In the ensuing discussion participants noted the importance of the Mid-term Review but highlighted the need for additional views on the beneficiaries of the projects. Participants from executing agencies offered their support to improve the Mid-term Review. It was noted that the weakest part of the Review was the lack of input from stakeholders and it was suggested that the Open-ended Working Group could offer a forum to collect additional information to improve the Review. The representative of the Secretariat noted that the part of the review relating to project performance was most reliable and was supported by evidence coming out of the final Monitoring and Evaluation reports submitted by implementers.

20. Given there were still funds remaining from money earmarked for the Mid-term Review, the secretariat suggested that an independent consultant could be hired to improve the Review using the current project performance data and provide a revised Mid-term Review for approval at the next meeting of the QSP Board.
21. Participants also highlighted the lack of replies to the questionnaires noting that only 18 responses had been received from over 300 focal points and urged that this lack of response be brought to the attention of participants at the Open-ended Working Group. It was suggested that the questionnaires might have had more success if they had been channelled through regional focal points. It was also noted that an analysis was only made of 23 projects but that information from the remaining projects that had completed activities but had not yet submitted their final reports should be obtained to complete the Review. The major problems associated with lack of reporting, especially of having final reports was noted and it was suggested that the executing agencies could be requested to assist in that process.
22. Further constraints associated with the Mid-term Review were, for example, that the focus and emphasis of the Mid-term Review relied too little on actual findings on effectiveness and efficiency. Additionally the Review did not say whether the QSP was accomplishing what it set out to do and moved too precipitously to recommendations. The right focus and emphasis was essential to enable the Board to draw conclusions and develop recommendations. It was suggested that the secretariat, with the assistance of a small group from within the Board working through telecommunication, could prepare a draft set of recommendations for the next Board meeting planned for April 2012.
23. It was suggested that paragraph 32 (e) of the terms of reference on the evaluation of the impact of activities should be the focus of gathering additional information as that remained the largest gap. The proposed small group from within the Board could also steer and assist the consultant to ensure the Review was going in the right direction.
24. The Board requested the secretariat to provide a draft of proposed next steps to complete the Mid-term Review. Accordingly, the secretariat drafted proposed next steps that were extensively discussed during the meeting. It was agreed that a new independent consultant be hired to revise and complete the Mid-term Review and that the consultant should work closely with the secretariat and the Board. In that respect the Board suggested that a small advisory board constituted from members of the Board or selected by them be established to provide advice to the secretariat and or the consultant, and draft recommendations for the third session of the Conference. The advisory group would work principally through telecommunication. Suggestions for revisions included added focus on efficiency and effectiveness and impact that projects were having. The report should also provide some lessons learned and obtain input from regional focal points and executing agencies. It was suggested that the consultant would be hired by mid-October and would provide a draft report January 2012.
25. The Board welcomed the intention of the secretariat to discuss with the Bureau the possibility of holding a two-hour information session on the QSP completed and nearly completed projects on Monday 14 November preceding the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group. The information session would serve to enhance information exchange on QSP projects and activities and be geared at sharing lessons learned and best practices with other SAICM stakeholders, increase stakeholder understanding of the QSP process and encourage countries that have not yet presented a proposal for the QSP to do so before the closure of the 12th application round in February 2012.
26. The amended text of the proposed next steps, as agreed by the Board, is attached to the current report as Annex I.

V. Review of implementation of the Quick Start Programme business plan

27. The Board had before it document SAICM/EB.6/5/Rev.1, a report on the implementation of the QSP business plan, providing information on progress against the business plan strategies and targets and additional information on QSP trust fund applications and approved projects over ten rounds. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that the business plan had been developed in 2007 as a result of a consultative process and updated in 2008 and 2009. Considered a living document, the business plan served as a tool to assess progress on the QSP and it was updated based on experience in implementing the QSP. She noted that the report contained information that allowed for assessment and monitoring of information in the fourth year and she made a detailed

presentation on the fund-raising strategy and targets, as well as the outreach and equitable delivery strategies. She concluded by noting that targets had not always been met when aimed at specific end points in ACP-countries as sufficient proposals for that purpose had not been received.

28. In the ensuing discussion participants requested clarification on the funds available for applications from ACP-countries as well as the numbers of related applications received. Clarification was also sought on applications for projects on non-chemical alternatives for which the Government of France had recently made a pledge for earmarked funds. Participants noted that, as had been discussed and agreed in a previous Board meeting, target (b) under Fundraising Strategy should be eliminated, given previous discussion on this issue where it was determined that the salary for a fund raising professional would probably be in excess of the funds that could be raised by that person. It was proposed that instead, synergies should be sought with UNEP Chemicals or other entities for fund-raising purposes. With regards to target (b) under Fund Raising Targets, the need for burden sharing was stressed, also as a means to ensure sustainability.

29. In response, the representative of the secretariat said that approximately 30,000 US dollars remained following the first round of application from ACP-countries. She noted that the challenge faced with disbursing targeted funds, such as with the funds provided by the Government of France could be resolved by adequate information sharing and outreach to stakeholders to inform on the availability of those funds so that projects could be designed and submitted accordingly. It was noted that some information available in the business plan could be included in the reporting on projects. It was suggested that for ease of consultation, relevant information could be collated into one document for the Open-ended Working Group.

30. In response to a request for clarification on the number of projects for which UNITAR was the executing agency and which concentrated on strategic priority (a), the representative of UNITAR said that given the projects were country driven it was up each country to indicate their priority. Additionally many of the projects in application rounds 9 and 10 were not limited to meeting strategic priority (a) and focus on elements of strategic priority (b) as well. The representatives of UNEP noted that projects for which it acted as executing agency with UNDP often involved testing of guidance at the country level and therefore did not carry the same portfolio as UNITAR. The representative of WHO noted that less projects were carried out with WHO as the executing agency in part for the same reason as UNEP and partly resulting from the difficulties of providing staff resources to support projects.

31. The Board took note of the information in the report.

VI. Status of the Quick Start Programme

A. Quick Start Programme Trust Fund

32. The Board had before it document SAICM/EB.6/6 containing the report of the fifth meeting of the QSP Board that took place in Geneva on 29 and 30 June 2010.

33. The Board adopted the report of its fifth meeting.

34. The Board also had before it document SAICM/EB.6/2 containing the report of the secretariat on the status of the QSP and its trust fund. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat noted that since the preparation of the report additional contributions had been received from France and from the United States of America for which she expressed her gratitude. She then made a presentation on the financial and administrative situation of the QSP Trust Fund.

35. In the ensuing discussion to a request for clarification on the impression that there was an ever-expanding number of projects, the representative of the secretariat confirmed that as the closing date for the QSP approached, it was reasonable to expect that requests for funding would increase or at least remain constant.

36. The board discussed what would be an appropriate target for contributions for 2012. It was suggested that if the existing methodology for determining targets for contributions was followed, the resulting target could be overestimated unless there was a clear shift in burden sharing. It was suggested that a reasonable target would be half of what would be calculated according to the existing

methodology. That would result in a target of USD 4 million for 2012. Participants reiterated the importance of disseminating results of the QSP projects to attract further funding. It was also suggested that awareness raising of SAICM-related issues in non-traditional forums was important.

37. The Board requested the secretariat to amend the targets in the business plan to reflect the proposed target for 2012 as agreed.

38. The Board also had before it document SAICM/EB.6/3 on the status of implementation of projects approved in the first ten rounds. Introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat described the new format used to prepare the report and made a detailed presentation on the issue including information on and reasons for delays encountered in implementing projects.

39. In the ensuing discussion the new format for reporting on status of implementation of projects was commended as being easier to understand. The secretariat was requested to verify figures quoted before presenting the report to the Open-ended Working Group. It was requested that the document indicate more clearly which projects demonstrated progress according to the workplan and which did not. Further it was suggested that an indication be provided on which projects supported implementation of multilateral environmental agreements. In response to a request for clarification on how disbursement of funds could take place prior to a signature of the agreement on some projects, the representative of the secretariat clarified that in relation to disbursements there are two arrangements, one for projects that have an executing agency (IGO) and the other for projects that do not. Projects with an IGO executing agency involve two agreements, one between UNEP and the agency, and another one between the agency and the implementer. When the agreement between UNEP and the executing agency is signed, UNEP is able to transfer the full amount of funds to the executing agency. However, in the second case where there is no executing agency, when the agreement with the implementer is signed, disbursements are made in instalments according to the approved workplan. The final disbursement is made once confirmation that all project activities have been completed is provided to the secretariat.

40. The Board requested the secretariat to provide information on any country that had more than one project, including multi-country projects, with the strategic priority (a). The secretariat provided the information requested which is included in Annex II. In addition to the requested list, the secretariat pointed to the breakdown of the total amount of funds disbursed to date to the principal executing agencies included in the update of the implementation of the business plan. The Board also request information on how many more countries could be supported by the QSP Trust Fund. The secretariat clarified that there are 133 countries listed as eligible to apply for QSP TF and that 103 already have received funds. Thus there are 30 more potential countries eligible to receive QSP TF funds. The list of eligible countries is presented in Annex III.

41. Responding to a request for clarification on amounts remaining to commit in the 11th round of application the secretariat noted that there remained approximately USD 1,600,000 available to award if all pledges made to the secretariat were met, but this figure would have to be confirmed by the secretariat's administrative officer. It was noted that the Trust Fund Implementation Committee also served the purpose of monitoring continuing projects, not solely awarding funds. In that respect it was suggested that the Implementation Committee be involved in the revision of the Mid-term Review report.

B. Non-Trust Fund Quick Start Programme

42. The representative of the secretariat drew attention to document SAICM/EB.6/INF/7 and updated participants on the status of the non-trust fund contributions to the QSP. The secretariat also noted that a communication had been sent to the members of the Board requesting confirmation whether declaration of non-trust fund contribution made this year qualify as a non-trust fund contributions. The secretariat received no objection to these declarations from the Board.

43. The representative of the European Commission noted that support provided by the International Council of Chemical Associations to the member states of the European Union could not be considered as a non-trust fund contribution to SAICM given they were not developing countries. The representative of the International POPs Elimination Network informed the meeting of the continuing global SAICM outreach programme as part of its non-trust fund contribution. The representative of the International Council of Chemical Associations recalled that their non-trust fund contribution was difficult to

quantify as it included costs for running all activities including travel, experts fees etc. that, he said, was not insubstantial. The Council had also made cash contributions to the senior experts group and was continuing to run programmes in both developing and developed countries. The representative of UNEP also noted that their non-trust fund contributions were not quantified as they were sourced from extra-budgetary funds and if reported would count double with donor contributions.

44. The participants discussed possible modalities for distinguishing non-trust fund contributions to those from governments, including acknowledging the funds going through the executing agencies. The possibility of having similar means of reporting by executing agencies with quantifiable figures was also discussed. The Board instructed the secretariat to request the Implementation Committee to examine the issues.

45. The Board took note of the information provided in the report and of the comments made.

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

46. The representative of the secretariat drew the attention of the meeting to document SAICM/EB.6/4 containing issues for possible consideration in the further development of operational guidance resulting from suggestions made at the 10th and 11th meetings of the Implementation Committee. The secretariat described the changes made to the funding application guidelines contained in the annex to the document presented for the Board's consideration. The Board endorsed these changes. In addition the Board requested to add to these guidelines a conditional note for countries that already have been granted support under the Programme and are requesting approval for another project. In these cases, an important condition for the eligibility for additional projects would depend on whether the relevant progress and or final reports have been duly submitted to the secretariat.

47. The secretariat also added that participants at the African regional meeting had stressed their concern regarding the diminishing timelines for completion of projects approved in rounds 12 to 14 starting in April 2012, for which projects would have 18, 12 and 6 months respectively to complete projects. The African region considered that these timelines were unrealistic given the types of projects supported in which significant stakeholder coordination was necessary. With diminishing timelines where projects last less than 24 months, their implementation would be very difficult.

48. In the ensuing discussion the difficulty of implementing projects in a shorter time span was acknowledged. It was noted that, once funds were provided for implementing projects in the final rounds, it was important to have arrangements in place to provide good guidance to run and complete those projects, obtain results and monitor outcomes.

49. With regard to the disbursement of funds for the final application rounds participants noted that there was a single disbursement to executing agencies but only partial disbursement to countries pending reporting of success of implementation. Participants raised questions such as when a country needed to report to ensure disbursement of final funds within the deadline of the QSP and what to do with funds that are not disbursed or returned to the Trust Fund. It was also noted that holding a meeting of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee late in 2013 was not practical as there would be insufficient time to disburse funds to countries at that time. If funds were collected in 2012 for disbursement by end 2013 this was possible if disbursement could be carried out through a executing agency however participants noted that countries should have the prerogative to select whether to use an executing agency or not and that decision should not be subject to conditional approval.

50. The Board recalled the reasons that lead to the shortening the lifespan of projects as of round 12, which was linked to resolution I/4 of the Conference for International Chemicals Management whereby the lifespan of the Trust Fund is defined. Decision I/4 states that the Trust Fund would remain open for contributions until after five years of being established and that disbursement of funds would continue for two years thereafter. The Board considered that this issue was outside their mandate and should be taken up by the Conference at its third session; however it was suggested that the Business Plan that provided for a lifespan of the QSP TF funded projects until to 2013 could be amended. Accordingly several proposals were made for amending the text of the Business Plan as contained in document SAICM/EB.6/INF/10. The Board requested the secretariat to develop a proposed text to amend the

business plan and after further discussion, the Board agreed to the proposed changes (see table below) and requested the secretariat to incorporate the changes into the business plan accordingly.

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

ICCM sessions	Calendar years	6-monthly trust fund rounds (according to application deadlines)
Phase 1: between ICCM1 and ICCM2: February 2006 to May 2009	2006 <i>Start-up phase in readiness for the opening of the trust fund on 1 December 2006.</i>	Round 1: 18 August 2006
<i>Includes:</i> - 11 months preparation; and - 29 of the 67 months for which the QSP trust fund is open for contributions.	2007	Round 2: 16 April 2007 Round 3: 14 September 2007
Phase 2: between ICCM2 and ICCM3: May 2009 to July 2012	2008 2009 <i>Projects approved in round 1 of the trust fund due for completion in early 2009, just before ICCM2.</i>	Round 4: 7 March 2008 Round 5: 29 August 2008 Round 6: 27 February 2009
<i>Includes:</i> - 31 of the 67 months for which the QSP trust fund is open for contributions; and	2010	Round 7: 31 August 2009 Round 8: 14 February 2010 Round 9: October (?) 2010
Phase 3: From ICCM3 until projects are completed.	2011 <i>NB Trust fund is open for contributions until ICCM3 to be held in 2012.</i>	Round 10: April (?) 2011 Round 11: October (?) 2011
<i>Includes:</i> - The last 16 months during which disbursements from the QSP trust will continue.	2012	Round 12: April (?) 2012 Round 13: October (?) 2012
	2013 [†]	Round 14: April (?) 2013

51. The Executive Board also requested the secretariat to prepare a draft recommendation for consideration by the third session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management to adopt a resolution amending resolutions I/4 and II/3 that specifies timelines by which disbursements of funds for projects financed under the QSP Trust Fund can be made. The amendment would enable funds to be committed until the end of 2013 allowing for disbursement to take place beyond the end of 2013. It is expected that the Open-ended Working Group would consider the proposed draft recommendation at its first session in November 2011. The Executive Board also requested the secretariat to explain the reasons for the resolution to the Open-ended Working Group.

VIII. Update on the Senior Expert Resource Group

52. The representative of the secretariat provided an update on the current status of the Senior Expert Resource Group. She noted that the existing and future implementation of SAICM activities under the QSP required significant technical, capacity guiding and project management expertise. In order to provide services on the needed expertise without incurring costly consultancy arrangements the secretariat has facilitated the development of the Senior Expert Resource Group to make available this expertise on a voluntary basis. She noted that the process had been recently launched and initiated owing to financial support of the International Council of Chemical Associations, the Government of Switzerland and by the Government of the United States of America. She concluded by noting there were currently four expressions of interest to participate in the Senior Expert Resource Group.

53. The representative of the International Council of Chemical Associations said that there had been some delays in the launch of the process. He added that were plans for a broad announcement

[†] Final trust fund disbursements to be completed by 30 November 2013.

through member countries of national associations to identify additional experts with the necessary background that would volunteer for the programme.

54. The meeting took note of the information provided and suggested that the availability of the service be advertised at the first meeting of the Open-ended Working Group.

IX. Other matters

55. The meeting heard a briefing from Mr. Jacob Duer, Chief, Strategic Policy and Facilitation Branch, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions, UNEP, on the progress of the consultative process on financing options for chemicals and wastes launched by the Executive Director of UNEP in 2009, in recognition of the need for adequate resources in the field of chemicals and wastes management. He said the final meeting of the consultative process would take place in Bangkok in October 2011. Although initiated through UNEP, the process had now shifted to being country lead and was co-chaired by Mexico and Sweden. Of 10 options drawn from a desk study on an integrated approach to financing chemicals and wastes, four tracks had been highlighted: mainstreaming of sound management of chemicals and hazardous wastes in national development programmes; industry involvement, including public-private partnerships and the use of economic instruments at national and international levels; expansion of the persistent organic pollutants window or creating a special window for chemicals or a trust fund under the Global Environment Facility; or creating a new trust fund similar to that of the Multilateral Fund for the Montreal Protocol. At the final meeting the four tracks would be examined for options to merge them into a concrete integrated approach. The final report would be submitted to the meeting of the Global Ministerial Environment Forum in early 2012, the third session of the International Conference on Chemicals Management and the 27th session of the UNEP Governing Council in 2013. Mr. Duer concluded by stressing that from the final discussions new ideas and solutions would be identified on how to finance the chemicals and wastes area.

56. In the ensuing discussion it was noted that progress in the chemicals sector would be dependent on results in the financial discussion as currently there was a mismatch between the needs and the available resources. Many participants lauded the process saying it continued to be promising, especially in the context of the current meeting that was discussing the time-limited QSP. The important next step would be to translate the “what” of the options into “how” to implement them. Questions addressed to Mr. Duer included a clarification on possible links with the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD) and the inclusion of key player from emerging economies. In response Mr. Duer said a report was being prepared for preparatory meetings for the UNCSD and options for submitting a report to the UNCSD itself would be explored. He added that all efforts had been made to ensure broad engagement including from the emerging economies. He concluded by noting that it was a non-negotiating process and unique in its informal nature that allowed for open discussion and brainstorming on new options and ideas.

57. The Board welcomed the expected briefing on the final discussions in Bangkok that were planned for the first session of the Open-ended Working Group.

X. Adoption of the report

58. The meeting agreed to approve the report following its finalization by the secretariat in consultation with the co-chairs, and following its circulation to participants at the meeting for comments. According to customary practice, the report would be formally adopted at the next meeting of the Board.

XI. Next meeting

59. The Board agreed to hold the seventh meeting of the Executive Board in April 2012.

XII. Closure of the meeting

60. Following the customary exchange of courtesies the meeting was declared closed at 4.45 p.m. on Wednesday 14 September.

Annex I

**Proposed next steps for improving the report of the
Quick Start Programme Mid term Review**

1. The secretariat, in light of the comments and recommendations raised at the Sixth meeting of the Quick Start Programme Executive Board on the Quick Start Programme Mid-term Review, hereby proposes the following next steps to improve the report for the Board's consideration:
2. Taking into account the shortcomings in stakeholder consultation reflected in the review, and the need to provide robust information on Project Performance and Impact as well as governance, the secretariat proposes to engage an independent consultant following the procedure established in the terms of reference of the Mid-term Review to:
 - a) Develop and implement a plan for stakeholder consultation that would include identification of key stakeholders, proposed schedule of interviews (phone and in person), and the appropriate use of the questionnaires developed by the previous consultants to collect the necessary data.
 - b) Take advantage of the First meeting of the Open-ended Working Group to be held from 15 to 18 November 2011 in Belgrade, Serbia, to access as many Quick Start Programme stakeholders as possible, where personal interviews would be conducted and the questionnaire distributed for completion during the meeting. The secretariat will contact regional focal points to aid in the distribution of the questionnaire and will discuss with the Bureau ways in which the Bureau could facilitate the consultation process by encouraging participants to make themselves available for interviews and/or fill out the questionnaire that would have been distributed during the registration of participants.
 - c) Complete and expand, where necessary, information regarding the outcomes of completed projects and progress of ongoing projects, in particular with regards to paragraph 32 (e) of the terms of reference.
 - d) Seek views from stakeholders on governance issues in accordance with paragraph 49 of the terms of reference.
 - e) Develop a revised QUICK START PROGRAMME mid term review report by addressing existing gaps with conclusions, including lessons learned, from which the Board could develop a set of recommendations for the consideration of the Third Session of the Conference.
3. Establish an advisory body composed of members of the Executive Board to develop draft recommendations for the consideration of the Executive Board at its seventh meeting. This body will work with the secretariat in overseeing the work of the consultant and the development of the draft recommendations, and assist the consultant with clarifications that might be needed.
4. The Executive Board would hold its seventh meeting in April 2012, at which considerations will be given to the revised report and findings of the stakeholder consultation process. Recommendations would then be developed for the consideration of the Conference at its third session.
5. Funding for this proposal will come from the remaining funds earmarked to conduct the review, upon approval of the principal donor of these funds. A proposed budget of 30,000 US dollars follows:

Expenditure Items	Costs in USD
Consultant fees (5 weeks)	20,000
Travel: (airfares and Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA))	6,000
Translation	2,500
Other: (stationery, postal expenses, telephone, etc.)	1,500

Annex II

1. Countries Repeating Projects (58/103)

Country	N° of projects	Rounds	Executing Agencies	Strategic Priorities
Armenia	3	1st(MC), 3rd, 7th (MC)	UNITAR, none, IPCP	A / B,C / B
Barbados	3	2 nd , 4 th (MC) , 7 th	UNITAR, UNEP, UNITAR	A / B / A,B
Belarus	3	3rd (suspended), 4 th (NGO), 9 th ,	UNDP & UNEP, none	B,C / B / A,B,C
Belize	2	4 th , 10 th	UNDP & UNEP, UNEP	B,C / B
Bolivia	4	2 nd , 3 rd (NGO, MC), 5 th (MC), 10 th	UNITAR, none, UNEP, UNITAR	A / B / B / A,B
Burkina Faso	3	1 st (MC), 7 th (MC), 10 th	UNITAR, CLISS, UNITAR	A / B,C / B,C
Burundi	2	2nd, 7th (MC)	UNITAR, none	A / B
Cambodia	4	2 nd , 4 th , 8 th , 8 th (MC)	UNITAR, UNEP, none, BCRC	A / B / B / B
Cameroon	2	8 th (NGO), 9 th	None, UNITAR	B / A,B
Chad	2	2 nd , 7 th (MC)	UNITAR, CILSS	A,B / B,C
Chile	5	1st (MC), 3 rd (NGO, MC), 3 rd (NGO, MC), 7 th , 9 th	UNITAR, none, none, IPCP, UNITAR	A / B / B / B / A,B
China	2	8th(MC), 9th	BCRC, UNITAR	B / A,B
Colombia	2	5 th , 10 th	UNIDO, UNITAR	A,B / A,B
Comoros	2	2 nd , 10 th	UNITAR, UNITAR	A / A,B
Congo (Republic of)	2	1st (MC), 8th	UNITAR, UNITAR	A / A,B
Costa Rica	2	1st, 6th	UNITAR, none	A / A,B,C
Cote d'Ivoire	2	1 st (MC), 4 th	UNITAR, Basel Convention Sec.	A / B
Djibouti	2	1 st (MC), 6 th	UNITAR, BCRC	A / B,C
Dominican Republic	2	8th, 10th (NGO, MC)	UNITAR, Sustainlabour	A,B / A,B,C
Egypt	2	2 nd (NGO), 5 th	None, UNIDO	B / B
El Salvador	2	3rd, 10th (NGO, MC)	UNIDO, Sustainlabour	B / A,B,C
Ethiopia	2	9 th , 9 th	BCRC, none	B / B
Gabon	2	6th (MC), 8th	UNEP&WHO, UNITAR	B / A,B
Gambia	2	6 th , 7 th	UNITAR, CLISS	A,B / B,C
Georgia	3	1 st (MC), 4 th , 8 th (NGO)	UNITAR, UNITAR, none	A / B / B,C
Ghana	2	2 nd , 7 th	UNITAR, IPCP	A / B
Guatemala	2	2 nd , 10 th	UNITAR, UNITAR	A / A,B
Haiti	3	1st(MC), 4 th (MC), 9 th	UNITAR, UNEP, UNITAR	A / B / A,B
Honduras	2	2 nd , 5 th	UNITAR, UNDP & UNEP	A / B,C
Indonesia	2	4 th (MC), 9 th	WHO, Blacksmith Institute	B / C
Jamaica	2	10 th , 10 th	None, UNITAR	A,B / A,B
Kazakhstan	2	2 nd , 4 th (NGO, MC)	UNITAR, UNITAR	A / B
Kenya	3	3 rd , 5 th (NGO), 6 th	UNITAR, none, UNEP&WHO	A / B / B
Kiribati	3	2 nd , 7 th (MC) 9 th	UNITAR, WHO	A / B / A,B

Kyrgyzstan	4	2 nd , 4 th (NGO, MC), 6 th , 10 th	UNITAR, UNITAR, UNEP&UNDP, UNITAR	A, B / B,C / A,B
Liberia	2	3 rd , 5 th	UNITAR, UNDP & UNEP	A / B,C
Madagascar	3	1 st (MC), 5 th , 9 th	UNITAR, WHO, UNITAR	A / A,B,C / A, B
Mali	5	3 rd , 6 th (MC), 9 th (NGO), 9 th (MC), 10 th	UNITAR, none, UNIDO, PAN, UNITAR	A/ B /A,B,C/ B,C/A,B
Mauritania	2	5 th , 7 th (MC)	UNDP&UNEP, CILSS	A,B,C / B,C
Mozambique	2	9 th , 9 th	FAO, BCRC	B / B
Moldova	3	2 nd , 9 th , 10 th (NGO)	None, UNITAR	A,B / A,B / B,C
Nepal	2	2 nd , 10 th (NGO)	UNITAR, LEADERS	A / B
Nicaragua	2	2 nd , 10 th (NGO)	UNITAR, Sustainlabour	A / A,B,C
Niger	2	7 th (MC), 8 th	CILSS, UNITAR	B,C / A,B
Paraguay	2	3rd (NGO, MC), 4th	UNITAR, UNITAR	B / A,B
Peru	3	3rd, 3rd (NGO, MC), 5th(MC)	UNIDO, none, UNEP	A,B / B / B
Philippines	2	4 th , 4 th (MC)	None, UNEP	A,B / B
Rwanda	2	1 st (MC), 7 th	UNITAR, none	A / B
Samoa	2	4th, 7th (MC)	None, WHO	A,B / B
Senegal	3	5 th , 6 th , 9 th (NGO)	UNITAR, none, PAN	A,B / B / B,C
Sri Lanka	3	5 th , 8 th (MC) 10th	WHO, BCRC, UNEP	A,B / B / B,C
Tajikistan	2	9th, 10th	None, UNITAR	A,B,C / A, B
Tanzania	2	4 th , 5 th (NGO, MC)	None, none	B / B
Thailand	3	4th(MC), 5th, 6th	WHO, none, Chulabhorn Research Institute	B / B / B
Uganda	3	1 st , 5 th (NGO, MC), 9 th (NGO)	UNDP&UNEP, none, UNDP	A / B / B,C
Uruguay	3	3rd (NGO, MC), 3rd (NGO, MC), 4th	None, none, UNIDO	B / B / B
Vietnam	2	9 th , 10 th	UNDP, none	A,B,C / A,B
Zambia	2	5 th , 10 th	UNITAR, WHO	A,B / A, B, C

20 Countries repeat Strategic Priority A
 42 Countries repeat Strategic Priority B
 3 Countries repeat Strategic Priority C
 23 Countries having implemented Strategic Priority A, B and C

MC- Multi Country
 IPCP- International Panel on Chemical Pollution
 PAN- Pesticide Action Network
 CILSS- Comité Inter-Etate pour la Lutte contre la Sécheresse au Sahel

2. Projects Related to Conventions

Convention	N° of projects	Funding granted	Region
Rotterdam	11	\$2'450'955	AFR, ASP, CEE
Basel	5	\$1'249'842	AFR, ASP
Stockholm	4	\$998'719	AFR, LAC
Rotterdam, Basel & Stockholm	5	\$1'156'943	AFR, LAC
Total MEA's	25	\$4'699'516	
GHS	19	\$4'627'399	AFR, ASP, LAC
Mercury	4	\$978'025	LAC, CEE, ASP
ILO	4	\$834'744	LAC, AFR, ASP

**Annex III: Countries' eligibility for support from the SAICM Quick Start Programme Trust Fund
(as of July 2011)**

Countries / Territories	Developing countries (145) on OECD DAC list**	LDC (49)	SAICM National Focal Point nominated (171)	Eligible for QSP Trust Fund	Approved QSPTF projects (as of 10th round)		
					National	Regional/ Multi-country	Civil Society
Afghanistan	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Albania	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Algeria	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Andorra				No			
Angola	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Antigua and Barbuda	DAC: UM			No			
Argentina	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	two (one***)
Armenia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	two	one***
Australia			√	No			
Austria			√	No			
Azerbaijan	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one****	none	none
Bahamas			√	Yes	none	one	none
Bahrain			√	Yes	one	none	none
Bangladesh	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Barbados	DAC: UM		√	Yes	two	one	none
Belarus	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one suspended	one	one
Belgium			√	No			
Belize	DAC: UM		√	Yes	two (one****)	none	none
Benin	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Bhutan	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Bolivia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	two (one****)	one	one
Bosnia and Herzegovina	DAC: LM			No			
Botswana	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Brazil	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	one
Brunei				No			
Bulgaria			√	No			
Burkina Faso	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one****	two	none
Burundi	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
Cambodia	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	two	none
Cameroon	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	one
Canada			√	No			
Cape Verde	DAC: LM			No			
Central African Republic	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Chad	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
Chile	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	two	two
China	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	none
Colombia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	Two (one****)	none	none
Comoros	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two (one****)	none	none
Congo, Republic of the	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	none

Countries / Territories	Developing countries (145) on OECD DAC list**	LDC (49)	SAICM National Focal Point nominated (171)	Eligible for QSP Trust Fund	Approved QSPTF projects (as of 10th round)		
					National	Regional/ Multi-country	Civil Society
Cook Islands	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	one	none
Costa Rica	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	one	none
Côte d'Ivoire	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one	one	none
Croatia	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Cuba	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Cyprus			√	No			
Czech Republic			√	No			
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one	none	none
Democratic Republic of the Congo	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one****	none	none
Denmark			√	No			
Djibouti	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
Dominica	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Dominican Republic	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	one
Ecuador	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Egypt	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	one
El Salvador	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	one
Equatorial Guinea	DAC: LDC	LDC		No			
Eritrea	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Estonia			√	No			
Ethiopia	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	none	none
Fiji	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Finland			√	No			
France			√	No			
Gabon	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	one	none
Gambia	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
Georgia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	one
Germany			√	No			
Ghana	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one	one	none
Greece			√	No			
Grenada	DAC: UM			No			
Guatemala	DAC: LM		√	Yes	two (one****)	none	none
Guinea	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Guinea-Bissau	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Guyana	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Haiti	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	two	none
Honduras	DAC: LM		√	Yes	two	none	none
Hungary			√	No			
Iceland			√	No			
India	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Indonesia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	none
Iran	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Iraq	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Ireland				No			

Countries / Territories	Developing countries (145) on OECD DAC list**	LDC (49)	SAICM National Focal Point nominated (171)	Eligible for QSP Trust Fund	Approved QSPTF projects (as of 10th round)		
					National	Regional/ Multi-country	Civil Society
Israel			√	No			
Italy			√	No			
Jamaica	DAC: UM		√	Yes	two (one****)	none	none
Japan			√	No			
Jordan	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Kazakhstan	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	one
Kenya	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one	one	one
Kiribati	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	one	none
Kuwait			√	No			
Kyrgyz Republic	DAC: OL		√	Yes	three (one****)	none	one
Laos	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one suspended	one	none
Latvia			√	No			
Lebanon	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Lesotho	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Liberia	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	none	none
Libya	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Liechtenstein			√	No			
Lithuania			√	No			
Luxembourg				No			
Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic of	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Madagascar	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	one	none
Malawi	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Malaysia	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Maldives	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Mali	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	three (one****)	one	one
Malta				No			
Marshall Islands	DAC: LM			No			
Mauritania	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
Mauritius	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Mexico	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one****	none	none
Micronesia, Federated States of	DAC: LM			No			
Moldova	DAC: LM		√	Yes	two	none	one
Monaco			√	No			
Mongolia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	one	none
Montenegro	DAC: UM			No			
Morocco	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Mozambique	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	none	none
Myanmar	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Namibia	DAC: LM			No			
Nauru	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Nepal, Republic	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	one****

Countries / Territories	Developing countries (145) on OECD DAC list**	LDC (49)	SAICM National Focal Point nominated (171)	Eligible for QSP Trust Fund	Approved QSPTF projects (as of 10th round)		
					National	Regional/ Multi-country	Civil Society
of							
Netherlands			√	No			
New Zealand			√	No			
Nicaragua	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	one
Niger	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
Nigeria	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one	none	none
Niue	DAC: LM			No			
Norway			√	No			
Oman	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Pakistan	DAC: OL		√	Yes	none	one	none
Palau	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Palestine	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one suspended	none	none
Panama	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Papua New Guinea	DAC: OL		√	Yes	none	none	none
Paraguay	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	one
Peru	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	two (one***)
Philippines	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	one***
Poland			√	No			
Portugal			√	No			
Qatar			√	No			
Republic of Korea			√	No			
Romania			√	No			
Russian Federation				No			
Rwanda	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	two	none
Saint Kitts and Nevis	DAC: UM			No			
Saint Lucia	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Samoa	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	none
San Marino				No			
São Tomé and Príncipe	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	one	none
Saudi Arabia			√	No			
Senegal	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	one	one
Serbia	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	one	none
Seychelles	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Sierra Leone	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Singapore				No			
Slovakia			√	No			
Slovenia			√	No			
Solomon Islands	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	one	none
Somalia	DAC: LDC	LDC		No			
South Africa	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Spain				No			





Countries / Territories	Developing countries (145) on OECD DAC list**	LDC (49)	SAICM National Focal Point nominated (171)	Eligible for QSP Trust Fund	Approved QSPTF projects (as of 10th round)		
					National	Regional/ Multi-country	Civil Society
Sri Lanka	DAC: LM		√	Yes	two (one****)	one	none
Sudan	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Suriname	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one****	none	none
Swaziland	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Sweden			√	No			
Switzerland			√	No			
Syria	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	one	none
Tajikistan	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one****	one	none
Tanzania	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	two - one suspended
Thailand	DAC: LM		√	Yes	one	one	one
Timor-Leste	DAC: LDC	LDC		No			
Togo	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Tonga	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	one	none
Trinidad and Tobago	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	none
Tunisia	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Turkey	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Turkmenistan	DAC: LM			No			
Tuvalu	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Uganda	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	two
Ukraine	DAC: LM		√	Yes	none	none	none
United Arab Emirates			√	No			
United Kingdom			√	No			
United States of America			√	No			
Uruguay	DAC: UM		√	Yes	one	none	two
Uzbekistan	DAC: OL		√	Yes	one	none	none
Vanuatu	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	none	none	none
Venezuela	DAC: UM		√	Yes	none	none	none
Vietnam	DAC: OL		√	Yes	two (one****)	none	none
Yemen	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	one	none	none
Zambia	DAC: LDC	LDC	√	Yes	two	none	none
Zimbabwe	DAC: OL		√	Yes	none	none	none

* In the case of multi-country projects, the dollar value to be used would be the funds assigned to the individual country concerned and not the total value of the overall project.

** Developing countries and countries with economies in transition listed on the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) list of recipients Official Development Assistance,
LDC: Least Developed Countries
OL: Other Low Income Countries
LM: Lower Middle Income Countries & Territories
UM: Upper Middle Income Countries & Territories
SIDS: Small Island Developing States

*** Deferred approval: an application of the corresponding project type, submitted in a previous round, would receive a deferred approval for a later round, subject to the funding available

**** Conditional approval to be confirmed

-  no project has been submitted/approved in this category
-  represent the number of projects that has been approved in this category
-  not eligible
-  30 countries that are eligible but have not yet received funds from QSP Trust Fund

NOTE: When appraising the applications, the QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee uses the following criteria:- it gives priority to countries which have not previously had support from the QSP trust fund;- it takes into account whether there had been satisfactory reports on earlier projects involving countries for the second time;- it seeks to avoid duplication of projects and ensure coverage of different QSP strategic priorities;- it seeks to avoid an excessive allocation of resources to individual countries; and- it observes the usual requirements for geographical and sectoral balance.