
**Second meeting of the Quick Start Programme
Trust Fund Implementation Committee**
Paris
18 October 2006

Report of the second meeting of the Trust Fund Implementation Committee 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. Representatives of the participating organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC)¹ and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) were invited to form a Trust Fund Implementation Committee for projects financed by the QSP Trust Fund. In addition, the ICCM established the QSP Executive Board consisting of government representatives of each of the United Nations regions and all the bilateral and multilateral donors and other contributors to the QSP.
3. At its first meeting on 19 April 2006, the Trust Fund Implementation Committee made recommendations on the application procedures and project management arrangements in order for the trust fund to become operational. At its first meeting on 26 and 27 April 2006, the QSP Executive Board further developed and endorsed the recommendations of the Committee. With the guidance provided by the Board and the Committee, the secretariat launched the first applications round in May 2006 on a trial basis. The applications round was closed on 18 August and forty-four applications were received by the secretariat.

* Document reissued for technical reasons.

¹ 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).

I. Opening of the meeting

4. The second meeting of the Committee was held at the headquarters of the OECD in Paris, France, on Wednesday 18 October 2006. The meeting was opened by the secretariat.

II. Organizational matters

A. Election of a chairperson

5. Mr. Robert Visser, Deputy Director of the Environment Directorate of OECD, was elected to chair the meeting.

B. Adoption of the rules of procedure

6. The Committee had before it document SAICM.TF.2/3 containing draft rules of procedure as considered and amended by the Committee at its first meeting. Following a discussion of the procedure to be followed in the case of a tied vote, the Committee amended and adopted the rules of procedure, ad referendum. The rules are set out in the annex to the present report.

C. Adoption of the agenda

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

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Election of a chairperson;
 - (b) Adoption of the rules of procedure;
 - (c) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (d) Organization of work.
3. Adoption of the report of the first meeting of the Committee.
4. Further development of application procedures and project management arrangements for the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund
5. Review and appraisal of project applications to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund
6. Other matters.
7. Next meeting.
8. Closure of the meeting.

D. Organization of work

8. The Committee agreed to meet from 9 a.m. to 12.00 p.m. and from 1.00 p.m. to 6 p.m.

III. Attendance

9. The following organizations were represented: FAO, ILO, OECD, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO.

IV. Adoption of the report of the first meeting of the Committee

10. The Committee had before it the draft report of the Committee's first meeting, contained in document SAICM/TF.2/2. The report was adopted without amendment.

V. Further development of application procedures and project management arrangements for the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund

11. The Committee had before it document SAICM/TF.2/5 (issues for possible consideration), which had been prepared by the secretariat as a possible starting point for the Committee's deliberations. Based on recommendations by the Executive Board, and the experience of the first round of applications, a number of issues relating to the application requirements and procedures were brought to the attention of the Committee for guidance and/or further development.

A. Eligibility

12. At its first meeting, the QSP Executive Board had advised that although industry should generally not be eligible to apply for project funding, small companies should not be excluded from proposing projects if submitting an application in partnership with a Government or a non-governmental organization. In response to the Board's request for it to define "small companies", the Committee recommended that the following text be added to the guidelines for applicants: "For the purpose of applications to the QSP, small companies are understood to have a low number of employees and annual revenue relative to national circumstances and the particular service, sector or nature of the activity in which the company is engaged. Small companies seeking to benefit from QSP funding should be locally or nationally owned. Proposals for projects involving small companies should be submitted, and the projects implemented, by Governments or NGOs. Applicants should make the case for the 'small company' status of the enterprises that would be involved in the project, including, for example, by reference to relevant national legislation."

13. The Committee discussed requirements for applications for regional projects in light of applications to the first round. The Committee confirmed that the provision in ICCM resolution I/4 that the maximum value of \$250,000 per project should be applied in the case of regional or multi-country projects and advised that such project proposals should be contained in a single application endorsed by all the relevant SAICM national focal points.

14. The requirement of ICCM resolution I/4 for civil society network applications to secure the endorsement of the countries hosting projects was also discussed by the Committee. In that regard, the Committee confirmed the need for endorsement, at the time of the application, by national focal points of all the countries where project activities would be undertaken.

15. The Committee decided that regional or multi-country applications jointly submitted by Governments and civil society networks were acceptable, noting that the Committee would need to take account of the additional eligibility criteria applying to civil society networks when appraising such applications.

16. The Committee noted that the Executive Board, at its first meeting, had deferred a decision regarding the use of the OECD Development Assistance Committee's list of aid recipients as the basis for determining whether a QSP Trust Fund project proponent is a developing country, or country with an economy in transition, pending further consultations by regional representatives. It was expected that the Board would decide on the matter at its next meeting.

B. Completeness

17. The Committee decided that, in order to be considered, advance copies of applications sent to the secretariat by e-mail or fax, pending submission of the original by post, should be signed by the SAICM national focal point. It also advised that all supporting documents should be submitted by the deadline for applications. The Committee agreed that, nonetheless, the secretariat should exercise discretion with regard to the late submission of supporting documents in exceptional circumstances.

C. Application requirements

18. The Committee noted the dialogue between the co-chairs of the Executive Board, donors and UNEP concerning a possible reduction to 5 per cent of UNEP's programme support costs as trustee and for the programme support costs of project executing agencies to be set at a maximum of 8 per cent in order for total administration fees to fall within the ceiling of 13 per cent of a project's value which was provided for in ICCM resolution I/4. Members of the Committee, speaking as potential executing agencies, indicated that they would need to undertake further consultations within their organizations on the viability of the proposed limit on their programme support costs to 8 per cent of a project's value. If Committee members confirmed their readiness, as potential executing agencies, to assist with projects on the basis of an 8 per cent programme support cost and the UNEP Executive Director approved the proposed reduction of UNEP's programme support cost, as trustee, to 5 per cent, the secretariat would provisionally amend the guidelines for applicants accordingly, pending formal endorsement by the Executive Board at its next meeting. The Committee recommended that the Board be invited to advise on whether, in the case of projects where no intergovernmental organization would serve as an executing agency, applicants should be permitted to allocate for themselves an administration fee of up to 8 per cent in the project budget.

19. One Committee member voiced concern that the proposed 8 per cent fee might be inadequate if the costs it was expected to cover included that of the financial audit which, in its organization, was mandatory for projects with expenditures of over \$100,000 per annum. Such audits typically cost approximately \$5,000 per project. It was suggested that, subject to concurrence by the Executive Board, this expense should be covered in the project budget in addition to the 8 per cent programme support costs. A related issue for the Board's consideration would be whether such evaluation and audit activities undertaken by a project executing agency could be regarded as an acceptable substitute for the "independent monitoring evaluation" required of the project proponent according to ICCM resolution I/4, thus avoiding duplication.

20. The Committee considered a case where a Government applicant had assigned responsibility for independent monitoring and evaluation to a specialized unit of the same Ministry as was involved in implementing the proposed project. The Committee indicated that the following criteria would need to be met:

- (i) The applicant would have to demonstrate, using legal or regulatory documents, that the person or department undertaking the monitoring and evaluation was under a different authority and had no ties to the project.
- (ii) The monitoring and evaluation undertaken by the Ministry would only cover substantive aspects of the project's implementation. Financial aspects would need to be addressed by a separate, external and independent entity.

21. The Committee noted that, according to United Nations financial rules and regulations, profit-making companies could not serve as executing or implementing agencies and their role should be limited to that of sub-contractors.

22. The concerns of potential applicants regarding the requirement for applications to be submitted in English were noted by the Committee. The Committee shared the secretariat's concerns regarding the time and resources which would be needed to translate applications and concluded that this was neither practical nor affordable within the secretariat's current budget. The Committee welcomed the availability of applications guidelines in French and Spanish and their potential translation into Arabic, Russian and Chinese.

23. The Committee noted that the use of the official format for budget tables had been problematic for some applicants and welcomed the secretariat's advice that a dispensation would be sought from UNEP to allow for a simpler approach based on the use of Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) rather than full project documents to govern the implementation of projects. It was acknowledged that, even with a simpler MOU approach, there would still need to be a standardized budget format. The Committee agreed that its chairperson should write to UNEP to encourage the granting of the dispensation.

D. Project implementing arrangements

24. At its first meeting the Executive Board had invited the Committee to comment on the roles of intergovernmental organizations in relation to project execution and oversight. The Committee indicated that when their organizations were executing agencies, their usual requirements for oversight applied for financial and substantive follow-up. In order to ensure appropriate reporting and avoid the risk of non-compliance with United Nations financial rules, the Committee suggested that applicants consider engaging, as a project executing agency, an intergovernmental organization with a comparative advantage in the field addressed by the project. In the absence of the involvement of a project executing agency, the Committee recommended that the SAICM secretariat should assist by, for example, facilitating progress reports on projects to satisfy the requirements of the trustee and the Executive Board. The Committee invited the Board to reflect on how they anticipated financial accountability would be ensured in the case of projects where no intergovernmental organization was involved as an executing agency.

25. Further to a request by the Executive Board to the Committee to report on project execution, Committee members confirmed their readiness to do so. They envisaged that brief progress reports would be provided to the Board, through the secretariat, by those Committee members acting as project executing agencies. Such reports would be provided on an annual basis in a standard format to be developed by the secretariat and would be in addition to the standard full reporting that project executing agencies would undertake in accordance with their own project management requirements. The secretariat would compile, for consideration by the trust fund donors and regional representatives on the Board, the progress reports submitted by project executing agencies and those the secretariat itself facilitated in cases where there was no project executing agency.

VI. Review and appraisal of project applications to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund

26. The Committee had before it document SAICM/TF.2/4 (summary of applications), as well as copies of the forty-four applications (thirty-two from Governments and twelve from civil society organizations) received by the secretariat in the first round of applications. In compliance with ICCM resolution I/4 and guidance by the Executive Board, the secretariat had screened the applications for completeness and eligibility and presented the complete and eligible applications to the Committee for approval and possible approval.

A. Completeness and eligibility

27. The secretariat reported that it considered that thirteen applications had not met the requirements for completeness and/or eligibility. The Committee endorsed the conclusions of the secretariat indicated in paragraph 7 and 8 of document SAICM/TF.2/4 and confirmed that five Government and eight civil society network applications would therefore not be appraised by the Committee. The Committee however invited the applicants to revise and resubmit their applications in a later round. The Committee recommended that the secretariat add to the guidelines for applicants an encouragement for SAICM national focal points to endorse project proposals on the basis of consultation with their national inter-ministerial coordination mechanism, where it existed, and the multi-sector stakeholders which they represent. Evidence such as letters of support should be provided to demonstrate that all the relevant sectors were supportive of proposed projects. This requirement would apply for all future project proposals, including those which were recommended for resubmission following the first applications round.

B. Appraisal and decisions

28. The Committee had before it document SAICM/TF.2/INF/2 on the status of financial contributions to the Trust Fund, document SAICM/TF.2/4 summarising the criteria for consideration of and information on the applications, as well as copies of the full project proposal documents for each application. In preparation for its consideration of the applications, the Committee agreed on the following guidelines:

- (a) In order to retain a reserve for the second round of applications pending commitments by donors to replenish the trust fund, the total value of projects to be approved in the present first trial round of applications should not exceed approximately 50 per cent of the \$5 million dollars pledged to the trust fund so far.
- (b) Bearing in mind the provision in ICCM resolution I/4 that civil society networks should be eligible for support from the trust fund on an “exceptional basis”, the Committee should aim to approve projects on a ratio of approximately one non-governmental organization project for every 10 Government projects.
- (c) Notwithstanding the preponderance of African and environment sector applications in the first round, the Committee would not strictly apply the requirement for geographical and sectoral balance in the first round but would aim to achieve this balance over several rounds.

29. The Committee reviewed and discussed the applications and decided to approve three projects and conditionally approve another five projects, with a combined total 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. The geographical breakdown of the 20 countries concerned was ten African, two Asian-Pacific, four Central and Eastern Europe and four Latin American and Caribbean countries. Seven of the eight approved or conditionally approved projects were multi-sectoral, including the environment sector. One was for the agriculture and labour sectors. The decisions of the Committee on the individual project proposals are summarized as follows:

- (a) Three projects with a combined total value of \$726,696 were approved:
 - (i) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/17 submitted by the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia for 248,400 (“Development and mainstreaming of the National Plan on SAICM implementation for the Republic of Macedonia”);
 - (ii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/26 submitted by Côte d'Ivoire, Haiti, Mongolia, Republic of Congo and the Syrian Arab Republic for \$248,296 (“Updating National Chemicals Management Profile, Development of a National SAICM Capacity Assessment and Holding a national SAICM Priority Setting Workshop in one least developed country and four developing countries: Mongolia, Côte d'Ivoire, Syria, Republic of Congo and Haiti”);
 - (iii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/29 submitted by Nigeria as a first priority for \$230,000 (“Establishing an Institutional Framework and Strengthening National Capacity within an integrated national programme for the sound management of chemicals and implementation of the strategic approach in Nigeria”).
- (b) Five projects with a combined total value of \$1,239,566 were conditionally approved:
 - (i) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/13 submitted by Uganda for \$250,000 (“Uganda , UNEP & UNDP Partnership initiative for the implementation of SAICM”) was approved subject to clarification of the pilot role of the project in establishing a replicable methodology for the

mainstreaming of sound management of chemicals in national development strategies.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/25 submitted by Burkina Faso, Djibouti, Madagascar, Rwanda and Sao Tome & Principe for \$249,731 (“Updating National Chemicals Management Profile, Development of a National SAICM Capacity Assessment and Holding a national SAICM Priority Setting Workshop in five least developed countries: Sao Tome & Principe, Djibouti, Rwanda, Madagascar and Burkina Faso”) was approved subject to confirmation of Rwanda’s agreement that financial aspects of the independent monitoring and evaluation requirement for the Rwandan component of the project cannot be covered by the Ministry of Lands, Environment, Forest, Water and Mines.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/27 submitted by ECO TOX (Armenia), Chile, Costa Rica, Georgia and Serbia for \$248,035 (“Updating National Chemicals Management Profile, Development of a National SAICM Capacity Assessment and Holding a national SAICM Priority Setting Workshop in two developing countries and three countries with economies in transition: Georgia, Armenia, Serbia, Costa Rica and Chile”) was approved subject to the Government of Armenia agreeing to act as the official implementing agency with EcoTox serving as the executing agency.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/28 submitted by Ecuador for \$250,000 (“Ecuador, UNEP & UNDP Partnership initiative for the implementation of SAICM”) was approved subject to clarification of the pilot role of the project in establishing a replicable methodology for the mainstreaming of sound management of chemicals in national development strategies.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/NGO/03 submitted by the Tanzania Plantation and Agricultural Workers Union for \$241,800 (“Strengthening the capacity of agricultural workers and workers’ organisation in the implementation of SAICM”) was approved subject to adjustment of the project proposal to emphasize community outreach activities rather than facilitation of the ratification of ILO conventions and indicate linkages with the Tanzanian Government’s pilot project on SAICM implementation to be undertaken in collaboration with UNITAR.

(c) 19 projects were recommended for amendment and resubmission:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/1 submitted as a first priority by Egypt for \$240,000 (“Capacity Building for an Integrated Management System to implement SAICM in Egypt”) was recommended for resubmission following adjustments to clarify its relationship with: earlier and ongoing bilateral or multilateral projects, such as those to develop a national chemical profile and a national chemicals information management system, and to promote cleaner production; a previously established national coordination committee; and SAICM implementation activities already initiated in Egypt.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/2 submitted as a second priority by Egypt for \$240,000 (“Capacity Building for applying the Best Available Technique (BAT) and Best Environmental Practices (BEP) to implement SAICM in Egypt”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of the first priority project, QSPTF/06/1/GOV/1.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/03 submitted by Palestine for \$61,900 (“Development of National Chemicals Profile for Palestine”) was recommended for resubmission following further elaboration of the proposal, potentially with the support of UNITAR.

- (iv) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/04 submitted by Georgia for \$198,579 (“Development of a Basis for a Modern System of Sound Chemicals Management in Georgia”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of the multi-country project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/27 and clarification of the expected role of UNITAR and the reorientation of the budget to give greater emphasis to activities.
- (v) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/06 submitted by the Republic of Armenia for \$249,680 (“Risk assessment related to Chemicals impact to human health and the environment and development of measures for risk reduction in the Republic of Armenia”) was recommended for resubmission after completion and assessment of the multi-country project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/27 and reorientation of the proposal to focus on enabling activities for SAICM implementation.
- (vi) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/08 submitted by Sudan for \$230,000 (“Development of Sustainable Integrated Programme for sound management of chemicals”) was recommended for resubmission after revision of the budget to reduce disproportionate personnel costs.
- (vii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/09 submitted by Chad for \$249,088 (“Chemicals integrated management in Chad”) was recommended for resubmission after clarification of the relationship of the proposed national coordination and management unit to existing mechanisms such as the frameworks established under the Sahelian Pesticides Committee and work on a national chemical profile and revision of the budget to reduce disproportionate personnel costs.
- (viii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/10 submitted by Burundi for \$248,800 (“Systematic data collection for a correct estimation of pesticides, PCBs, dioxins and furans”) was recommended for resubmission following a revision of the proposed budget to reduce disproportionate salaries and equipment costs.
- (ix) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/12 submitted by the Syrian Arab Republic for \$155,000 (“Integrated programme for Sound Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Management”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of the multi-country project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/26 and elaboration of the proposal in more detail.
- (x) Linked project proposals QSPTF/06/1/GOV/14 and QSPTF/06/1/GOV/15 submitted by Zambia and Ethiopia for \$119,124 and \$124,524 respectively (“Strengthening the legislative, regulatory and enforcement capacity of LDCs and LLDs in Africa to manage hazardous wastes and other wastes, including chemical waste”) were recommended for resubmission as a single regional application with a combined value of not more than \$250,000, and without the previously associated Ugandan sub-project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/16 but with possible additional countries.
- (xi) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/18 submitted by Mozambique for \$196,670 (“SAICM enabling activities in Mozambique”) was recommended for resubmission with clarification as to the project’s relationship to the African Stockpiles Programme, more detailed budget information and a reorientation of the budget to avoid disproportionate equipment costs and to focus more on activities.
- (xii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/20 submitted by Haiti for \$249,750 (“Initial enabling activity for SAICM implementation in Haiti”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of multi-country project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/26.

- (xiii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/21 submitted by the Republic of Congo for \$250,000 (“Enabling activities to facilitate early action on the implementation of SAICM in Congo”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of the multi-country project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/26 and elaboration of the proposal in more detail.
- (xiv) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/22 submitted by Morocco as a first priority for \$100,000 (“Strengthening the National Capacities on Chemicals Management”) was recommended for resubmission following further elaboration, including clarification of the tasks of sub-contractors.
- (xv) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/23 submitted by Morocco as a second priority for \$250,000 (“Preparing a National Pollutant release and Transfer Register (PRTR)”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of the first priority project, QSPTF/06/1/GOV/22.
- (xvi) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/30 submitted by Nigeria as a second priority for \$200,000 (“Promoting knowledge creation and awareness raising on chemical hazards”) was recommended for resubmission following completion and assessment of the first priority project, QSPTF/06/1/GOV/29.
- (xvii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/31 submitted by Mexico for \$97,500 (“Integrated Programme for the implementation of SAICM”) was recommended for resubmission following clarification of the relationship of the proposed intersectoral mechanisms with existing coordination structures such as under NAFTA/CEC and provision of missing job descriptions and details of monitoring and evaluation arrangements.
- (xviii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/NGO/01, submitted by the Golan Environment and Heritage Association in the Syrian Arab Republic for \$209,000 (“Pollution of water by chemical products”) was recommended for resubmission following further elaboration of the proposal in more detail, including potential linkages with other chemicals management projects being undertaken by the Syrian Government such as multi-country project QSPTF/06/1/NGO/26.
- (d) Four projects were declined:
- (i) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/05 submitted by the United Republic of Tanzania for \$159,000 (“Initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities for SAICM”) was declined on the grounds that the proposed project appeared to duplicate work on SAICM implementation being undertaken in a current UNITAR pilot project under the broader QSP.
- (ii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/GOV/16 submitted by Uganda for \$119,124 in association with linked Zambian and Ethiopian projects QSPTF/06/1/GOV/14 and QSPTF/06/1/GOV/15 (“Strengthening the legislative, regulatory and enforcement capacity of LDCs and LLDs in Africa to manage hazardous wastes and other wastes, including chemical waste”) was declined on the grounds that Uganda would receive funding from the QSP trust fund for another project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/13 and that the relationship of proposed project QSPTF/06/1/GOV/16 to work being undertaken with UNDP in Uganda was unclear.
- (iii) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/NGO/02 submitted by Campo Limpio in Peru for \$234,752 (“Establishment of a network for environmentally sound management of used agrochemical containers in Peru”) was declined on the grounds that the proposed work was the responsibility of industry as a matter of product stewardship and should not therefore be financed by the QSP trust fund.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/06/1/NGO/05 submitted by the Balkan Science and Education Centre of Ecology and Environment in Bulgaria for \$239,000 (“Development of the Bulgarian Plan for the implementation of SAICM”) was declined on the grounds that the proposal did not provide a clear demonstration of the exceptional circumstances which would justify the project being undertaken by a civil society network.

30. Noting the dominance of African and environment sector proposals in the first round of applications, the Committee recommended that the secretariat discuss with SAICM regional focal points means of encouraging more applications for other regions and sectors.

31. Reflecting on the apparent duplication with other projects entailed in some trust fund project proposals, the Committee requested the secretariat to prepare for the Committee’s future reference a list indicating which countries had ratified which international chemicals agreements and developed national chemical profiles, and the status of Stockholm Convention National Implementation Plans. The Committee also recommended that the guidelines be amended to include a requirement for applicants to state how their proposed projects would relate to past and existing chemicals management activities and projects, such as work to implement international agreements and develop national profiles, and bilateral and multilateral projects, and whether national focal points for international agreements had been involved in the development of the proposed projects. The guidelines should also be amended to require that supporting letters from the various sectors to be involved in a project should accompany the application.

32. The Committee noted its expectation that the secretariat would take responsibility for confirming that additional requirements had been fulfilled by proponents of proposals which the Committee had conditionally approved.

33. The Committee remarked on the usefulness of summary information prepared by the secretariat in relation to its screening of project proposals for completeness and eligibility and invited the secretariat, in future, also to highlight key points in applications pertinent to the Committee’s appraisal task and to provide a scenario note proposing a methodology for the Committee consideration of the applications before it at each meeting.

VII. Other matters

34. No other matters were raised.

VIII. Next meeting

35. It was tentatively agreed that the next meeting of the Committee should be held at the offices of UNEP in Geneva on 29-30 May 2007.

IX. Closure of the meeting

36. The chairperson declared the meeting closed at 6 p.m. on Wednesday 18 October 2006. The Committee reconvened briefly at 4 p.m. on Thursday 19 October and finally at 11.30 a.m. on Friday 20 October to consider and adopt the report of its second meeting.

Annex

Rules of procedure of the SAICM Quick Start Programme Trust Fund Implementation Committee, as adopted, ad referendum, by the Committee at its second meeting on 18 October 2006

Institutional arrangements

1. The representatives of each of the participating organizations of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals, composed of the United Nations Environment Programme, the International Labour Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, World Health Organization, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, and the representative of the United Nations Development Programme hereby agree to form a Trust Fund Implementation Committee of the Quick Start Programme of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (hereby referred to as the Committee in the present rules of procedure).
2. The Committee shall perform such functions as expected of it by the International Conference on Chemicals Management as set out in resolution I/4 adopted by the conference at its first session held in Dubai, United Arab Emirates from 4-6 February 2006.

Representatives

3. The Committee shall be composed of one representative of each of the organizations referred to in paragraph 1 above, who may be accompanied by advisors. Each organization that is represented at the Committee shall make its own arrangements for bearing the cost for its representative to attend meetings of the Committee.

Observers

4. The Committee may agree to invite observers to attend its meetings as necessary.

Chairperson

5. The Committee shall elect its Chairperson, who shall serve on a rotational basis for the period to be specified by the Committee.
6. If the Chairperson cannot preside at a meeting or any part thereof, he/she shall appoint one of the representatives to take his/her place. If the Chairperson is unable to perform his/her functions, the Committee shall elect a new Chairperson.

Meetings

7. The Committee shall hold its meetings on a regular basis. The Committee shall determine the date, time and place of each meeting. Meetings shall normally be held back-to-back with another relevant meeting.
8. In addition to regular meetings of the Committee above, an extra-ordinary meeting of the Committee may be called at the request of at least three representatives of the organizations referred to in paragraph 1 above. The date, time and place of such an extra-ordinary meeting shall be determined by the Chairperson in consultation with the Secretariat and the representatives of the organizations referred to in paragraph 1 above.

Secretariat

9. UNEP, acting in its capacity as the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, shall act as the Secretariat for the Committee. The Secretariat shall be responsible for making necessary arrangements for meetings of the Committee, including notification of the meetings and preparation of the provisional agenda and other meeting documents as well as minutes of the meetings, and for providing support for the functioning of the Committee.

Conduct of business at meetings

10. Six representatives from among the organizations referred to in paragraph 1 shall constitute a quorum.

11. The Chairperson shall declare the opening and closing of each meeting of the Implementation Committee, direct the discussions, accord the right to speak, put questions or proposal for decisions by the Committee, and otherwise shall have control of the proceedings of the meeting.

12. The Committee shall endeavour to take all its decisions by consensus among the representatives. If it is not possible for the Committee to reach consensus, after it has exhausted reasonable efforts to do so the Committee may, as a last resort, take a decision by a majority of the representatives present and voting. For this purpose, each representative, including the chairperson, shall have one vote, except in the case of a tied vote, when the chairperson shall exercise an additional casting vote.

13. In cases where an organization that is represented at the Committee is involved in a project submitted to the Committee for its consideration, the representative of that organization shall declare his/her interest in the project before it is discussed by the Committee and recuse himself/herself from decision-making by the Committee in relation to the project in question.

14. The language of the meetings of the Committee shall be English.

Amendment

15. The present rules of procedure may be amended by the Committee by consensus among the representatives present at its meetings.