
**Fifth meeting of the Quick Start Programme
Trust Fund Implementation Committee**
Geneva
17-18 April 2008

Report of the fifth 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 to review and appraise projects to be financed by the QSP trust fund.

I. Opening of the meeting

3. The fifth meeting of the Committee was held at WHO premises in Geneva, Switzerland, on Thursday 17 and Friday 18 April 2008. The meeting was opened by the secretariat.

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).

II. Organizational matters

A. Election of a chairperson

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

B. Adoption of the agenda

5. The representatives adopted the following agenda for the meeting on the basis of the provisional agenda set out in document SAICM/TF.5/1:

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Election of a chairperson;
 - (b) Adoption of the agenda;
 - (c) Organization of work.
3. Adoption of the report of the fourth 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 proposals in the fourth round of applications to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund.
6. Status of projects approved in the first, second and third rounds of applications.
7. Other matters.
8. Next meeting.
9. Adoption of the report.
10. Closure of the meeting.

C. Organization of work

6. The Committee agreed to meet from 12 p.m. to 6 p.m. on 17 April and from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on 18 April 2008.

D. Attendance

7. The following organizations were represented: ILO, OECD, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO. FAO was unable to attend.

III. Adoption of the report of the fourth meeting of the Committee

8. The Committee had before it the draft report of the Committee's fourth meeting, contained in document SAICM/TF.5/2. The report was adopted without amendment.

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

9. The secretariat reported to the Committee on the donors' meeting held in Paris on 12 February 2008 on the basis of the summary provided in document SAICM/TF.5/INF/8. The Committee took note of the comments made by donors on the need to review of the progress of implementation of QSP trust fund projects, improve balance between the three priorities of the QSP and transparency on approved projects.

10. The SAICM secretariat also reported on a preparatory teleconference held by the QSP Executive Board on 2 April 2008. The Committee took note of the decision to recognize FAO's non-trust fund contribution to the QSP, as well as the on going discussion of the Board on the scope of enabling activities.

11. The secretariat introduced document SAICM/TF.5/4, listing issues for possible consideration and Committee's deliberations, including a draft glossary of QSP trust fund terminology, requested by the Committee at its fourth meeting. The Committee recommended clarifications on national chemical profiles and the inclusion of the International Health Regulations as an international agreement and adopted the finalized glossary, as presented in annex to the present report. The Committee invited the secretariat to add the glossary to the application guidelines, in order for it to be used in the fifth round of the QSP trust fund.

12. In preparation of the review and appraisal of applications to the fourth round, the Committee noted that certain QSP trust fund eligibility and project implementation arrangements matters would require further guidance from the QSP Executive Board.

13. The Committee identified several issues arising from the application of the Board's guidance limiting the participation of countries in multiple projects,² and agreed that further clarification be sought from the Executive Board. The Committee noted that, in the course of the two subsequent application rounds, at regional meetings and through bilateral contacts, Committee members and the secretariat had been made aware that this current guidance was viewed as very restrictive by QSP applicants. While the Committee appreciated the Board's rationale that repeated access to QSP trust fund resources should be limited in order to allow the maximum number of countries to benefit, it suggested that it might be beneficial for the Board to review its policy, taking into account factors such as the following:

- In the first two rounds (before the guidance came into effect) many countries opted for a small initial project, aimed at assessing their situation, with a view to following up once priorities had been identified. Application of the guidance on multiple projects effectively precludes their applying for a further project. Had they known that they would not be permitted to apply for a second national project they might well have opted for a more comprehensive project.
- In addition, projects approved in the first two rounds round were on a relatively small-scale, with an average funding of \$93,370 per country.³
- The majority of projects approved so far are addressing QSP strategic priority a), which involves work on national profiles and capacity assessments. There is a logic in progressing from such initial planning to work to follow-on projects addressing strategic priorities b) and c) in relation to international agreements and initiatives and mainstreaming work. However, the limit of one national project per country prevents such a progression and restricts the ability of the QSP eventually to achieve a balance among the three strategic priorities.
- With approved projects involving 63 developing countries and countries with economies in transition, including 30 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Small

² At its second meeting, held on 23-24 April 2007, the Executive Board decided that "spread over the lifetime of the QSP trust fund, it should be possible for a Government to participate in a multi-country and/or civil society project as well as receiving assistance for a national governmental project, provided that such projects did not involve duplication and that sufficient funds were available to the QSP trust fund, bearing in mind the need for equitable access to the trust fund among the eligible countries."

³ The average takes into account all 29 projects approved in the first and second round, for with activities are undertaken in 32 countries.

Island Developing States (SIDS), the QSP trust fund is already well advanced in meeting its business plan target of benefitting at least 95 developing countries and countries with economies in transition and at least 76 LDCs and SIDS.

- If countries are restricted to participating in only one multi-country project and/or one civil society project, there is a risk that some countries and civil society networks would be disadvantaged by being associated in a regional project and/or civil society project with a country that is subsequently deemed to have exceeded its "quota".

14. The Committee agreed that it should seek guidance from the Board with regard to the inclusion of the direct costs of executing agencies in QSP trust fund project budgets.⁴ By "direct costs", the Committee was referring to human resources costs, including staff and consultancy costs, incurred by executing agencies in the course of providing international coordination and expertise for individual projects.⁵ It was noted that while some agencies typically relied on the services of external consultants, others executed through project and other staff, or used "special fellows." The Committee agreed to confirm with the Board that executing agencies have the flexibility and discretion to assign their support for a project to whichever category of human resource would be most appropriate for the executing agency concerned.

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

15. The secretariat reported that following the fourth round of applications which closed on 7 March 2008, it had received 37 applications, 29 from Governments and eight from civil society organisations, and totalling \$7,906,929 of demand. In compliance with ICCM resolution I/4 and guidance by the QSP Executive Board, the secretariat had screened the applications for completeness and eligibility and presented the complete and eligible applications to the Committee for appraisal and possible approval.

A. Completeness and eligibility

16. The secretariat reported that it considered that six applications had not met the requirements for completeness and/or eligibility. The Committee endorsed the conclusions of the secretariat indicated in paragraph 3 and 4 of document SAICM/TF.5/3, summarizing applications, and confirmed that three Government and three 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 when requirements for completeness and eligibility had been met.

B. Appraisal and decisions

17. The Committee had before it document SAICM/TF.5/INF/2 on the status of financial contributions to the trust fund, document SAICM/TF.5/3 summarizing criteria for consideration of and information on applications, as well as copies of the full project proposals for each application. The Committee also took note of the provisions of the QSP business plan, in document SAICM/TF.5/INF/1, for equitable delivery strategies and targets for the trust fund.

18. The Committee reviewed and discussed the 31 complete and eligible applications and decided to approve four projects and conditionally approve another 13 projects, with a combined value of \$3,888,505. The approved or conditionally approved projects related to 15 Government applications and two civil society applications and involved activities in 21 countries, including four LDCs and nine SIDS. The geographical breakdown of the 21 countries concerned was two African, nine Asian-Pacific, two Central and Eastern European and eight Latin American and Caribbean countries. 12 approved or conditionally approved projects were multi-sectoral in scope, one related to health specifically, one to health and labour, one to health and environment,

⁴ While there is no obligation for project applicants to engage the services of an executing agency, a majority of applicants has sought such assistance and agreed on a budget with the agency concerned.

⁵ These costs were over and above the "indirect costs" (for accounting, treasury, staff management, etc.) already covered by the administration fees of up to 8% of a project budget.

one to environment and mining and one to industry and health. The decisions of the Committee on the individual project proposals are summarized as follows:

- (a) Four projects with a combined total value of \$969,386 were approved:
 - (i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/10, jointly submitted by Indonesia and Thailand for \$219,456: “Technical Support to Strengthening National Capacities for Sound Management of Priority Industrial Carcinogens in Indonesia and Thailand.”
 - (ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/15, submitted by Côte d’Ivoire for \$249,930: “Strengthening the capacity of Côte d’Ivoire to control the transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and chemicals in the context of the Basel Convention, the International Health Regulations (WHO, 2005) and other relevant MEAs as per necessary, and ensure their environmentally sound management.”
 - (iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/22, submitted by Cuba for \$250,000: “Capacity building for POPs laboratories in Cuba under multilateral environmental agreements.”
 - (iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/25, jointly submitted by the Bahamas, Barbados and Haiti for \$250,000: “Capacity building for POPs analysis to support the Global Monitoring Plan of POPs for effectiveness evaluation of the Stockholm Convention.”
- (b) 13 projects with a combined total value of \$2,919,119 were conditionally approved:
 - (i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/04, submitted by the Philippines for \$250,000: “Development of an effective national chemical safety program towards chemical poisoning prevention and control” was approved on the condition that letters indicating support for and involvement in the project by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and that separate entities be tasked with the audit and with independent monitoring and evaluation.
 - (ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/07, submitted by Bahrain for \$250,000: “Capacity Building for Integrated and Sustainable Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Management” was approved on the condition that the QSP Executive Board confirmed the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project’s executing agency.
 - (iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/08, submitted by Samoa for \$250,000: “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 Samoa” was approved on the condition that a letter confirming co-financing for the project was provided, and that the provision for catering in the project budget be reassessed.
 - (iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/09, submitted by Tanzania for \$248,819: “Capacity Enhancement for the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention in the United Republic of Tanzania” was approved on the condition that additional information be provided on the costs relating to meetings, that a different entity is nominated to undertake the independent monitoring and evaluation, that the consistency of the project with priorities identified in the National Implementation Plan of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants be confirmed and that confirmation of in-kind contributions be submitted.

- (v) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/12, submitted by Guyana for \$90,000: “Developing an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals and SAICM Implementation in Guyana” was approved on the condition that the QSP Executive Board confirmed the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project’s executing agency.
- (vi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/14, submitted by Palau for \$250,000: “Establishing an institutional framework and strengthening national capacity for the sound chemicals management and implementation of the Strategic Approach in the Republic of Palau” was approved on the condition that clarification is provided with regards to the relationship between the project objectives, activities and outcomes, in particular in relation to mainstreaming of chemicals management in national development planning and governance strengthening, the current status of the national chemical profile, and the consulting firm and costs identified for the independent monitoring and evaluation. The Committee also requested the applicant to review the project budget for consistency, in consultation with the secretariat.
- (vii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/16, submitted by Georgia for \$170,500: “Strengthening Capacities for Developing a National Pollutant and Release Transfer Register and Supporting SAICM Implementation in Georgia” was approved on the condition that a letter indicating support for and involvement in the project of the Ministry of Industry was provided, and the QSP Executive Board confirmed the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project’s executing agency.
- (viii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/21, jointly submitted by Cambodia and the Philippines for \$250,000: “Protecting human health and the environment from mercury in artisanal and small scale gold mining (ASGM) in Asia” was approved on the conditions that letters indicating support for and involvement in the project were provided by each country’s Ministry of Health, as well as confirmation be provided by the QSP Executive Board of the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project’s executing agency.
- (ix) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/26, submitted by Paraguay for \$250,000: “Developing an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals and SAICM Implementation in Paraguay” was approved on the condition that clarification be provided as to the need for updating the national profile, that stronger linkages be made to work by UNDP and UNEP on mainstreaming of chemicals management in national development planning, and that confirmation be provided by the QSP Executive Board of the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project’s executing agency.
- (x) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/27, submitted by Belize for \$250,000: “Belize, UNDP & UNEP Partnership Initiative for SAICM Implementation” on the condition that letters indicating support for and involvement in the project be provided by the Ministry of Industry and the Ministry of Labour.
- (xi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/28, submitted by Uruguay, as first priority, for \$249,800: “Sound Management for Mercury Products” was approved on the condition that a letter indicating support for and involvement in the project was provided by the Ministry of Health.
- (xii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/NGO/06, submitted by the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC), as a first priority, for

\$250,000: “Scientific Capacity Building in Support of SAICM in Africa” was approved on the condition that additional information be provided on the sustainability of the proposed African network following the initial workshop. The Committee recommended that possible synergies with the Pan African Chemistry Network be explored.⁶

(xiii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/NGO/08, jointly submitted by the Network for the Protection of Public Environmental Interests in the Kyrgyz Republic, the Green Partnership Environmental Network (Belarus) and the Local Self-Government Development Centre (Kazakhstan) for \$160,000: “Strengthening Capacities of Civil Society Organizations for National and Regional SAICM Implementation in the Eastern Europe, Caucuses and Central Asia region” was approved on the condition that the QSP Executive Board confirmed the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project’s executing agency. The Committee recommended coordination with the global NGO network of the International POPs Elimination Network.

(c) Noting that in the present round insufficient resources were available in the trust fund to support all suitable projects, the Committee decided to defer its approval of three applications, based on prioritization within the category of lower and upper middle income countries and existing coverage in other projects, including multi-country ones. Subject to the availability of funding, the following three projects will be treated as “approved” in the upcoming fifth application round:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/18, submitted by Thailand for \$250,000: “Capacity Building and Awareness Raising Programmes on the Implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in Thailand” was provisionally approved for the fifth round with the recommendation that the project should also aim to address the International Health Regulations.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/20, jointly submitted by Bolivia and Peru for \$250,000: “Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining Regional Project in South America” was provisionally approved for the fifth round and on the conditions that letters confirming co-financing for the project be provided, and that the QSP Executive Board confirmed the acceptability of arrangements for covering the executing agency’s direct costs.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/19, submitted by Panama for \$170,000: “Strengthening Capacities for Developing a National Pollutant and Release Transfer Register and Supporting SAICM Implementation in Panama” was provisionally approved for the fifth round and on the condition that the QSP Executive Board confirmed the acceptability of arrangements for covering the executing agency’s direct costs. The Committee also recommended the involvement of the National Cleaner Production Centre in Panama (Centro Nacional de Producción Más Limpia de Panamá) in the project.

(d) 11 projects were recommended for amendment and resubmission:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/01, submitted by Egypt as a first priority for \$179,760: “Capacity Building of Egyptian Industry in Chemicals Waste Management and Technology Transfer” was recommended for resubmission following clarification of the description of activities, outcomes and benefits of the project, the legal status of the Cleaner Production Centre within the Government structure, and links with work undertaken on a national Pollutant and Release Transfer Register.

⁶ Noting the regional scope of the projects, the Committee indicated that the SETAC project would not be counted in the quota of Tanzania’s QSP trust fund projects.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/05, submitted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for \$244,750: "Strengthening Capacities for National SAICM Implementation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea" was recommended for resubmission following deletion of the activities and objectives relating to mainstreaming, clarification of the status and role in project implementation of the independent monitoring and evaluation institution, further elaboration of the links between the project activities and outcomes, as well as confirmation from the QSP Executive Board of the acceptability of arrangements for covering the direct project costs of the project's executing agency.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/06, submitted by Mauritius for \$79,702: "Developing a National Chemicals Management Profile, a National SAICM Capacity Assessment and Holding a National SAICM Priority Setting Workshop in Mauritius" was recommended for resubmission following the submission of letters confirming co-financing for the project and letters of support from Ministries in relevant sectors, clarification of the involvement of intergovernmental organizations and of subcontracts, as well as the identification of an audit arrangement.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/13, submitted by Mongolia for \$223,500: "Institutional strengthening of environmental authorities and promotion of public awareness activities on the management of environmental chemicals in Mongolia" was recommended for resubmission following clarification of the links between project objectives, activities and outcomes, the involvement of the health sector, the need and budget for laboratory testing and equipment, as well as the submission of a letter confirming in-kind contributions to the project. The Committee also suggested the possible involvement of UNITAR and the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention to assist in the revision.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/17, submitted by Sri Lanka for \$100,000: "Updating of National Chemical Profile and the identification of capacity needs for sound chemicals management as a strategic priority of the Quick Start Programme" was recommended for resubmission following clarification of arrangements for independent monitoring and evaluation, clarification of the description of activities, and their links to the budget, as well as the submission of letters of support. The Committee also suggested the possible involvement of UNEP and of the secretariat of the Rotterdam Convention to assist in the revision.

(vi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/23, jointly submitted by Burundi and Rwanda for \$249,630: "Institutional Capacity building for controlling environmental contamination of POPs and other chemicals and awareness-raising on POPs issues among different population groups" was recommended for resubmission following clarification of the links between the project and other relevant projects, including those currently implemented QSP trust fund, of the activities undertaken nationally and jointly, the identification of an audit mechanism, the submission of a detailed project budget, as well as letters confirming contributions to the project and letters of support.

(vii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/24, submitted by Uruguay as a second priority for \$247,960: "Strengthening National Capacities for SAICM, developing regional risk communication strategies, increasing intersectoral chemical information exchange and public awareness" was recommended for resubmission as a regional project and further development following relevant revisions to include additional countries, as well as the submission of annexes and letters of support. WHO indicated its willingness to assist in the further development of the proposal.

(viii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/GOV/29, submitted jointly by Armenia, Chile, Ghana and Syria for \$250,000: “Prioritization of chemical risks at national level in a global context” was recommended for resubmission following clarification of the links of the proposed toolbox with existing similar methodologies, including those of WHO, as well as the provision of guidance by the QSP Executive Board on the eligibility of applicants already implementing a QSP trust fund multi-country project.

(ix) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/NGO/01, submitted by the Association pour la Valorisation de l’Environnement et pour la Promotion d’une Gestion Rationnelle des Produits Chimiques (Republic of Congo), for \$50,690: “Information and Sensitization of Political Decision-makers and of the Public at Large on the Dangers of Chemicals and Waste” was recommended for resubmission following further development of the proposal to focus on public and civil society awareness-raising in relation to SAICM objectives and to involve the health sector, as well as the provision of more details in the project document and confirmation of the in-kind contribution.

(x) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/NGO/04, jointly submitted by AGENDA (Tanzania), iLima (Kenya) & NAPE (Uganda) for \$250,000: “SAICM implementation in East Africa: Law reform and capacity building for sound chemicals management in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda” was recommended for resubmission following clarification of the civil society engagement in the proposed legal reform process and revision of related outcomes, of civil society participation in the on-going activities of other QSP trust fund projects implemented in each country and of efforts to avoid possible duplication.

(xi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/4/NGO/07, submitted by SETAC, as a second priority, for \$250,000: “Scientific Capacity Building in Support of SAICM in Latin America was recommended for resubmission pending demonstrated success in the first priority project (QSPTF/08/4/NGO/06) conditionally approved in the present round, and following revision to the project budgets in order to avoid overlaps between the two projects, and the provision of letters of support from the region.

19. The Committee requested the secretariat to take responsibility for confirming that additional requirements had been fulfilled by proponents of proposals which the Committee had conditionally approved, except in the case of applications which were linked to a decision of the QSP Executive Board. In such cases, the secretariat would apply the guidance of the Board and inform applicants and the Committee accordingly.

20. The Committee indicated that it would from now expect that conditions for approval are met within three months from the date of the notification of the decision of Committee. Failure to provide supporting information and/or documents in this timeframe would result in projects being declined.

VI. Status of projects approved in the first, second and third rounds of applications

A. Report of the secretariat to the Implementation Committee

21. The secretariat representative introduced document SAICM/TF.5/5, the report of the secretariat on the status of projects approved in the first, second and thirds rounds of applications, as well as for reference document SAICM/TF.5/INF/8, a compilation of progress report received. He informed that Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) between UNEP, as trustee, and project executing agencies or funding recipients had all been signed for projects approved in the first round. He noted that while activities had started in a number of countries, some further delays had been encountered for others. For second round projects, most MoUs with UNEP had been concluded but little progress on project implementation had been made at the time of the reporting period of January 2008. The Committee was also informed that all conditionally approved projects in the third round had been confirmed although MoUs were still to be finalized for the majority of projects.

22. In considering the performance of the fund to date, it was noted that there was a considerable delay between approval by the Committee, and the commencement of projects. The secretariat was asked for a breakdown of the delay, so as to identify where the delays were occurring. The secretariat noted that the delays could be explained at three different levels. Firstly, at the level of the SAICM secretariat and UNEP, it was noted that there had been delays in the development and finalization of MoUs, due to the processing of agreements for three rounds at the same time, as well as the introduction of new legal requirements and instruments by UNEP. Secondly, in cases of projects with an executing agency, the need to develop a secondary agreement between executing agencies and the Governments concerned added a period of coordination and consultation, often only undertaken after conclusion of a MoU with UNEP. Finally, it was noted that at the national level, a number of coordination and management challenges had been faced, such as staff replacement and time required for internal consultations on budgets.

23. Committee members involved in projects as executing agencies confirmed that more time than envisaged had been required to establish project management arrangements, in particular for consultations on the development of agreements and final budgets, signature processes and the transfer of funds.

24. The Committee expressed concerns with regards to the delays in the implementation reported so far, and in particular in relation to UNEP's processing of MoUs, which were preventing the early implementation of QSP trust fund activities. The Committee invited the QSP Executive Board to note the situation.

B. Report of the Implementation Committee to the Executive Board

25. At its fourth meeting, the Committee had agreed that the secretariat's report on project implementation should lay the ground for the Committee's own report on project execution for consideration of the Executive Board at its next meeting on 6-7 May 2008. The Committee considered a draft report, contained in document SAICM/TF.5/6, and indicated it was comfortable with its content. The need to update the report with the outcome of the fourth round of applications and the Committee's present meeting were noted. Committee members involved as project executing agencies were given the opportunity to provide some clarification or additional language to the secretariat for inclusion on the report. Additional information could be submitted to the secretariat by email until Friday 25 April 2008, in order to allow the secretariat to finalize the report in time for the Board meeting.

26. The secretariat also clarified that the report of the Committee to the Executive Board would only cover factual information on project implementation. It was agreed that substantive and policy matters⁷ would be included in a separate document (SAICM/EB.3/4), entitled: "issues for possible consideration in the further development of operational guidance.

VII. Other matters

28. No other matters were raised.

VIII. Adoption of the report

29. The Committee invited the secretariat to prepare a draft provisional report of the meeting and to circulate it to members of the Committee before 25 April 2008. It was agreed that comments could be sent to the secretariat until 30 April 2008, after which the report would be provisionally issued and considered for adoption by the Committee at its sixth meeting.

⁷ Such issues including the three identified by the Committee at its present meeting, namely, clarification of the eligibility to the QSP trust fund (see paragraph 13 above), confirmation by the Board of the inclusion of direct project costs in QSP trust fund budgets (see paragraph 14) and comments on UNEP's performance in administering the QSP trust fund (see paragraphs 22-24).

IX. Next meeting

30. It was confirmed that the sixth meeting of the Committee should be held at the headquarters of UNIDO, in Vienna, on 16 and 17 October 2008.

X. Closure of the meeting

31. The chairperson declared the meeting closed at 5.30 p.m. on Friday 18 April 2008.

Annex

Glossary of terms of the QSP trust fund

The present glossary aims to assist applicants to the QSP trust fund in their preparation of project proposals. The explanations provided in the present list are not official definitions. They rather aim to clarify the terminology of the QSP trust fund and application materials. Examples are provided only for purpose of illustration.

Administration fee: QSP trust fund guidelines allow for administration costs to be included in project budgets (see table D in the application materials). Such costs may be charged as a fee by the project proponent, intergovernmental organizations or other external partners involved in the project as *executing agency* (see below). The fee is applicable to cover general services in support of the project but not directly linked to its implementation. Indirect costs for this may include budgeting, accounting, treasury, staff management and technical support services which are not directly linked to the activities undertaken. A maximum of 8 percent of project costs can be budgeted to cover administration fees.

Audit: In the case of projects without any intergovernmental organization involved as *executing agency* (see below), applicants are required to identify an audit arrangement. The audit will entail an examination and verification of the project's financial and accounting records and supporting documents. Such work would be undertaken by a professional company, or individual, certified as an accountant or auditor.

Chemical profile: National chemical profiles provide a comprehensive overview of the national chemicals management situation in a country. Its development or updating provides the opportunity to assess the existing national legal, institutional, administrative, and technical infrastructure for the sound management of chemicals. National profiles can serve as a basis for identifying national chemicals management priorities and for initiating targeted and coordinated follow-up action. The development or updating of national chemicals profiles is recognized by ICCM resolution I/4 as a strategic priority of the QSP (see *enabling activities* below) and can be supported through the QSP trust fund.

Civil society networks: ICCM resolution I/4 provides that, on an exceptional basis and having regard to the resources and administrative capacity available, representatives of civil society networks participating in SAICM are eligible to present QSP trust fund project proposals, subject to endorsement by the countries hosting the projects. The term "civil society networks" is understood to be equivalent to "non-governmental organizations" and includes the following major groups: farmers, women, educators, the scientific, technological and professional communities, children and youth, indigenous peoples and their communities, workers and trade unions, as well as local authorities.

Country-driven: In line with ICCM resolution I/4, QSP trust fund projects are expected to be country-driven, which is understood as being consistent with identified national priorities. Such priorities may be identified from different sources, including national legislation and policies on chemicals management, preparatory work undertaken for the implementation of Multilateral Environment Agreements or national chemicals profiles. When endorsing applications to the QSP trust fund, *SAICM national focal points* (see below) certify that proposed projects are consistent with national priorities.

Enabling activities: ICCM resolution I/4 states that the objective of the "is to support initial enabling capacity-building and implementation activities in developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing States and countries with economies in transition." While there is no definition of enabling activities, references are made in the Overarching Policy Strategy to initial activities stakeholders may undertake in preparation of their implementation of SAICM. Paragraph 22 of the Strategy provides that "SAICM implementation could begin with an enabling phase to build necessary capacity, as appropriate, to develop, with relevant stakeholder participation, a national SAICM implementation plan, taking into consideration, as appropriate, existing elements such as legislation, national profiles, action plans, stakeholder initiatives and gaps, priorities, needs and circumstances." Further more, the three strategic

priorities of the QSP, defined in ICCM resolution I/4, provide an indication as to the scope of enabling activities. The strategic priorities are:

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

Executing agency: QSP trust fund project management arrangements allow that intergovernmental organizations or non-governmental organizations may act as an executing agency for a project if requested by the applicant. The executing agency is understood to have responsibility in the overall administration and delivery of the project, including for conclusion of a legal agreement with UNEP on project implementation arrangements, management of project funds, implementation of the work plan and activities and reporting. The involvement of project executing agencies is not an application requirement. Applicants who choose to engage the services of an executing agency are free to choose whichever organization they consider most suitable.¹

Governance: According to the United Nations Development Programme, governance can be understood as “the exercise of economic, political, and administrative authority to manage a country’s affairs at all levels and the means by which States promote social cohesion, integration, and ensure the well-being of their populations. It embraces all methods used to distribute power and manage public resources, and the organizations that shape government and the execution of policy. It encompasses the mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their obligations, and resolve their differences.” By extension, governance in chemicals management can be related to the overall exercise of chemicals management by stakeholders in relation to legal and administrative frameworks, institutional and informal coordination, enforcement capacity and involvement in decision-making. While in some cases, governance may relate to Government inter-agency coordination and administrative mandates, governance can also relate to the participation and influence of civil society organizations, industries and public authorities, on institutions and practices.

Implementing agency: The implementing agency of a QSP trust fund project is expected to be the main coordinator of project activities. Unlike the *executing agency* (see above), the implementing agency does not always have responsibility for the overall administration of the project. For example, in cases where an executing agency is involved, the implementing agency may oversee the project but is not responsible for the conclusion of a legal agreement with UNEP project implementation arrangements, management of project funds and reporting. The implementing agency may be identical to the project applicant. It can also be a related entity to the project applicant, for example, in Government applications, a separate Ministry or agency, and for *civil society networks* (see below), a separate organization affiliated to the applicant. The implementing agency can also be an external partner with relevant expertise. For example, a Government project can be implemented by a civil society organization.²

Independent monitoring and evaluation: In compliance with provisions of ICCM resolution I/4, QSP trust fund applicants are required to identify an arrangement for independent monitoring and evaluation. The purpose of the independent monitoring and evaluation is to provide a neutral third party assessment of project implementation, to identify project achievements and challenges, to measure project performance against objectives and to provide indications of progress. Such tasks should be performed by a person or an organization, which has no ties to the project development and implementation and may be, for example, an academic institution, a research centre, an independent consultant or a non-governmental organization. Monitoring is considered to be the continuous process of assessing the status of project implementation in relation to the project work plan. It is considered as a means to suggest performance improvements and the achievement of results. Evaluation is understood to be a way of determining as systematically and objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the project’s activities in relation to its objective. Additional guidance on independent monitoring and evaluation can also be found on the SAICM web site, alongside application materials to the QSP trust fund: www.chem.unep.ch/saicm.

¹ Profit-making entities cannot serve as project executing agencies.

² Profit-making entities cannot serve as project implementing agencies.

International chemicals-related agreements and initiatives: The second strategic priority of the QSP (see *enabling activities* above) indicates that support can be provided for the development and strengthening of national chemicals management institutions, plans, programmes and activities to implement SAICM, building upon work conducted to implement international chemicals-related agreements and initiatives. International agreements provide a legal framework under which to address common concerns and/or transboundary issues.³ In addition to such legal instruments, there are voluntary international initiatives⁴ emanating from intergovernmental processes.

Mainstreaming: The Dubai Declaration on International Chemicals Management provides that “the sound management of chemicals is essential if we are to achieve sustainable development, including the eradication of poverty and disease, the improvement of human health and the environment and the elevation and maintenance of the standard of living in countries at all levels of development.” While the links between chemicals management and sustainable development are well recognized in the SAICM context, it is important that such links are more widely demonstrated, including in relation to achieving the Millennium Development Goals. Mainstreaming provides a wide framework to integrate chemicals management problems into development priorities of developing countries. In particular, mainstreaming aims to assist countries to undertake research, strengthen interagency coordination and increase awareness of the relevance of chemicals management to development planning. Activities may include qualitative and quantitative analysis of links between priority chemical management issues and human health and environmental quality, research to assess the costs of inaction and benefits of action, using planning and economic terminology, of priority chemicals management issues, as well as integrating chemicals management priorities into each country's development planning processes and plans. Mainstreaming is recognized by ICCM resolution I/4 as a strategic priority (see *enabling activity* above) of the QSP and can be supported through the QSP trust fund.

Multi-country and regional projects: Several Governments may submit a joint QSP trust fund project proposal to the QSP trust fund. Proposals for such projects should be submitted in a single application and seek a maximum total funding of \$250,000. Projects grouping countries from different United Nations regions are referred to as multi-country projects. Projects grouping countries within the same United Nations region are referred to as regional projects.

Multisectoral and multistakeholder involvement: The SAICM Overarching Policy Strategy provides that the involvement of all relevant *sectors and stakeholders* (see below), including at the local, national, regional and global levels, is seen as key to achieving the objectives of SAICM. QSP trust fund projects are also expected to be inclusive of all stakeholders and sectors. In the case of projects with a multisectoral dimension, applicants are required to include letters of support from such stakeholders with their application.

SAICM national focal point: The Overarching Policy Strategy, in paragraph 23 of provides that to facilitate communication, nationally and internationally, each Government should designate a SAICM national focal point to act as an effective conduit for communication on SAICM matters, including invitations to participate in meetings and information dissemination. Governments, through their Ministries for Foreign Affairs, have been invited by the SAICM secretariat to designate a national focal point. The SAICM National Focal Point is nominated officially through the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and should be a representative of the country's inter-ministerial or inter-institutional arrangements, where such arrangements exist. Lists of SAICM national focal points with contact details can be found on the SAICM web site: www.chem.unep.ch/saicm. All applications to the QSP trust fund must be endorsed by the official SAICM national focal point of the country (or countries) where the project will be implemented and activities will be undertaken.

³ Examples include the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutant, the International Health Regulations, the International Labour Organization Convention 170 on Safety in the Use of Chemicals at Work, the International Maritime Organization Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships and the Vienna Convention on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

⁴ Examples include the International Code of Conduct on the Distribution and Use of Pesticides developed under the auspices of the Food and Agriculture Organization and the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals developed by the United Nations Economic and Social Council's Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods.

Seed money: ICCM resolution I/4 provides that the objective of the QSP trust fund is to provide seed money to support the objective and strategic priorities of the QSP. While seed money is more commonly used in the context of private investment, in the context of the QSP, it can be understood as initial financial support which will assist the recipient to leverage additional funding. A QSP trust fund project may, for example, be used for *mainstreaming* activities (see above) that, once completed, may enable the recipient to obtain bilateral development assistance to address chemicals management identified priorities. QSP trust fund assistance may also be considered as seed money if used as co-financing for larger projects, for example under the framework of the Global Environment Facility.

Stakeholders and sectors: SAICM stakeholders are understood cover organizations, groups and individuals that have direct or indirect interest in the sound management of chemicals. Sectors in the SAICM framework are domains of economic and social life that related directly or indirectly to chemicals management. The main stakeholders in SAICM are Governments, regional economic integration organizations, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and individuals involved in the management of chemicals throughout their life cycles from all relevant sectors, including, but not limited to, agriculture, environment, health, industry, relevant economic activity, development cooperation, labour and science. Individual stakeholders include consumers, disposers, employers, farmers, producers, regulators, researchers, suppliers, transporters and workers. Applicants to the QSP trust fund are strongly encouraged to engage stakeholders from relevant sectors in the development and implementation of projects.

Sub-contractors: Sub contractors can be involved in the implementation of QSP trust fund projects as partners for limited and defined activities. They are understood to providers of services or goods in relation to specific individual project tasks. Sub-contracts may be entered into with different entities such as: United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations (cooperating agencies), external public organizations, such as civil society, academic or research organizations (supporting organizations), as well as profit-making entities (commercial companies).

Synergies: In general terminology synergy is a process seeking to combine distinct elements to obtain a more advantageous conjunction. In the context of SAICM and Multilateral Environmental Agreements, synergies are understood as the promotion and implementation of measures to enhance cooperation and coordination in administration, policy, legislation, programmes and activities for the sound management of chemicals throughout their life-cycle.
