
**Sixth meeting of the Quick Start Programme
Trust Fund Implementation Committee**
Vienna
16-17 October 2008

Provisional report of the sixth 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 sixth meeting of the Committee was held at the headquarters of UNIDO in Vienna, Austria, on Thursday 16 and Friday 17 October 2008. The meeting was opened by the secretariat.

* The report of the meeting is issued on a provisional basis and will be considered for adoption by the Implementation Committee at its seventh meeting, which will be held in Geneva, Switzerland, on 16 and 17 April 2009.

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.6/1:

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 fifth 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 fifth round of applications to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund.
6. Status of projects approved in the first four 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 11.15 a.m. to 6 p.m. on 16 October and from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on 17 October 2008.

D. Attendance

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

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

8. The Committee had before it the draft report of the Committee's fifth meeting, contained in document SAICM/TF.6/2. 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 issues contained in document SAICM/TF.6/4, considered by the QSP Executive Board at its third meeting, held in Geneva on 8 and 9 May 2008, as well as one linked to the fifth round of applications to the QSP trust fund.

10. The Implementation Committee took note of the continued discussion by the Board of the scope of enabling activities and the absence of any conclusion on the matter. The Committee also noted the Board's acceptance of the inclusion of executing agencies' direct human resources costs in QSP trust fund projects, the request for increased transparency in and further justification of the approval of QSP trust fund applications, as well as the Board's views on the need for collaboration between intergovernmental organizations for the successful implementation of projects.

11. After making some adjustments, the Committee adopted the revised glossary of QSP trust fund terminology, which is contained in the annex to the present report.

12. When considering the guidance of the Board in relation to eligibility, the Committee concluded that multi-country civil society projects could be considered in the multi-country category. In addition, the Committee considered that civil society networks could submit several proposals covering different countries if they could demonstrate their administrative capacity to implement more than one project.

13. The Committee considered the new requirements set by UNEP, as trustee, for legal instruments establishing initial implementation arrangements for successful applicants and project executing agencies. The Committee expressed concern at the complexity of the new legal arrangements. In particular, the Committee considered it unnecessary to have tripartite legal agreements on project implementation in order for applicants to confirm the role of executing agencies, as this was already indicated in the project application form. It was noted that newly established requirements could lead to further delays in the implementation of projects, for example because of the need to translate tripartite agreements. The Implementation Committee asked the representative of UNEP to undertake internal consultations with a view to the trustee reconsidering arrangements for legal instruments.

14. In addition, the Committee requested the secretariat to modify application materials and guidelines in order to require that project executing agencies provide a letter confirming their role and for applicants to explicitly confirm that, if a project was approved, management arrangements could be concluded between UNEP and a project executing agency. This was intended to avoid the need for tripartite legal agreements. The Committee also agreed to keep the matter under review, in particular if the newly established arrangements further delayed the implementation of projects.

15. When considering civil society applications and Government applications in which civil society organizations served as project executing agencies, the Committee considered that the legal personality as well as the administrative capacities to undertake projects of such organizations should be demonstrated.

V. Review and appraisal of project applications in the fifth round of the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund.

16. The secretariat reported that following the fifth round of applications which closed on 29 August 2008, it had received 29 applications, 22 from Governments and seven from civil society organizations, to which three applications which had received a deferred approval in the fourth round were added, and all totalling \$7,154,605. 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

17. The secretariat reported that it considered that three 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.6/4, summarizing applications, and confirmed that one Government and two civil society network applications would therefore not be appraised by the Committee. Noting that in the present round fewer applications had been considered incomplete and/or ineligible, the Committee commended the support provided by the secretariat to applicants.

B. Appraisal and decisions

18. The Committee had before it document SAICM/TF.6/INF/2 on the status of financial contributions to the trust fund, document SAICM/TF.6/3 summarizing criteria for consideration of and information on applications, as well as copies of the full project proposals for each application. Subject to the confirmation of the availability of all the funding required for the present round, the Committee decided that it would grant project funding of up to a maximum of approximately \$4 million.

19. The Committee reviewed and discussed the 29 complete and eligible applications and decided to approve six projects and conditionally approve another 11 projects, with a combined value of \$4,071,489. The approved or conditionally approved projects related to 16 Government applications and one civil society application, involving activities in 20 countries and including four least developed countries and one small island developing state. The geographical breakdown of the 20 countries concerned was 11 African, four Asian-Pacific, and five Latin American and Caribbean countries. Twenty approved or conditionally approved projects were multi-sectoral in scope and one related to industry. The decisions of the Committee on the individual project proposals are summarized as follows:

- (a) Six projects with a combined total value of \$1,414,150 were approved:
 - (i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/02, 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." When appraising the proposal, the Committee considered that the proposal had a strong multisectoral scope, that it covered the first and second strategic priorities of the QSP. In addition the project was the country's first project and it contributed to ensuring geographical balance among projects.
 - (ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/21, submitted by Honduras for \$250,000: "Honduras, UNDP, and UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Integration of Sound Management of Chemicals Considerations into Development Plans and Processes." The Committee recommended that the Cleaner Production Centre in Honduras be involved during the implementation of the project. The Committee noted that the project addressed the second and third strategic priorities of the programme and demonstrated strong multi-sectoral and multi-sectoral involvement.
 - (iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/23 by Thailand for \$250,000: "Capacity Building and Awareness Raising Programmes on the Implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in Thailand."²
 - (iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/24, submitted by Panama for \$170,000: "Strengthening Capacities for Developing a National Pollutant and

² The proposal had been approved in the fourth round but unfunded due to the lack of available resources.

Release Transfer Register (PRTR) and Supporting SAICM Implementation in Panama.”³

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/08/2/GOV/25 by Bolivia and Peru for \$249,400: “Artisanal and Small Scale Gold Mining Regional Project in South America.”⁴

(vi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/NGO/04, jointly submitted by AGENDA (Tanzania), iLima (Kenya) & NAPE (Uganda) for \$250,000: “SAICM implementation is East Africa: Law reform and capacity building for sound chemicals management in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.” It was pointed that the project addressed the exceptional circumstances under which civil society networks are eligible, it had demonstrated stakeholders’ support and contributed to the second strategic priority of the QSP.

(b) Eleven projects with a combined total value of \$2,657,339 were conditionally approved:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/01, submitted by Egypt for \$250,000: “Assessment and Capacity Building in Chemicals and Chemicals Waste Management in Egypt” was approved on the condition that the increase of the budget since the resubmission of the proposal should be justified or reallocated from salaries in order to increase the scope of activities, in particular for the dissemination of the outcomes of the project. The Committee’s approval of the project reflected that this was Egypt’s first project, it included in-kind contributions and was multi-stakeholder in scope, as well as being a contribution to the sub-regional balance among approved projects.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/08, submitted by Uzbekistan for \$250,000: “Developing an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals and SAICM Implementation in Uzbekistan” was approved on the condition that additional information on the body responsible for the independent monitoring and evaluation be provided. The Committee also recommended the involvement of the National Cleaner Production Centre of Uzbekistan in the implementation of the project. When appraising the proposal, the Committee took note that it was the country’s first project, which contributed to geographical balance, addressed the first and second priorities of the QSP and demonstrated multi-stakeholder participation.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/09 submitted by Morocco for \$175,000: “Strengthening national capacity in safe management of public health pesticides in Morocco” was approved on the condition that letters demonstrating support for and participation in the project from the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment be provided. A recommendation was made to link and coordinate project implementation with other relevant projects, such as those supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the safe management and disposal of PCBs and the Africa Stockpile Programme. In approving the proposal, due consideration was given to the fact that the project was the first one for Morocco, that it addressed the first and second strategic priorities of the QSP, that it contributed to regional and sectoral balance, and was relevant to risk reduction.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/10, submitted by Mauritania for \$250,000: “Mauritania, UNDP and UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Integration of Sound Management of Chemicals Considerations into Development Plans and Processes” was approved on the condition of the submission of terms of reference for project staff and consultants and a letter

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

confirming the support for and involvement in the project of the Ministry of Industry. The Committee noted that Mauritania was a least developed country, that the present project was its first application, that the proposal addressed the third strategic priority of the QSP, that it involved several stakeholders and that intergovernmental organizations were working in close collaboration.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/11, submitted by Sri Lanka for \$232,539: “Strengthening National Capacities for Sound Management of Priority Industrial Carcinogens and Updating National Chemicals Profile in Sri Lanka” was approved on the condition that additional information on the activities relating to the update of the national chemical profile be provided. The Committee recommended the involvement of the National Cleaner Production Centre of Sri Lanka in the implementation of the project. In its appraisal of the proposal, the Committee noted that the proposal covered the first and second strategic priorities of the QSP, that it engaged several sectors and stakeholders, and that it contributed to geographical balance.

(vi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/14, submitted by Zambia for \$250,000: “Strengthening Capacities for SAICM Implementation and Supporting Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) Capacity Building in Zambia” was approved on the condition that additional information be provided on how the project usefully complements UNDP-UNEP and Basel Convention projects on chemicals management supported by the Government of Sweden, in particular to avoid duplication of staff costs, and that terms of reference for consultants be submitted. The Committee also recommended that lessons learned from the project be gathered and shared in the region, and that the health sector, and in particular the national poison centre, be involved in the project’s implementation. The Committee’s decision was motivated by that fact that the project was Zambia’s first project, that the country was a least developed country, that it involved several stakeholders and that it supported the second strategic priority of the QSP, and that this was the first QSP project relating directly to GHS.

(vii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/16, submitted by Liberia for \$250,000: “Liberia, UNDP, and UNEP Partnership Initiative for the Integration of Sound Management of Chemicals Considerations into Development Plans and Processes” was approved on the condition that a letter of support confirming the support for and involvement in the project of the Ministry of Industry was submitted. The decision of the Committee was motivated by the fact that Liberia was a least developed country, that the project addressed the third strategic priority of the QSP, and that it could lead to a sustainable follow-on, using the QSP as seed money.

(viii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/17, submitted by Madagascar for \$250,000: “Recycling and disposal of Insecticide-Treated Nets” was approved on the condition that terms of reference for national consultants be provided. The Committee recommended that special attention be given to the possible secondary effects of the eventual burning, disposal and recycling of the nets and the impact of residual pesticides on human health and the environment. The Committee noted that Madagascar was a least developed country which was closely involved in SAICM implementation, that the project supported the second and third project of the QSP, its country-drivenness, as well as the possible replicability of the project and its follow-on in the region.

(ix) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/19, submitted by Senegal for \$250,000: “Strengthening Capacities for National SAICM Implementation in Senegal” was approved on the condition that confirmation be given that implementation of the project would be undertaken through intersectoral collaboration and coordination. The Committee justified its decision by the fact that Senegal was a least developed country, that the present project was its first

project and supported the second objective of the QSP, it was relevant to a recent lead contamination incident, and would contribute to risk reduction.

(x) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/20, submitted by Seychelles for \$250,000: “Developing an Integrated National Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals and SAICM Implementation in Seychelles” was approved on the conditions that letters indicating support for and involvement in the project were provided by the Ministries of Agriculture, Health and Industry and that terms of reference for consultants be provided, as well as clarification be given concerning the additional chemical topics and priorities to be addressed in the latter part of the project. In its approval of the proposal, the Committee highlighted the fact that Seychelles was a small island developing state and that the present proposal was its first project, which addressed the first and second strategic priorities of the QSP, and had relevant multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral scopes.

(xi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/22, submitted by Colombia for \$249,800: “Strengthening National Governance for SAICM Implementation in Colombia” was approved on the condition that a letter confirming support for and involvement in the project by the Ministry of Health was submitted. The Committee recommended collaboration with UNITAR in order to benefit from existing expertise and methodologies. The Committee also noted that the project as Colombia’s first, addressed the first and second strategic priorities of the QSP, and had a strong stakeholder and multi-sectoral scope and involvement.

(c) Noting that in the present round insufficient resources were available in the trust fund to support all suitable projects, the Committee decided to approve but not to fund two 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 and meeting conditions outlined below, the following projects will be treated as “approved” in the upcoming sixth application round:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/05, submitted by Costa Rica for \$250,000: “Design and implementation of a National Information System for the Integrated Management of Chemical Substances in Costa Rica” was approved on the condition that a letter demonstrating support for and involvement in the project from the Ministry of Health and additional information on the possible development and implementation of a policy on information on chemicals, as well as on the sustainability of the project be provided. It was also recommended that links be made with relevant work undertaken in the health sector, in particular by the national poison control centre. The Committee noted that the project was a relevant follow-on to an existing QSP project, addressed the second strategic priority of the QSP, and had strong stakeholder involvement.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/13, submitted by Gabon for \$250,000: “Strengthening Capacities for National SAICM Implementation in Gabon” was approved on the condition that a letter confirming the support for and involvement in the project of from the Ministry of Health be provided. In approving the proposal, due consideration was given to its contribution to the first and second strategic priorities of the QSP, as well as the involvement of different stakeholders and sectors.

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

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/03, submitted by Turkey for \$250,000: “Enhanced Strategic Coordination for the Sound Management of Chemicals in Turkey” was recommended for resubmission following the consideration of the possible inclusion in the project of the development of a national chemicals profile, as well as clarification of the relationship with

relevant existing chemicals work, including that already supported by the European Union to comply with its regulation on Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemical substances (REACH), as well as OECD Council decisions and recommendations, and other projects indicated in the application. Such information would indicate that work for the proposed project would not be duplicative and demonstrate its added value. The Committee also suggested the reconsideration of the composition of the thematic areas working groups 1, 2, 4 9, 10 and 11 described in the project in order for them to include additional relevant stakeholders. Finally, the Committee invited the applicant to provide additional information on the involvement of civil society groups.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/12, jointly submitted by Mali and Senegal for \$250,000: “Chemical Accident Prevention Programme for West Africa” was recommended for resubmission following clarification concerning the UNEP guidance for a Flexible Framework for Major Chemical Accident Prevention and Preparedness and its links to the relevant OECD, ILO and UNIDO guidance, as well as the UNEP Awareness and Preparedness for Emergencies at the Local Level (APELL) programme, and clarification of the project budget, particularly in relation to administration fees. The Committee also invited the applicants to consider how the update of national chemicals profiles to be undertaken in other QSP trust fund projects could contribute to the assessment of national needs for the prevention of chemicals accidents.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/15, submitted by Angola for \$249,372: “Strengthening of National Capacities for the Public Health Management of Chemical Incidents and Emergencies in Angola” was recommended for resubmission following reconsideration of the costs related to travel, consideration of possible opportunities for co-financing of or contributions to the project and the possible involvement of UNITAR in the update of the national chemicals profile, as well as the submission of letters of support and additional information on the proposed workshops and related costs.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/18, jointly submitted by Armenia, Chile and Ghana for \$250,000: “Prioritization of chemical risks at national level in a global context” was recommended for resubmission following the formal establishment of IPCP’s legal personality, as well as a revision of the proposals in the light of consultations with WHO, including for the possible alignment of the proposal with WHO’s work for the development of an assessment toolkit.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/NGO/03, submitted by the Associated Labour Unions –Trade Unions Congress of the Philippines for \$119,134: “Trainer’s training workshop for Trade Unions on Chemicals and Waste Management and strengthening of partnerships for SAICM implementation” was recommended for resubmission following the further development of the proposal for it to include more information on activities, objectives and outputs, as well as on the added value of the project. The Committee also requested the applicant to submit letters of support, and further information on the audit arrangements and the evaluation plan of the project.

(vi) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/NGO/06, submitted by the Society of Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC) for \$250,000: “Scientific Capacity Building in Support of SAICM in Latin America” was recommended for resubmission following completion and in the light of the outcomes and experience of the similar African project, approved in the fourth round, as well as reduction of the time and budget for preparations for the Latin American workshop. The Committee also invited the applicant to look into the possibility of finding co-financing for the project.

(e) Four projects were declined:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/06, submitted by Mauritius for \$79,702: “Capacity Building for Integrated and Sustainable Chemicals and Hazardous Waste Management” was declined given that the resubmitted proposal had failed to address the recommendations made the Committee in the fourth round, in particular in relation to the independent monitoring and evaluation of the project, the submission of letters of support and clarification of the involvement of intergovernmental organizations.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/GOV/07, submitted by Jordan for \$221,950: “Implementation of the Integrated National Programme for Chemicals and Waste Management in Jordan 2009-2010” was declined as it failed to address the recommendations of the Committee made in its previous appraisal of the proposal, including its lack of focus, the need for budget clarifications, the absence of letters of support, terms of reference and letters confirming in-kind contributions.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/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 declined as previous recommendations of the Committee were not addressed in the revised application and the project focused too much on advocacy amongst decision-makers and politicians. The Committee recommended the involvement of the applicant in the Civil Society Global Outreach project to be implemented by the International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN).

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/08/5/NGO/05, submitted by Land and Human to Advance Progress for \$171,000: “Linking chemicals management to national development priorities of Jordan: an awareness and lobbying national campaign” was declined as it was not clear how the proposal contributed to the QSP and its strategic priorities.

20. The Committee requested the secretariat to take responsibility for confirming that additional requirements had been fulfilled within three months by proponents of proposals which the Committee had conditionally approved.

VI. Status of projects approved in the first four rounds of applications

21. The secretariat representative introduced document SAICM/TF.6/5, the report of the secretariat on the status of projects approved in the first four rounds of applications, as well as for reference document SAICM/TF.6/INF/7, a compilation of progress reports and SAICM/TF.7/INF/8, a compilation of independent monitoring and evaluation reports. While the Implementation Committee took note of the report, several members whose agencies were involved in projects suggested that it should be revised with updated information. It was agreed that members of the Committee would be able to send comments and revised text to the secretariat until Friday 7 November 2008.

22. The Implementation Committee underlined the importance of the report of the status of projects which will be part of the Executive Board’s report on the QSP to the second session of the ICCM. The Committee suggested that the Board consider using the narrative summary contained in first part of the report, as well as summary tables and that the annexed tables should be separated. Such a breakdown would allow the summary tables to be updated shortly before the second session of the ICCM.

VII. Other matters

23. The secretariat drew to the attention of the Committee the staff needs for the full operation of the QSP. The Committee took note of the growing workload and expressed support for seeking ICCM approval for the allocation of additional staff resources to the secretariat for the servicing of the QSP.

VIII. Next meeting

24. It was confirmed that the seventh meeting of the Committee would be held at the headquarters of ILO, in Geneva, on 16 and 17 April 2009.

IX. Adoption of the report

25. The Committee invited the secretariat to prepare a draft provisional report of the meeting and to circulate it to members of the Committee before 31 October 2008. It was agreed that comments could be sent to the secretariat until 7 November 2008, after which the report would be provisionally issued and considered for adoption by the Committee at its seventh meeting.

X. Closure of the meeting

26. Members of the Implementation Committee expressed their appreciation to UNIDO for its hosting of the meeting and hospitality. The chairperson declared the meeting closed at 4.00 p.m. on Friday 17 October 2008.

Annex

Glossary of terms of the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund

The present glossary aims to assist applicants to the Quick Start Programme (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.

Appraisal of projects: Following each round of applications to the QSP trust fund, applications are appraised by the QSP Trust Fund Implementation Committee. After reviewing the applications, the Implementation Committee has several options for decisions to reflect its assessment of the applications, as follows:

- a) Project proposals may be *approved* by the Committee.
- b) Projects may be *approved but not funded*. Because of limited funding for a round, and the consequent need for the Committee to set priorities among projects, including multi-country ones, the Committee may need to defer funding for an approved project. In that case, the project would be considered in future rounds.
- c) Projects may receive a *conditional approval* from the Committee. The Committee may request the applicant to clarify or modify aspects of the application and instruct the secretariat to verify that conditions are met by the applicant and confirm the approval.
- d) The Committee can suggest that the *further development* and *resubmission* of a project proposal in a later application round. In such cases, the Committee indicates the areas of the application which would require further clarification or modification. Applications that are not approved due to geographical, sectoral and strategic priority balance considerations might also be recommended for resubmission in a later round.
- e) The Committee may also choose to *decline* applications that do not fall under the scope of the QSP objectives or that the Committee deems not suitable for funding from the QSP trust fund.

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.

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 QSP “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.” The strategic priorities of the QSP, defined in ICCM resolution I/4, provide a further indication as to the scope of enabling activities, which are to be in keeping with the work areas set out in the strategic objectives of section IV of the Overarching Policy Strategy, namely risk reduction, knowledge and information, governance, capacity building and illegal international traffic, and relate in particular to:

- 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.

Implementation activities: ICCM resolution I/4 states that the objective of the QSP “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.” Although “implementing activities” are not expressly defined in the SAICM texts, the statement of needs contained in section III of the Overarching Policy Strategy indicates in paragraph 10 that “capacity-building and technical assistance in relation to all aspects of the sound management of chemicals are among the essential elements for the successful implementation of SAICM.” In addition, the Strategy indicates in paragraph 13 that the overall objective of the sound management of chemicals by 2020, “will be achieved, among other ways, through the implementation of activities set out in the Global Plan of Action.”

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

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 have 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.saicm.org.

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.

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

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.

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.saicm.org. 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.

National 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.

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.
