



**Eighth meeting of the Quick Start Programme
Trust Fund Implementation Committee**
Washington, D. C.
15-16 October 2009

Report of the eighth 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 seventh meeting of the Committee was held at the headquarters of the World Bank in Washington, D.C., on Thursday 15 and Friday 16 October 2009. 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.8/1:

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 seventh 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 seventh round of applications to the Quick Start Programme Trust Fund.
6. Status of projects approved in the first six 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 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p. m. and 13:00 p.m. to 6 p.m. on 15 October and from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. on 16 October 2009.

D. Attendance

7. The following organizations were represented: ILO, FAO, OECD, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR and WHO. In addition, the World Bank attended the meeting as an observer.

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 seventh meeting, contained in document SAICM/TF.8/2. 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.8/4, related to the status of signature of legal instruments for QSP Trust Fund projects, progress in project implementation, including delays in completing the projects within 24 months and associated requests for project extensions.
10. The Committee noted the progress in finalizing and concluding legal agreements with executing agencies, Governments and civil society networks and reaffirmed that continuous efforts should be made to decrease to the minimum the backlog of agreements yet to be concluded.
11. In the light of the increasing number of projects that had reached or were approaching their expiry date, delays in project implementation, and the initial guidance of the Committee to limit the projects to 24 months, the Committee decided that extensions of up to 12 months may be granted, thus limiting the overall possible duration of a project to 36 months. The secretariat could grant an extension of 12 additional months to projects with satisfactory performance which had completed the two-thirds of their agreed work plans, subject to the provision of the revised work plan for an additional year to the secretariat in addition to a substantive report outlining the status of implementation and an interim financial report indicating the amount of funding spent to date as required by UNEP's internal rules.
12. It was agreed that for projects which demonstrated less substantial or poor performance by the mid-term of their life cycle, the secretariat should set up a measurable indicator or objective, which should be attained within a requested timeline and this should be demonstrated by a project proponent in the subsequent progress report. To monitor progress and determine whether the implementation of a project was on track the secretariat would draw on various information sources including half-yearly progress reports and mid-term independent monitoring and evaluation reports. If the project proponent failed to meet the objective or indicator as required, no project extension would be granted.
13. The Committee decided that the legal agreement between UNEP and the project proponent must be concluded within 12 months of the agreement being made available by UNEP to the project proponent. If the agreement was not signed within this period of time, the secretariat should recommend that the Committee suspend the project and require its resubmission in a subsequent application round.
14. In the case of projects for which the legal agreements had been concluded between UNEP and an executing agency, internal legal arrangements between the executing agency and the applicant should be concluded within 12 months from the date of the conclusion of the agreement between UNEP and the executing agency. If not, the secretariat should recommend that the Committee suspend the project and require its resubmission in a subsequent application round.
15. The above mentioned rules would be applied retroactively to ongoing projects.
16. The Committee requested the secretariat to circulate the rules established by the Committee on the project implementation arrangements internally in UNEP for information and general advice.
17. The secretariat presented a document SAICM/TF.8/INF/2 which contained a draft outline of terms of reference for the mid-term review of the Quick Start Programme. The Committee provided its feedback on the outline and requested the secretariat to circulate full terms of reference for comments once available.

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

18. The secretariat reported that in the seventh round of applications which closed on 31 August 2009, it had received 29 applications, 22 from Governments and seven from civil society organizations, to which two applications which had received a deferred approval in the sixth round were added. The applications sought a combined total of \$7,352,461. In compliance with resolution I/4 of the International Conference on Chemicals Management 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

19. The secretariat reported that it considered that applications by three Governments and two civil society network 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.8/3, summarizing applications, and confirmed that applications from the Governments of Ethiopia (QSPTF/09/7/GOV/17), Mali (QSPTF/09/7/GOV/18), and Vietnam (QSPTF/09/7/GOV/22), and from the Environmental Applications and Technology Centre (QSPTF/09/7/NGO/06) and the OXO Association (QSPTF/09/7/NGO/07) would therefore not be appraised by the Committee.

B. Appraisal and decisions

20. The Committee had before it document SAICM/TF.8/INF/3 on the status of financial contributions to the trust fund, document SAICM/TF.8/3 summarizing criteria for consideration of and information on applications, as well as copies of the full project proposals for each application.

21. The Committee reviewed and discussed the 26 complete and eligible applications and decided to approve one project and conditionally approve nine projects, with a combined value of \$2,476,478. The approved or conditionally approved projects related to 10 Government applications, involving activities in 21 countries and including 12 least developed countries and eight small island developing states (three of which belonged to both categories). The geographical breakdown of the 21 countries concerned was 11 African, six Asian-Pacific, one Central and Eastern European and three Latin American and Caribbean. Six approved or conditionally approved projects were multi-sectoral in scope and one related to environment, one related to environment and health sectors, and another one to agriculture, environment, and health. The decisions of the Committee on the individual project proposals are summarized as follows:

(a) One project with a combined total value of \$250,000 was approved:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/24, submitted jointly by Armenia, Chile and Ghana for \$250,000: “Training on risk assessment of chemicals at national level at a global context” was approved.¹

(b) Nine projects with a combined total value of \$2,226,478 were conditionally approved:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/03, submitted by Barbados for \$250,000: “Strengthening capacities for SAICM implementation and supporting capacity-building for the Globally Harmonized System for Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS) in Barbados” was approved on the condition that

¹ The proposal had been approved in the sixth round but unfunded due to the lack of available resources.

letters demonstrating support for and participation in the project from the Ministries of Health, Industry and Labour be provided.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/05, submitted by Mauritius for \$249,519: “Mauritius, UNDP and UNEP partnership initiative for SAICM implementation” was approved on the condition that information on independent monitoring and evaluation arrangements be provided.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/07, submitted jointly by Burundi and Rwanda for \$249,900: “Institutional capacity building for implementing of the Stockholm Convention on POPs and awareness raising on POPs issues” was approved on the conditions that more support letters be provided, in particular from the governmental agencies specified in the application form as those that would participate in the project, and the administration fee be reallocated to the project activities.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/09, submitted jointly by Burkina Faso, Chad, Gambia, Mauritania, and Niger for \$247,066: “Strengthening pesticide management in the Sahel Institute of the Permanent Interstate Committee for the Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) member States” was conditionally approved on the conditions that monitoring and evaluation costs be budgeted for the first year in addition to the second year and information on the mandate of CILSS to deal with pesticides management be provided. Alternatively, letters demonstrating support for the project from the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Health from participating Governments could be submitted instead of information on the CILSS’s mandate.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/11, submitted jointly by the Cook Islands, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands, and Tonga for \$249,994: “Poison information network for the Pacific” was conditionally approved on the conditions that the letters demonstrating support for and participation in the project from the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment be provided, monitoring and evaluation costs be budgeted for the first year in addition to the second year, sources of funding for personnel of the poison centres in the participating countries be specified.

(vi) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/12, submitted by the Lao People's Democratic Republic for \$250,000: “Laos, UNDP, and UNEP partnership initiative for the integration of sound management of chemicals considerations into development plans and processes” was approved on the conditions that a letter from the executing agency confirming its role and responsibilities, letters demonstrating support for and participation in the project from the Ministries of Environment, Health, and Industry, and information on the independent monitoring and evaluation arrangements be provided, the expenditures for international consultants be specified in the budget, and the total amount requested from the QSP Trust Fund be verified in the budget tables. In addition, the development of a national chemicals management profile to be considered as an additional activity is another condition for the project approval.

(vii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/13, submitted by Swaziland for \$250,000: “Developing an integrated national programme for the sound management of chemicals and SAICM implementation in Swaziland” was approved on the condition that letters demonstrating support for and participation in the project from the Ministries of Agriculture, Environment and Health be provided.

(viii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/16, submitted by the Republic of Guinea for \$250,000: “Developing an integrated national programme for the sound management of chemicals and SAICM implementation in the Republic of Guinea” was approved on the conditions that the technical expertise and

capacities of the independent monitoring and evaluation entity be demonstrated and the costs for the international project coordinator be re-allocated to project activities.

(ix) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/19, submitted by Saint Vincent and the Grenadines for \$229,999: “Establishing an institutional framework and strengthening national capacity within an integrated process for the sound management of chemicals and the implementation of the Strategic Approach in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines” was approved on the conditions that links with QSP priorities be demonstrated, support letters and letters confirming the in-kind contributions be provided, guidance documents which would be used as methodology be indicated and made reference to, the administrative capacity of the executing agency in chemicals management be demonstrated, and budget tables be revised, including so that the proportion of the budget allocated to consultants be reduced.

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

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/02, submitted by Cambodia for \$249,900: “Collection system for environmentally sound management of e-waste in Cambodia”² was recommended for resubmission following the provision of terms of reference for the resource persons and the demonstration of the involvement of the cleaner production centre in the project, and the sustainability of the project beyond its termination. A recommendation was made to link and coordinate the project implementation with other relevant projects in Cambodia, such as those supported by the Global Environment Facility and Montreal Protocol.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/06, submitted by Cambodia for \$250,000: “Cambodia and UNEP partnership on development of a coherent legal and institutional framework in Cambodia for the sound management of chemicals”³ was recommended for resubmission following the reconsideration of the monitoring and evaluation arrangements, provision of additional support letters from stakeholders, reallocation of the administration fee to activities, and demonstration of the links with other ongoing initiatives that take place in Cambodia, in particular with regard to activities related to the inter-ministerial coordination efforts.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/15, submitted by Ghana for \$249,930: “Strengthening the capacity of Ghana to monitor and control the transboundary movements of chemicals and hazardous wastes and ensure their environmentally sound management” was recommended for resubmission following completion and in the light of the outcomes and experience of the similar project in Djibouti, submission of additional support letters and demonstration of the commitment of resource persons to be engaged in the project.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/08 submitted jointly by Thailand and Sri Lanka for \$250,000: “Chemical accident prevention programme for Asia (CAPP-A)” was recommended for resubmission following reconsideration of travel costs for consultants, further explanation of the role of the Mahidol University, Thailand as a sub-contractor, and further clarification of expected results related to the improvement of health aspects as well as preparedness and response aspects from the implementation of chemical accident prevention programmes.

² Given that Cambodia is eligible for one national project, the applicant indicated the application for a national project “Cambodia/UNEP partnership on development of a coherent legal and institutional framework in Cambodia for the sound management of chemicals” as the first priority and the application for a national project: “Collection System for Environmentally Sound Management of E-waste in Cambodia” as the second priority.

³ Ibid.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/20 submitted by Chile for \$250,000: “Developing information for the adequate management of chemicals in Chile” was recommended for resubmission following the engagement of a partner with appropriate technical expertise for the GHS component, provision of the co-financing to the project, e. g. in the form of an in-kind contribution, consideration of inventories and assessments that have already been developed in Chile, provision of support letters and information on the laboratory equipment to be upgraded within the project, and terms of reference for project staff and consultants.

(vi) Sixth round deferred approved project QSPTF/09/7/GOV/23, submitted by Gabon for \$250,000: “Strengthening capacities for national SAICM implementation in Gabon” was recommended for resubmission, taking into account the activities of the project approved in the sixth application round in Kenya and Gabon.

(vii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/NGO/01, submitted by the Island Sustainability Alliance (Cook Islands) for \$174,400: “Capacity Building and institutional strengthening of waste management and disposal of e-waste” was recommended for resubmission following confirmation of the in-kind contributions, demonstration of the sustainability of the project beyond its termination, correspondence between the terms of reference and budget tables, provision of further details of the evaluation plan, and submission of additional support letters from the Ministries of Health, Industry and Labour, and the Rotary Club.

(viii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/NGO/02, submitted by Pro-biodiversity Conservationists in Uganda (PROBICOU) for \$250,000: “Chemical safety for children at work in agriculture” was recommended for resubmission following explanation of how the proposed project would be coordinated with the international programme for the elimination of child labour supported by ILO, explanation of the relation between the national steering committee on child labour established in 2001 and the one proposed under the project, clarification on the budget tables, including the reallocation of the costs for the steering committee, budgeting of the international consultant, and provision of the curriculum vitae of the consultant responsible for pesticide management and training.

(ix) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/NGO/03, 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 revision of the budget, including re-allocation of the implementation fee, the proportion of the budget allocation for the development of the curriculum, consideration of reducing the budget for the proposed activities, and provision of the terms of reference of staff and consultants.

(x) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/NGO/04, submitted by the Informer, Sensibiliser, Eduquer les Populations Cibles (Côte d’Ivoire) for \$231,166: “Inform, educate, and train agricultural peasants, workers in chemical and agrochemical, and other people on the use of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and other pesticides in Côte d’Ivoire” was recommended for resubmission following provision of more details on project activities, and demonstration of implementation capacities, including through ensuring support from the International POPs Elimination Network and the Pesticides Action Network to the project.

(xi) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/NGO/05, submitted by Fundacion Nature (Ecuador) for \$228,130: “Environmentally sound management of PCBs in Galapagos Islands ” was recommended for resubmission following

demonstration of problems, risks and concerns raised by PCBs in Galapagos islands, provision of more details on the project “Environmentally sound management of PCBs in Ecuador” which would provide a framework and opportunities for coordination between two projects, confirmation of the in-kind contribution from each entity providing such a contribution, and revision of terms of reference for the independent monitoring and evaluation.

(e) Five projects were declined:

(i) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/01, submitted by Tunisia for \$250,000: “Capacity-building for integrated and sustainable chemicals management” was declined given the lack of details on project activities, the absence of engagement of the cleaner production centre in the project, and the unsuitability of the project activities initially tailored for activities in Bahrain to be transferred to Tunisia without relevant adjustments.

(ii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/04, submitted jointly by Cambodia, China, Lao, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka for \$249,000: “Capacity building on practical use of best available techniques and best environmental practices and environmentally sound management of POPs wastes and PCBs in selected Asian countries” was declined given that project objectives were considered too ambitious, similar activities that are taking place in the region, and there appeared not to have been coordination with the Stockholm Convention secretariat.

(iii) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/10, submitted by China for \$250,000: “Development of action plan for chemicals management in China - overview of the legal basis, industrial capacity and gaps” was declined given that project activities would duplicate other ongoing efforts that are taking place in China, including those on drafting and adopting a chemicals management legislation framework and inter-ministerial coordination.

(iv) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/14, submitted by the Republic of Congo for \$228,634: “Strengthening the legal, institutional and technical capacities of the Republic of Congo to handle POPs pesticides in an environmentally sound manner” was declined given that project objectives were considered too ambitious and not proportionate to the budget, and no efforts had been made to coordinate the project activities with the Africa Stockpiles Programme.

(v) Project proposal QSPTF/09/7/GOV/21, submitted by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela for \$230,596: “Updating national chemicals management profiles, development of a national SAICM capacity assessment, and holding of a national SAICM priority setting workshop in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela” was declined given the absence of the letter confirming the in-kind contribution, terms of reference for project staff and consultants, information on the monitoring and evaluation arrangements, and support letters. In addition, there had been no coordination with the indicated executing agency, UNITAR, and the overall amount requested from the QSP was considered too high relative to the activities presented in the proposal.

22. 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 six rounds of applications

23. The secretariat representative introduced document SAICM/TF.8/5, the report of the secretariat on the status of projects approved in the first six rounds of applications, document SAICM/TF.8/INF/8,

a compilation of progress reports, and SAICM/TF.8/INF/9, a compilation of independent monitoring and evaluation reports.

VII. Other matters

24. No other matters were raised under this agenda item.

VIII. Next meeting

25. It was confirmed that the ninth meeting of the Committee would be held in Geneva, Switzerland, on 30 and 31 March 2010.

IX. Adoption of the report

26. The Committee invited the secretariat to prepare a draft provisional report of the meeting and to circulate it to members of the Committee before Friday 30 October 2009. It was agreed that comments could be sent to the secretariat before Friday 13 November 2009, after which the report would be provisionally issued and considered for adoption by the Committee at its ninth meeting.

X. Closure of the meeting

27. The chairperson declared the meeting closed at 12.30 p.m. on Friday 16 October 2009.
