



Report of the Second meeting of the Executive Board of the Special Programme 11-13 October 2016, Bangkok, Thailand

I. Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting was opened at 10:10 a.m. by Ms. Leticia Reis de Carvalho (Brazil), Executive Board co-chair. She provided her welcome remarks and wished the meeting participants a fruitful meeting with a good outcome over the next three days.
2. Mr. Niko Urho (Finland), Executive Board co-chair provided his welcome remarks. He noted the privilege of being involved in operationalising the Special Programme, which has gained significant interest with over 40 eligible applications submitted to the Secretariat and the general level of applications high. This demonstrates that the demand for funding is high by developing countries and countries with economies in transition. He further stated that the multitude of applications also sets the Executive Board in an unexpected situation, as the Board members need to review a large number of applications during the three days meeting. He highlighted that this first pilot round of applications will set a precedent and guide applicants in subsequent rounds of applications. Lastly, he reminded the Board members that the 2030 Agenda on Sustainable Development calls for stepping up activities for achieving the sound management for chemicals and wastes. The Special Programme has an important role to play to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, and can be used as a tool to attract new donors and to effectively involve entities working on the realization of the 2030 Agenda.
3. Mr. Jacob Duer, Principal Coordinator of the Secretariat of Special Programme, welcomed the meeting participants on behalf of UN Environment. He recognized that a large number of applications had been received by the Secretariat, and that the need of the Special Programme had clearly showed during this first pilot round of applications, and thus confirmed that it was the right decision by UNEA-1 to establish the Special Programme. He noted that the Special Programme is an important tool for the beyond 2020 Agenda. Lastly, he expressed appreciation to the donors that have provided funding to the Special Programme until now. He stated that the Secretariat has appreciated working with the Executive Board in the run-up to this meeting and wished the participants a fruitful and successful meeting.
4. A tour de table was undertaken, and all Executive Board members, the Observers and the Special Programme Secretariat introduced themselves. The representative of the United States of America announced their contribution of an additional US\$500,000 to the Special Programme in 2016.
5. The Co-Chairs stated that the meeting documents were circulated in advance to all Executive Board members and observers to the meeting. Given the heavy agenda in front of the meeting, the co-

chairs asked participants for flexibility and encouraged the Board to be as efficient as possible. They further highlighted rule 18 of the Rules of Procedure for the Executive Board, which notes that the Co-Chairs will grant permission to the representatives and observers to speak during the course of this meeting.

Organizational matters

II. Adoption of the agenda

6. The provisional agenda as set out in document SP/EB.2/1 was adopted without any modifications.

III. Approval of the report of the 1st Executive Board meeting held from 2 to 3 February 2016, Geneva, Switzerland

7. The report of the 1st Executive Board meeting held from 2 to 3 February 2016 in Geneva as contained in document SP/EB.2/2, and which was circulated and reviewed by Executive Board members before this meeting was adopted without any modifications.

IV. Consideration of eligible and complete applications

8. The Co-Chairs introduced Agenda item 4 and asked the Board to consider the applications received by the Secretariat for the first and pilot round of applications under the Special Programme by the deadline of 4 July 2016. All applications were listed in the meeting documents and all Board members and observers had been provided with the relevant meeting documents through electronic means.

9. Summary information on the applications were presented in documents SP/EB.2/3/Rev.1 and SP/EB.2/3/Add.1/Rev.1. The Co-Chairs reminded that their role as co-chairs was defined in the rules of procedures for the Executive Board, and in particular Rules 10, 11, 12 and 13. They further reminded that they also would act in the capacity as Executive Board members and be involved in the discussions. They informed that they would announce to the meeting in the event that they were taking the floor in the capacity as Board member. In addition, Rule 14 of the rules of procedure may be used, when necessary. Further, the Co-Chairs reminded that all decisions taken by this meeting would be made by the Executive Board members through consensus wherever possible, in accordance with the Terms of Reference.

10. The Co-Chairs invited the Secretariat to provide a general overview of the first round of applications, including the process of preparing for this meeting. The Secretariat gave some background information on activities undertaken since the 1st Executive Board meeting held in February 2016. The application guidelines were finalized and all comments provided by the Board members during the 1st meeting were taken on board. Secondly, the first round of application to the Special Programme was launched on the 4 April 2016. The announcement was broadcasted through the website of the Special Programme and additionally through the websites of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, the Minamata Convention and SAICM. To reach out to the developing countries and countries with economies in transition, the Special Programme was also introduced during relevant chemicals and waste related meetings and workshops, and seven webinars were held for different regions in different languages through the webinar portal of the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions.

11. The Secretariat further expressed appreciation to the donors of the Special Programme. It was noted that the outreach events generated success, with a total of 54 applications received by the deadline of 4 July 2016. The Secretariat acknowledged receipt within 1 – 2 days of receipt of the applications, in accordance with the application guidelines. Furthermore, the Secretariat worked together with the applicants to ensure that the applications were complete and by early September 2016, 42 preliminarily eligible and complete applications were shared with the Executive Board. It was noted that some countries had asked for an extension of the deadline for submission, however

given the short time to review the applications, the Secretariat encouraged these countries to apply during the second and subsequent rounds. Between July and September 2016, an informal Internal Task Team was set up consisting of members from the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, the interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention, and the SAICM Secretariat, to support the Special Programme secretariat. The Internal Task Team met four times during this period, reviewed all the applications and assisted the Secretariat in the appraisal, as partly reflected in the project summaries shared with the Executive Board and other meeting participants. Finally, in line with the terms of reference of the Special Programme, the GEF Secretariat also reviewed the applications before this meeting as contained in document SP/EB.2/INF.3.

12. Following the general overview presented by the Secretariat, the Co-Chairs introduced their proposal for undertaking the assessment of the applications by the Executive Board. It was noted that in line with Rule 25 of the rules of procedure of the Executive Board, an Executive Board member representing a recipient country, which had submitted an application would be excused from the substantive discussion on the respective application, and excused from decision making on the respective application. This was the case for the Board members representing Macedonia and Pakistan.

13. It was further agreed that the proposed appraisal methodology (score cards) that had been developed by the Secretariat before the meeting, would need further revision.

14. As agreed at the first meeting of the Executive Board, it was confirmed that the aim was to approve a limited number of projects during the first and pilot round and provide additional guidance for the rest of the applications. The Co-Chairs further emphasized the importance to ensure a regional balance and taking into account the special needs of least developed countries and small island developing States in accordance with paragraph 6 of the terms of reference of the Special Programme when making the final decision on funding applications. The relatively “low number” of projects to be approved was due to the fact that the first round is a pilot phase, in the sense that it would allow the Board to improve application guidelines, application forms and appraisal methodology and process based on the lessons learned during this round. Furthermore, this was also a result from the current level of funding available US\$1.7 million. The co-chairs finally reiterated Rule 18 of the rules of procedure for the Executive Board about the co-chairs giving the floor to observers after all Executive Board members have spoken.

15. The Executive Board proceeded to review the applications as listed in Annex 2.

16. In view of the appraisal by the Secretariat, assisted by the internal Task Team, the Executive Board undertook an in-depth assessment of the conformity of the applications with the requirements and criteria contained of the Terms of Reference (ToR), including *inter alia* measures proposed in accordance with the objective of the Special Programme (paragraphs 1 and 2 of the terms of reference), overall country approach to strengthening institutional capacity (paragraph 18 of the terms of reference), identification of associated domestic measures to be taken to ensure long term sustainability (paragraph 8 of the terms of reference); information on proposed measures, performance targets and long-term sustainability (paragraph 18 of the terms of reference); beneficiary country contribution (paragraph 21 of the terms of reference), etc.

17. The GEF Secretariat was also requested by the Executive Board to provide explanations on their assessment of GEF eligible and partially eligible projects (paragraph 4 of the terms of reference).

18. Following this detailed assessment, the Executive Board noted that although the quality and conformity of most of the applications with the requirements and criteria of the terms of reference could be improved, it had been decided to launch a pilot phase with a limited number of projects in order to start the operations of the Special Programme and to learn relevant lessons for the subsequent application rounds. Thus, the Executive Board of the Special Programme approved seven (7) projects for the pilot round amounting to US\$ 1.75 million, which also reflected regional balance and priority

to be accorded to countries with least capacity, taking into account the special needs of least developed countries and small island developing states, as follows:

- (i) Benin: Legal and institutional strengthening for the sound management of chemicals in Benin;
- (ii) Tanzania: Strengthening institutional capacity for sound management of chemicals and waste in the United Republic of Tanzania;
- (iii) Iraq: Develop and strengthen the institutional structure for the management of chemicals and waste in Iraq;
- (iv) Kyrgyz Republic: Strengthening capacities for national implementation of chemicals and waste related international agreements;
- (v) Ukraine: Strengthening the enforcement of the Rotterdam Convention in Ukraine, and building capacity to counteract illegal trafficking of chemicals;
- (vi) Argentina: Strengthening national capacity for the sound management of chemicals and waste;
- (vii) Dominican Republic: Strengthening institutional capacity for the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, the Minamata Convention and SAICM in Dominican Republic.

19. The conclusions of the Executive Board during their appraisal of the complete and eligible applications will be communicated by the Secretariat to the applicants for their information and response, and subsequent revision as appropriate.

20. The application from Kosovo was rejected by the Executive Board as ineligible. For the remainder, it was agreed that the projects reviewed but not approved during this round would not be requested to submit a new application, but instead may revise their projects based on the general and project specific guidance provided by the Executive Board. It was agreed that revised project proposals will be fully appraised by the Secretariat for consideration of the Executive Board during the 2nd round similar to new project submissions.

21. The following guidance will be provided regarding the budgets contained in the applications:
- (i) All budgeted items should be clearly identified in relation to the measures proposed in accordance with the terms of reference of the Special Programme;
 - (ii) It is expected that those applicant countries that decide to manage the projects should be able to administer the project themselves without having to devote funds from the Special Programme for this task. In duly justified circumstances, a maximum 5% for administrative fees, including any implementing agency, could be considered, notably if an implementing agency is tasked with project management;
 - (iii) As enhancing institutional capacity requires a minimum level of commitment notably from an administrative and logistical perspective, it is also expected that applicant countries will provide the necessary administrative and logistical support. Therefore, normal operational costs such as office equipment, premises, vehicles, fuel, etc. will not be eligible for support. In duly justified circumstances, a maximum 10% for specialised and technical equipment costs could be considered;
 - (iv) Similarly, it is expected that beneficiary countries will provide the necessary staff resources as part of the long term sustainability of the institutional strengthening. In cases where it is nevertheless proposed to obtain financial support from the Special Programme for staff costs, the reasons for it should be duly justified, including a detailed and clear explanation of how long term sustainability of such personnel and the proposed institutional strengthening will be ensured;
 - (v) Applications should respect the limit of US\$ 250,000 per project in order to be eligible for consideration. Applications exceeding this amount should only be considered eligible in exceptional circumstances and provided that a clear and comprehensive country approach to institutional strengthening at the national level for the sound management of chemicals and waste.

23. Regarding the seven projects approved in the first round of applications, and in line with its pilot phase nature, the Executive Board also requested to start the necessary process in a flexible and pragmatic manner, taking into account as appropriate the guidance agreed, including on budgetary matters.

V. Review and endorsement of procedures for the revised application guidelines and application forms

22. Following the first round of applications, the Secretariat prepared a list of lessons learned and inputs based on the experiences of the Secretariat and comments received from project proponents. During the review of the projects under agenda item 4, some cross-cutting issues were raised, which will be included in the application guidelines and application forms. It was agreed that the conclusions reached by the Executive Board will also be reflected in the revised application guidelines and application forms by the Secretariat, and circulated through electronic means to the Executive Board for further comments, with a view of finalising the application guidelines and application forms in time for the launch of the second round of applications in February 2017.

Application guidelines

23. The Executive Board noted that key lessons were learned during this first and pilot application round. The Executive Board members noted the difficulty in reviewing and appraising the projects as in some cases the information provided in the application forms was not coherent and targeted, in particular in assessing whether a project was in line with the objectives of the Special Programme, the proposed measures, long term sustainability, unclear budgets, etc.

24. The Secretariat was tasked by the Executive Board to undertake the following steps for the eligibility and appraisal phase:

Step 1: Formal acknowledgement has been received within the deadline – 1 week of receipt of the application package by the Special Programme Secretariat;

Step 2: Eligibility check to ensure that the eligibility criteria are in line with the terms of reference. It was noted that the guidelines should highlight the terms of reference, given that many of the applications did not include information in accordance with the TORs. It was also agreed that the Secretariat should ensure that the eligibility criteria are met. Furthermore, there should be a preliminary exchange with the GEF regarding GEF eligibility. If the GEF considers that an application is "GEF eligible", this should be communicated to the applicant in order to give the possibility to revise and/or clarify the proposed measures.

The proposed measures and associated measures for institutional strengthening and ensuring sustainability, within the objective (ref: Special Programme terms of reference paragraphs 1, 2 and 8) should be clearly detailed and included in the application. The Secretariat could include some examples in the revised guidelines. The proposed budget should be adequately submitted and presented clearly identifying each budget item with the relevant proposed measures and the requested amounts should respect the applicable limits.

Step 3: Appraisal by the Secretariat – this phase will be undertaken with the support from the internal task team comprising of representatives from the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions Secretariat, the interim Minamata Secretariat and Secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) and the GEF Secretariat. The appraisal would involve a qualitative analysis of the project and technical review of the activities to be carried out. The appraisal will also include a detailed budget review and assessment of the budget in relation with the proposed activities.

25. Based on the above, the Special Programme Secretariat was requested to revise the project application guidelines and applications. Further the internal task team comprising of representatives from the Secretariats of Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, Minamata Convention and

SAICM and the GEF Secretariat was formalized. A mandate was given to the Special Programme Secretariat to undertake the appraisal (in line with Step 3 above), with the assistance of the internal task team, and the IOMC members as appropriate. And finally, the Executive Board agreed on the revision of the appraisal methodology in line with the agreed conclusions expressed during the meeting (see in various parts above) with an aim to finalise the methodology in early 2017 for use by the Secretariat for the appraisal of the second round of applications.

26. The list below includes elements agreed by the Executive Board for the Secretariat to take into account and to reflect, as appropriate, in the revised project guidelines:

General points:

- (i) Underscore the key elements of terms of reference of the Special Programme and clearly reflect these in the relevant documents and forms in order to ensure that these are clearly prioritised and identified in the application, including paragraphs 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 18, 20 and 21 of the terms of reference.
- (ii) Emphasize relevance to the Post 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals and the Overall Orientation and Guidelines for Achieving the 2020 Goal on the sound management of chemicals and waste;
- (iii) Include further guidance on the long term sustainability of the project;
- (iv) Include succinct information on best practices on institutional strengthening for sound management of chemicals and wastes
- (v) Include guidance for covering gender considerations in project proposals, using existing gender guidelines
- (vi) Ensure preliminary exchange with the GEF on matters regarding GEF eligibility and measures that can be taken to avoid submission of GEF-eligible projects. For example, requesting to contact GEF focal points to review the applications prior to submitting the project documents. Listing in an Annex the application related funding received from the GEF projects. The project proposals should also try to show how these projects would build on past or ongoing projects. This should be included in the Secretariat appraisal.

Specific points related to Form I Project summary and Form II Project description:

- (vii) Clear description of the proposed measures in line with the objective of the Special Programme (paragraphs 18, 1, and 2 of the terms of reference)
- (viii) Description of the associated domestic measures to be taken to ensure that the national institutional capacity supported by the Special Programme is sustainable in the long term (paragraph 8 of the terms of reference).
- (ix) Outline of the overall country approach to strengthening institutional capacity(paragraph 18 of the terms of reference)
- (x) Reference to relevant activities and projects undertaken and ongoing which are complementary to the project proposal;
- (xi) Any applicant country has to formally notify a single focal point through which any application from that country shall be submitted.
- (xii) Provide examples of partners that can be included in project implementation (e.g. the private sector);
- (xiii) Provide links to relevant sources of information to support drafting of the application form – for example the UN Environment Guidance on the development of legal and institutional infrastructures and measures for recovering costs of national administration for the sound management of chemicals (Lira guidelines);
- (xiv) Provide an example of a log frame;
- (xv) Sub-headings can be used for national profiles;
- (xvi) Streamlining the templates to focus on sustainability. Some information was repeated in 3 different places for this pilot round and these sections should be consolidated to make the forms more succinct and improve the quality;
- (xvii) Screening of QSP projects should be easily available, for example in a list format;
- (xviii) Important to check on the obligations of all of the Conventions;
- (xix) Process should strive for quality process, especially those who have IGOs supporting their development;

- (xx) Encourage countries to submit one application to facilitate coordination and cooperation. This is already embedded in the terms of reference under the need for an overall country approach to strengthening institutional capacity. If a country is submitting several applications they should all have to explain how these multiple applications address the country approach.

Specific points related to budget considerations:

- (xxi) Budget considerations included that US\$ 250,000 is the maximum amount to be allocated for a project and shall be respected for an application to be eligible. On an exceptional basis the Executive Board may consider awarding US\$ 500,000 for a comprehensive country approach to institutional strengthening at the national level for the sound management of chemicals and waste, which would address all relevant sectors and institutional actors, etc.;
- (xxii) For personnel costs, applicant countries are expected to provide staff resources to ensure long term sustainability of the institutional capacity to be strengthened. If there is a request for funding of personnel costs, the application should duly explain and justify the need for such costs, clearly demonstrate how these costs would support project activities and implementation and, most importantly, how the long term sustainability related to those staff costs will be ensured. The possibility of a cap will be reviewed following the second and subsequent rounds of applications and revision of the application guidelines.
- (xxiii) It is expected that those applicant countries that decide to manage the projects themselves should be able to administer the project without having to devote funds from the Special Programme for this task. In duly justified circumstances, a cap for administrative fees of 5%, including any implementing agency, could be considered, notably if an implementing agency is tasked with project management.
- (xxiv) As enhancing institutional capacity requires a minimum level of commitment notably from an administrative and logistical perspective, it is also expected that applicant countries will provide the necessary administrative and logistical support. Therefore, normal operational costs such as office equipment, premises, vehicles, fuel, etc. will not be eligible for support. In duly justified circumstances, a maximum 10% for specialised and technical equipment costs could be considered.

VI. Update on the operations of the Special Programme

(a) Secretariat and budget

27. The Secretariat provided an update on the work and budget of the Secretariat as contained in document SP/EB.2/5. The importance of securing resources for the Secretariat was highlighted. It was noted that some of the donors have been supporting the Secretariat and have expressed commitment to continue their support for the Secretariat into the future. However there is a need for the traditional donor base to be expanded, and there was a request to *inter alia* target those potential donors who were involved in the negotiations of the terms of reference and who have not provided funds to the Special Programme to date.

28. During this discussion, the Executive Board also discussed the need to outreach and raise the profile of the Special Programme. In this regard, Government of Brazil offered to host an event on the margins of the intersessional meeting of ICCM-5 to be held in Brasilia in February 2017, if deemed feasible. Other opportunities include the BRS COPs in May 2017 and COP1 of the Minamata Convention tentatively scheduled in September 2017.

(b) Draft resource mobilization strategy

29. The draft resource mobilization strategy was presented by the Secretariat as contained in SP/EB.2/6, noting it was an initial draft. It was noted that there is a need to link the resource mobilization strategy to the 2030 agenda, as many donors are prioritising 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Overall Orientation and Guidance as approved by ICCM-4 in September 2015.

30. In addition to requesting potential donor countries to increase their support to the Special Programme, the importance of the Special Programme's links to the UNEP Programme of Work was highlighted. In this regard, it was emphasised that the Programme of Work budget should increase its support to the Special Programme, notably in implementation of §15 ToR which, as incorporated in UNEA 1/5 resolution, foresees that UNEP will provide a secretariat, including the allocation of human and other resources. In addition, it was noted the need to further consider the issue of programme support costs, notably in line with § 20 ToR, as incorporated in UNEA 1/5 resolution, and the need to retain part of those costs for the functioning of the secretariat of the Special Programme, as is the case for the secretariat of MEAs served by UNEP. The consideration of applicable programme support costs would also have to take into account the cumulative effect of additional programme support or administrative costs that may be contained in the applications.

31. Private sector was deemed important to include as potential donors. It was noted that some projects address the establishment of financial mechanisms at the national level. In addition, it was noted that in most cases the national regulatory frameworks are supported by the private sector as a partner in its implementation.

32. The Executive Board members may submit their written comments on the draft resource mobilization strategy to the Secretariat. The strategy will be revised taking on board the comments received.

VII. Date and venue of the next meeting

33. It was agreed that the Secretariat in consultation with the Co-Chairs would finalise the report of the meeting and circulate it to Executive Board members for comments approximately one month after the meeting. The members of the Executive Board may then provide comments on the draft. The meeting report will be formally adopted at the next meeting of the Executive Board.

34. The Executive Board agreed on a tentative timeline for the work of the secretariat and the launch of the second application round:

Indicative dates	Activities
Oct-Nov 2016	Secretariat to respond to all applicants
Oct-Dec 2016	Revision of project application guidelines, application forms and appraisal methodology, draft resource mobilization strategy for approval by the Executive Board (electronically)
Oct 2016 – Jan 2017	Project implementation arrangements for approved projects. Preparation of implementation arrangements (through UNEP's SSFA or other relevant instruments)
Feb-May 2017	2 nd call of applications
June-Sept 2017	Secretariat eligibility assessment and appraisal, in consultation with internal task team (Phase 1, 2, 3)
Oct/Nov 2017	3 rd Executive Board meeting (exact dates and venue to be determined)

35. The Secretariat will provide the Executive Board tentative dates in October and November 2017 for the 3rd meeting of the Board, noting that these tentative dates would depend on whether the project applications are ready for approval. Executive Board members have possibility to host the meeting.

VIII. Any other business

36. A short discussion on the implementation of resolution 1/5 resulted in the Executive Board requesting the Secretariat to draft a report for UNEA-3, in accordance with paragraph 9 of this resolution, to be circulated to the Executive Board for comments and finalisation.

37. The 2 year term of Executive Board members started from 2 February 2016. The Secretariat will therefore launch the nomination process for the next Executive Board members for 3 February 2017.

38. The representative from Argentina informally informed the Executive Board about the outcomes of the 12th meeting of the Implementation and Compliance Committee held in June 2016.

IX. Closure of the meeting

39. The Co-Chairs closed the meeting at 5:30 p.m. thanking all the Executive Board members, Observers and the Secretariat for all their hard work in achieving a good outcome of the meeting.

Annex 1: List of participants**EXECUTIVE BOARD**

RECIPIENT COUNTRIES	
<p>AFRICA Mr. Charles Sunkuli Principal Secretary Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources State Department of Environment P. O. Box 30126-00100, NHIF Building, 12th Floor Ragati Road Nairobi, Kenya</p> <p>CENTRAL EASTERN EUROPE Ms. Suzana Andonova National SAICM Focal Point, POPs Unit Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning MRTV Bldg, 12th floor/Office 1207 Bul. Goce Delcev 18 1000 Skopje Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</p>	<p>ASIA AND THE PACIFIC Mr. Tariq Sardar Joint Secretary Administration Department Ministry of Climate Change LG 6 RD Complex, G-5/2 44000 Islamabad, Pakistan</p> <p>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN Ms. Leticia Reis de Carvalho Director of Environmental Quality in the Industry Secretariat of Climate Change/Environmental Quality Ministry of Environment SEPN 505 ED. Marie Prendi Cruz, Bloco B Sala T-20, Brasilia, Brazil</p> <p>LEAST DEVELOPED COUNTRY Mr. Murad Alfakih Chemical Safety, Hazardous wastes Department Environment Protection Agency (EPA) Zubairy Street P.O. Box 19719 Sanaa, Yemen</p>

DONORS	
<p>EUROPEAN UNION Mr. Jorge Peydro Aznar Lead Negotiator – European Union DG Environment, European Commission 1049 Brussels, Belgium</p> <p>GERMANY Ms. Simone Irsfeld Deputy Head of Division IG II 3 Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) Robert-Schuman-Platz 3 Bonn 53175, Germany</p> <p>FINLAND Mr. Niko Urho Senior Officer Unit for International and EU Affairs Ministry of the Environment P.O Box 35, FIN-00023 Government Finland</p>	<p>SWEDEN Ms. Jenny Rönngren Adviser/Programme Manager International Unit Swedish Chemicals Agency P.O. Box 2 17213 Stockholm Sweden</p> <p>UNITES STATES OF AMERICA Ms. Rowena Watson Acting Division Chief for Air Pollution, Chemicals and Waste Office of Environmental Quality and Transboundary Issues United States Department of State 2201 C Street NW, Washington DC 20520 United States of America</p>

OBSERVERS

GOVERNMENTS	
<p>ARGENTINA Mr. Juan Ignacio Simonelli Waste & Chemical Cluster - Global Liaison Environmental Control & Monitoring Secretary Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development San Martín 451, Oficina 405, Caba C1004AAI Ciudad de Buenos Aires Argentina</p> <p>EUROPEAN UNION Ms. Maria Pachta Policy Officer Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development European Commission Rue de la Loi 41 1000 Brussels Belgium</p> <p>CAMBODIA Mr. Seiha Chhun Chief Office of Hazardous Wastes Management and Focal Point of Basel Convention Hazardous Substances Management General Directorate of Environmental Protection Ministry of Environment Morodok Techo Building (Lot 503) Tonle Bassac Chamkarmon Phnom Penh Cambodia</p> <p>KENYA Mr. Francis Kihumba Principal Secretary Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources P.O. Box 30521 00100 Nairobi Kenya</p>	<p>Mr. Philip Suyia Environment and Natural Resources Department Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources P.O. Box 30126 00100 Nairobi Kenya</p> <p>REPUBLIC OF KOREA Mr. Nam-hyuk Kim Director Green Economy and Environmental Diplomacy Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs 60, Sajik-ro 8-gil, Jongno-gu 3172 Seoul Republic of Korea</p> <p>Ms. Hyun Jin Cha Third Secretary Green Economy and Environmental Diplomacy Division Ministry of Foreign Affairs 60, Sajik-ro 8-gil, Jongno-gu 3172 Seoul Republic of Korea</p> <p>THAILAND Ms. Pattanan Tarin Environmentalist Waste & Hazardous Substance Management Bureau Pollution Control Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment 92, Phaholyothin 7, Samsen Nai, Phaya Thai 10400 Bangkok Thailand</p>

BRS, INTERIM MINAMATA AND SAICM SECRETARIATS	
<p>BRS Mr. Frank Moser Programme Officer Office of the Executive Secretary Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions Switzerland Tel.: +41 22 917 89 51 E-mail: frank.moser@brsmeas.org</p>	<p>UNEP (INTERIM MINAMATA & SAICM) Ms. Kakuko Nagatani-Yoshida Regional Subprogramme Coordinator for Chemicals and Waste UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific The United Nations Building Rajadamnern Nok Avenue, Dusit Bangkok 10200 Thailand Tel.: +66 2 288 1679 E-mail: kakuko.nagatani@unep.org</p>
GEF SECRETARIAT	
<p>Mr. Anil Sookdeo Coordinator Chemicals and Waste Focal Area Global Environment Facility 1818 H St. NW 20433 Washington, DC United States of America Tel.: 1-2024580683 Email: asookdeo@thegef.org</p>	
IGOs	
<p>UNITAR Mr. Brandon Turner Adviser, Chemicals and Waste Management Programme, UNITAR Palais des Nations CH-1211 Geneva 10 Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 81 66 Email: brandon.turner@unitar.org</p>	<p>WHO Ms. Lesley Jayne Onyon Regional Adviser - Occupational and Environmental Health Department of Noncommunicable Diseases and Environmental Health World Health Organisation (WHO) WHO Regional Office for South-East Asia World Health House, I.P. Estate New Delhi 110002, India Tel: +91 96 50 19 73 84 Email: onyon@who.int</p>
SPECIAL PROGRAMME SECRETARIAT	
<p>Mr. Jacob Duer Principal Coordinator Secretariat of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management, Interim Secretariat of the Minamata Convention on Mercury and Secretariat of Special Programme Chemicals and Waste Branch Economy Division United Nations Environment Programme Tel: +41 22 917 8217 Email: jacob.duer@unep.org</p>	<p>Ms. Nalini Sharma Programme Officer Secretariat of the Special Programme Economy Division United Nations Environment Programme Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 8343 Email: nalini.sharma@unep.org</p> <p>Ms. Lina Fortelius Associate Programme Officer Secretariat of the Special Programme Economy Division United Nations Environment Programme Geneva, Switzerland Tel: +41 22 917 8191 Email: lina.fortelius@unep.org</p>

Annex 2: List of applications considered by the Executive Board at their second meeting, 11 to 13 October 2016, Bangkok, Thailand

Country	Project title
<i>Africa</i>	
Benin	<i>National executive framework of integrated sound management of e-waste in Benin (CNGI-E-Waste)</i>
Benin	<i>Programme support and promotion of private-public partnership in the field of waste management</i>
Benin	<i>Legal and Institutional Strengthening for the Sound Management of Chemicals in Benin</i>
Burkina Faso	<i>Project institutional capacity-building for the sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste in Burkina Faso</i>
Cote d'Ivoire	<i>Strengthening the institutional capacity for the sound management of chemicals and industrial and hazardous waste</i>
Egypt	<i>Environmental Sound Management (ESM) of used and waste tyres</i>
The Gambia	<i>Strengthening chemical accident prevention and preparedness in the Gambia</i>
Ghana	<i>Strengthening institutional capacity and coordinating mechanism for the sound management of chemicals and waste and the effective implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata conventions and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) in Ghana</i>
Madagascar	<i>Strengthening institutional capacities on environmentally sound management of chemicals and hazardous wastes (ESMCW) in Madagascar</i>
Malawi	<i>Strengthening the national capacity for the effective implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, as well as other relevant international agreements in the chemicals and waste cluster</i>
Mauritius	<i>Institutional strengthening for management, control, monitoring of POPs and Mercury in the environment sector</i>
Seychelles	<i>Strengthening institutional capacity for effective implementation of chemical related conventions in Seychelles</i>
Tanzania	<i>Strengthening Institutional Capacity for Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste in the United Republic of Tanzania</i>
Togo	<i>Strengthening chemical accident prevention and preparedness in the Togolese Republic</i>
Tunisia	<i>Updating of the national public policies and capacity building for chemicals and hazardous wastes management</i>
Zimbabwe	<i>Strengthening Zimbabwe's capacity to improve chemicals management and implement the chemicals conventions</i>
<i>Asia and the Pacific</i>	
China	<i>Promoting environmentally sound management of chemical and waste through strengthening capacity on transboundary movement management</i>
DPR Korea	<i>Capacity building for the sound management of hazardous industrial waste in DPR Korea</i>
Iraq	<i>Develop and strengthen the institutional structure for the management of chemicals and waste in Iraq</i>
Kazakhstan	<i>Strengthening national capacity of the Republic of Kazakhstan for management of chemicals by ensuring fulfilment of commitments under international environmental agreements</i>
Kyrgyz Republic	<i>Strengthening capacities for national implementation of chemicals and waste related international agreements</i>
Lao PDR	<i>Strengthened national institutional and promoting the mainstreaming of the sound management of chemicals and wastes in Lao PDR</i>
Lebanon	<i>Sustainable management of chemicals and waste</i>
Pakistan	<i>Strengthening of national legislation and capacity building of stakeholders for sound chemicals and hazardous waste management in Pakistan</i>

Country	Project title
Papua New Guinea	<i>Strengthening the institutional framework and national capacity of key stakeholders in Papua New Guinea in wastes and chemical management</i>
Philippines	<i>Creating and updating systems for the operational management of chemicals and wastes in the Philippines (CUSTOMS)</i>
Vietnam	<i>Support to Vietnam's implementation to the Rotterdam Convention</i>
Central and Eastern Europe	
Kosovo	<i>Support chemicals management in Kosovo</i>
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	<i>Updating of the National Plans for implementation of SAICM and Minamata Convention inclusion in the triple synergy scheme for implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions</i>
Moldova	<i>Improving sustainable institutional and regulatory framework for chemicals and waste management throughout their lifecycle in the Republic of Moldova</i>
Serbia	<i>Strengthening the synergy between Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions at national level in the Republic of Serbia</i>
Ukraine	<i>Strengthening the Enforcement of the Rotterdam Convention in Ukraine and Building Capacity to Counteract Illegal Trafficking of Chemicals</i>
Latin America and the Caribbean	
Argentina	<i>Strengthening national capacity for the sound management of chemicals and waste</i>
Barbados	<i>Development of a chemicals management policy and a multifaceted chemicals tracking system for Barbados</i>
Barbados	<i>Enhancing the institutional capacity to improve the management of pesticides in Barbados</i>
Chile	<i>Strengthening the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, Minamata Convention on Mercury, and the Statements of Strategic Approach in Rational Management through the development of an information system of chemicals for industrial use</i>
Chile	<i>Development and implementation of a computerized management system to update chemical information in Chile under GHS criteria</i>
Cuba	<i>Strengthening the health sector capacities for the identification and management of risks associated to chemicals in Cuba</i>
Dominican Republic	<i>Strengthening institutional capacity for the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm and Minamata Convention and SAICM in Dominican Republic</i>
Haiti	<i>Implementation of the National Plan of chemicals and hazardous waste management</i>
Honduras	<i>National inventory of industrial chemicals in Honduras</i>
Uruguay	<i>Strengthened national capacities for management control of industrial solid waste</i>