

2 February 2018

English only

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE SPECIAL PROGRAMME

Nairobi, Kenya, 2 – 3 December 2017

I. Opening of the meeting

1. The third meeting of the Executive Board of the Special Programme to support institutional strengthening at the national level for the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm conventions, the Minamata Convention and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) was officially opened at 9:15 a.m. on 2 December 2017 by the Executive Board co-chairs, Ms. Suzana Andonova (Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) and Ms. Sofia Tingstorp (Sweden). The meeting was attended by 8 of the 10 Executive Board members and represented quorum for decision making in accordance with Rule 17 of the rules of procedure for the Executive Board of the Special Programme¹.

2. Ms. Andonova provided welcome remarks to Executive Board members and observers and congratulated the Special Programme Secretariat for successful preparatory work undertaken for the second round of applications and the convening of the current meeting and the support given to the co-chairs.

3. Ms. Tingstorp also welcomed meeting participants and wished them a fruitful meeting with a good outcome over the next two days. She underlined how the Special Programme is running smoothly, noting the high interest expressed by developing countries and countries with economies in transition represented by the high number of applications received. She also emphasised the importance of the work to be undertaken during this meeting and how by approving projects for funding by the Special Programme Trust Fund, would contribute to institutional strengthening at the national level.

4. Ms. Ligia Noronha, Director of the Economy Division, on behalf of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), welcomed the Executive Board members and representatives from different Governments, including observers, and from the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm and the Minamata Conventions, SAICM Secretariat and the Global Environmental Fund (GEF). She highlighted that the Special Programme since its establishment in September 2015, is now fully operational and running smoothly. She noted the Special Programme's important contribution to the UNEA 3 theme on pollution, noting similarities to the Montreal Protocol fund. She stated that the large number of applications received in the 1st and 2nd round of applications demonstrated the importance of the Special Programme to developing countries and countries with economies in transition in meeting their obligations for the different chemicals and waste multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and SAICM. Lastly, she expressed appreciation to the donors that have provided funding to the Special Programme until now, accounting for US\$ 16,925,288 including among others, from the European Union, Sweden, the United States, Germany, Finland, Norway, the Netherlands, Austria and Denmark.

5. A tour de table was undertaken, and all Executive Board members, the Observers and the Special Programme Secretariat members introduced themselves.

II. Adoption of the agenda

6. The provisional agenda as set out in document SP/EB.3/1/Add.1 was adopted without any modifications.

III. Approval of the report of the 2nd Executive Board meeting held from 11 to 13 October 2016, Bangkok, Thailand

7. The report of the 2nd Executive Board meeting held from 11 to 13 October 2016 in Bangkok as contained in document SP/EB.3/2, which was circulated and reviewed by Executive Board members prior to the meeting

¹ Document SP/EB.3/INF/2: Rules of procedure for the Executive Board of the Special Programme

was adopted without any modifications. The Special Programme Secretariat was requested to make the report available on the Special Programme website.

IV. Consideration of eligible and complete applications for the 2nd round of applications

8. The co-chairs introduced Agenda item 4 and requested the Executive Board to consider the applications received by the Secretariat for the second round of applications by the deadline of 20 June 2017. Summary information on the applications were presented in documents SP/EB.3/3 and its addenda SP/EB.3/3/Add.1, SP/EB.3/3/Add.2 SP/EB.3/3/Add.3 and SP/EB.3/3/Add.4, with full application packages being uploaded through electronic means and provided to all meeting participants.

9. The co-chairs reminded the meeting that their role as co-chairs was defined in the rules of procedures for the Executive Board, in particular Rules 10, 11, 12 and 13. They noted that they also would act in the capacity as Executive Board member to represent their relevant constituencies and be involved in the discussion, and would announce to the meeting in the event that they were taking the floor in the capacity as an Executive Board member. In addition, in Rule 14 of the rules of procedure that states “*In carrying out its tasks the secretariat shall, as necessary, consult with the co-chairs*”, may be used. The co-chairs reminded the meeting that all decisions taken by this meeting would be made by the Executive Board members. The co-chairs also noted that in line with Rule 25 of the rules of procedure for the Executive Board “*in cases where a recipient country that is represented on the Executive Board is involved in a project submitted to the Executive Board for its consideration, the representative of that country shall be excused from decision-making by the Executive Board in relation to the project in question*” as contained in SP/EB.3/INF/2. This was the case for the Executive Board members representing Kenya and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

10. The co-chairs drew attention to the efforts by the Secretariat in preparing the documents for the Executive Board in a timely manner. The co-chairs invited the Secretariat to provide a general overview of the second round of applications, including consideration of eligible and complete applications submitted. The Secretariat provided background information on activities undertaken since the second Executive Board meeting held in October 2016. The Secretariat took note of the applications received following the deadline of 20 June 2017 with 42 applications received from 39 countries in line with the following regional breakdown: Africa, 12 applications, Asia and the Pacific, 19 applications, Central and Eastern Europe, 5 applications and Latin America and the Caribbean, 6 applications. The steps undertaken by the Secretariat on the screening and appraisal of applications were also presented. The screening and appraisal process included a substantial amount of work by the Secretariat, including extensive communication with each applicant during the revision of the application. In addition, the process involved coordination with the internal task team consisting of members from the Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions, the Minamata Convention, SAICM and the GEF, both through face to face meetings and electronic means in providing their respective comments to the Secretariat. The Secretariat ultimately reviewed and appraised 39 applications from 39 countries, 6 of which were subsequently considered incomplete or withdrawn.

11. The Executive Board at their 3rd meeting considered 33 eligible and complete applications, according to the following regions: Africa, 7 applications, Asia and the Pacific, 15 applications, Central and Eastern Europe, 5 applications, and Latin America and the Caribbean, 6 applications. The total amount requested was US\$ 8,929,211, while the total uncommitted cash under the Special Programme Trust Fund excluding PSC was US\$ 6,812,176.

12. Following the general overview presented by the Secretariat, the co-chairs introduced their proposal for the Executive Board to undertake the review and appraisal of the projects as follows:

- (i) The Executive Board, following a short presentation by the secretariat of each of the remaining eligible and complete applications (this would be in the order that they are presented in the meeting documentation) would have a discussion on the application, and a preliminary decision would be taken on whether to further consider the application.
- (ii) Detailed notes would be taken by the secretariat, to capture the discussion and record the recommendations.
- (iii) The first round of review would result in a smaller number of applications for further consideration, and recommendations on how to deal with the applications that would not be considered by the meeting.
- (iv) The second round of review would entail a more detailed discussion by the Executive Board on the selected applications, and this process would be further elaborated during the course of the meeting.

- (v) The second round of review would result in a final set of applications for approval by the Executive Board, as well as recommendations and detailed comments on the applications not approved for funding by the Executive Board during this second round of application.

13. The proposed procedure was agreed by the Executive Board who expressed gratitude to the Secretariat for the well organised and structured documents. During the initial reflections, the Executive Board agreed on understanding the content of the used methodology before going through the appraisal of the applications by keeping an open mind for regional, thematic and country driving realities of further consideration and decision. It was also agreed that such decision would be taken on basis of merit and quality of the applications.

14. The Executive Board also drew attention to specific criteria to be used for appraisal of applications, which requested more than US\$ 250,000. This criteria included, among others, i) potential involvement of the private sector and in a circular economy and/or green procurement processes basis, ii) proposal supporting the institutional strengthening in line with its expected outcomes of the application, iii) the involvement of many sectors e.g. agriculture and manufacture, and the participation of the civil society, iv) the possible linkage with external investment banks by further consider how the projects could be taken up from an investment perspective opportunity, v) mainstream overall integration and synergistic efforts that could be shared in regional settings, vi) the complementarity on existing projects from the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions and SAICM and EU related projects such as the SWITCH Asia and Africa, and vii) the need for the application to contain additional support letters.

15. The Executive Board proceeded to review the applications, starting from Africa, Asia Pacific, Central and Eastern Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean, as listed in Annex 2.

16. Following this detailed appraisal, the Executive Board approved 17 projects amounting to US\$ 5,096,735, which also reflected regional balance and priority for countries with least capacity, taking into account the special needs of least development countries and small island developing states, as follows:

Africa

- (i) **Ghana:** Strengthening institutional capacity for the sustainable sound management of chemicals and waste throughout their life-cycle and the effective implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata conventions and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) in Ghana;
- (ii) **Kenya:** Support to chemicals and waste MEAs and SAICM implementation in Kenya;
- (iii) **Nigeria:** Strengthening of the legal and institutional infrastructures for the sound management of chemicals (SMC) in Nigeria
- (iv) **The Gambia:** Elimination and environmentally sound disposal of Asbestos in The Gambia;
- (v) **Uganda:** Strengthening national institutional capacity in sound management of chemicals and waste in Uganda.

Asia Pacific

- (vi) **Afghanistan:** Enhancing the sustainable institutional capacity to regulate toxic chemicals;
- (vii) **China:** Strengthening institutional capacity for the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions and SAICM;
- (viii) **India:** Institutional capacity building for sustainable management of chemicals and waste with special focus on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs);
- (ix) **Kiribati:** Strengthening legal systems, institutions and data collection infrastructures in Kiribati;
- (x) **Papua New Guinea:** Strengthening the institutional framework and national capacity of key stakeholders in Papua New Guinea in wastes and chemical management;
- (xi) **Vietnam:** Strengthening national capacity in sound chemicals and waste management for the implementation of the Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam, Minamata Conventions, SAICM in Vietnam.

Central and Eastern Europe

- (xii) **Belarus:** Establish a sustainable national infrastructure to join and support the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in the Republic of Belarus;
- (xiii) **Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia:** Strengthening institutional capacities for mainstreaming quadruple synergy schemes in implementation of the National Action Plans (NAPs) for implementation of SAICM and inclusion of Minamata convention;
- (xiv) **Republic of Moldova:** Improving sustainable institutional and regulatory framework for chemicals and waste management throughout their lifecycle in the Republic of Moldova
- (xv) **Serbia:** Strengthening the synergy between Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions at national level in the Republic of Serbia.

Latin America and the Caribbean

- (xvi) **Brazil:** Strengthening institutional capacity for sound management of chemicals through the establishment of necessary structure to implement the national legislation on industrial chemicals;
- (xvii) **Ecuador:** Strengthening of the national control system for the management of dangerous materials in Ecuador.

17. During the meeting, it was also agreed that the comments provided by 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 subsequent revision as appropriate.

18. The following general observations were made during the appraisal of the complete and eligible applications undertaken by the Executive Board:

- (i) Some projects are well-formulated, comprehensive, and addressed the objectives of the Special Programme by aiming to strengthen overall institutional capacities, as well as, countries' reporting obligations under the relevant MEAs;
- (ii) Some projects were considered to be very conceptual in focus rather than being concrete projects. In other cases, projects had narrow focus e.g. health, plastic, hazardous waste, pharmaceutical waste, industrial chemicals, implementation of one MEA, GHS, which were considered neither within the broad scope and objectives of the Special Programme, nor did the projects link to other sectors;
- (iii) Some of the resubmitted projects had taken on board the comments from the Executive Board from the first round of applications and the feedback from the internal task team, however, there were other projects that did not address the comments and feedback provided;
- (iv) Some projects presented strong country's ownership and political commitment. However, in some cases, the projects did not demonstrate country ownership and lacked a country driven process. One key evidence of this fact was the amount allocated to contractual services, that is, outsourcing to other implementing partners without clarification on how project sustainability would be maintained and how services and skills would be transferred and retained by the countries;
- (v) Many projects had strong components on project management and inter-sectoral coordination; and
- (vi) A number of projects included elements promoting regional cooperation and synergies within the region.

19. The following observations regarding the project description were made during the appraisal of the complete and eligible applications undertaken by the Executive Board:

- (i) A number of projects did not present a concrete implementation roadmap and proposed activities in a clear manner, which lead to lack of clarity of how the project would be fully implemented;
- (ii) Many projects included a wide range of implementing partners and demonstrated strong elements of engagement with, but not limited to NGOs, private sector stakeholders, youth, and women;
- (iii) Many projects presented strong multi-sectoral coordination mechanisms, amongst many stakeholders supporting the implementation of the project, however there were a few projects that lacked an approach to institutional strengthening in an integrated manner e.g. non-inclusion of a multi-sectoral approach to improve coordination between government ministries and other stakeholders;
- (iv) A number of projects contained well-developed gender mainstreaming components;

- (v) A few projects contained too many measures, and it was not clear how these measures would be implemented and completed during the project duration;
 - (vi) One projects' activities fell within the mandate of the GEF, which according to the terms of references of the Special Programme, do not qualify to receive funds from the Special Programme Trust Fund;
 - (vii) Many projects did not fully develop the logical framework to include well-defined baselines and targets, as well as linkages between measures, outputs and outcomes;
 - (viii) Some projects contained elements of training-of -trainers', with appropriate allocation of resources; however, many other projects contained a lot of training components that did not address the weakness and needs of the country due to the lack of integration, mainstreaming and sustainability of the measures;
 - (ix) Many projects did not address how the lessons learned and results from previous projects of similar scope can be built upon in the design of this new project, e.g. National Implementation Plans of the Stockholm Convention, Quick Start Programme of SAICM and the GEF, as well as synergies with other programmes;
 - (x) Some projects presented how their activities would provide support to the ratification of relevant Conventions and their amendments; however, a few projects lacked activities and linkages with relevant MEAs including the promotion to become a Party to a Convention and meeting Parties' compliance performance with timely national reporting and legally binding obligations of the relevant Conventions;
20. The following observations on the project budget were made during the appraisal of the complete and eligible applications undertaken by the Executive Board:
- (i) One project in particular contained a component on cost recovery, which was considered forward-thinking in terms of investment and return. This project should be considered as a pilot, and this example can be highlighted in the revised application guidelines;
 - (ii) A number of projects contained high beneficiary contribution, which was well received;
 - (iii) A few projects provided rationale on the limited budget requested and their duration;
 - (iv) Many projects contained administrative fees that were higher than the maximum of 5%; and
 - (v) Many projects included high personnel and contractual services costs;
21. The following observations on project sustainability and synergy were made during the appraisal of the complete and eligible applications undertaken by the Executive Board:
- (i) Some projects presented good sustainability elements including long-term strategic plan, integration into national budget planning; however, a number of projects did not contain measures to maintain outcome of the project, therefore not convincing from a sustainability perspective;
 - (ii) Some projects contained potential regional cooperation elements; and
 - (iii) A number of projects took into consideration and built upon potential synergies with other ongoing and previous programmes, projects, and funding opportunities and mechanisms e.g. SWITCH, and PAGE, Japan International Cooperation Agency.
22. The Executive Board did not consider the projects from Barbados and Chile eligible for funding from the Special Programme Trust Fund given their development status under the Official Development Assistance eligibility used by many donors. The Executive Board referred to the eligibility criteria of the Special programme as stated in its term of reference "*Support from the Special Programme will be available for developing countries, taking into account the special needs of least developed countries and small island developing States and for countries with economies in transition, with priority given to those with least capacities*".

V. Lessons learned from implementation of the approved projects in the 1st round of applications, and the launch and review process for the 2nd round of applications

23. Presenting the experiences from the implementation of the approved projects in the 1st round of application, the Secretariat noted that the development and finalization of the agreements took longer than originally anticipated, resulting in part of the project implementation starting in late 2017 or planned for beginning of 2018 in some cases. It was noted that one applicant requested that the agreement be translated into their native language to facilitate its signature, which again resulted in delays in the finalizing the agreement.
24. Following the 2nd round of applications, the Secretariat prepared a list of lessons learned and inputs received from proponents of the applications as contained in document SP/EB.3/4. The Secretariat presented several lessons learnt and associated recommendations including on recurring issues such as (i) incomplete

associated domestic measure eligibility criteria; (ii) misunderstanding between *proposed measures* and *associated domestic measures*; (iii) lack of clarity on the logical framework; (iv) missing information on linkages of past, on-going or planned projects; (v) failure to adhere to budget limit in line with the application guidelines; and (vi) in most cases, approximately 50% of the requested funds were allocated towards personnel and contractual services. The Executive Board endorsed the recommendations including, among others: (i) further strengthen of the guidelines with concrete examples; (ii) provide concrete examples for the logical framework; and (iii) highlight the importance of demonstrating the linkages and/or relevance of past, on-going and planned projects.

25. The Executive Board noted that the GEF eligibility should be highlighted and additional guidance for the GEF to screen the projects should be provided.

26. The role of the Executive Board was also discussed. It was suggested that there be a transition from the current Executive Board to the new Executive Board starting their term in February 2018, and this can be done through reporting the results of this meeting. The important role of Executive Board members engaging at the regional level as showcased during this meeting was also underscored.

27. The Executive Board agreed that the appraisal methodology and guidelines should be clear and would be circulated to its members by mid- January 2018. In addition, the Executive Board agreed that the application guidelines should be translated to French and Spanish, and requested the Secretariat to facilitate the translation. One suggestion was to request willing countries to undertake the translation.

VI. Update on the operations of the Special Programme

(a) Secretariat and budget

28. The Secretariat provided an update on the work undertaken by the secretariat since the 2nd Executive Board meeting in October 2016, and budget and expenditures of the Special Programme Trust Fund and the operations of the Special Programme. The total amount of pledged and/or contributed to the Special Programme amounted to a total of US\$ 16,925,288.

29. The Executive Board endorsed the update on the secretariat and budget as contained in document SP/EB.3/5 including a fully staffed secretariat which will ensure the delivery of the Special Programme's activities. It terms of lessons learned, it was noted that the experience from the QSP has been incorporated and is relevant to the activities of the Special Programme. The Executive Board also welcomed the support from the UN Environment's regional offices to the Secretariat in carrying out its work, especially in support of project implementation and monitoring. In addition, the regional offices can play an important role in supporting the development of applications as well as communicating success stories of on-going projects in the regions. The Executive Board requested that focal points from ongoing projects be invited to the next Executive Board meeting to share their experiences and lessons learned. The Executive Board also suggested that its members should provide guidance on regional basis to improve the applications to the Special Programme.

30. The Executive Board expressed its gratitude to the donors to the Special Programme. The Executive Board recognized the competition for limited funding and expressed the need to attract non-traditional donors, including but not limited to the private sector. Success stories from approved projects should be made available to potential donors. The Executive Board however highlighted the need to communicate not only success stories but also challenges and how to overcome them.

31. The Executive Board approved the 2018 budget proposal as presented by the Secretariat in relation to the three main outputs of the Special Programme (i) management of the Special Programme Trust Fund and providing Secretariat's services to the Executive Board; (ii) technical assistance for the development of project applications and management of approved projects; and (iii) development of communication products, services, and activities to key stakeholders.

(b) Draft resource mobilization strategy

32. The Secretariat presented the draft resource mobilization strategy as requested by the Executive Board at its first meeting and contained in SP/EB.3/6.

33. The Executive Board expressed the need to strengthen the engagement with the private sector and industry. The Executive Board also recognized that the engagement of private sector and industry goes beyond financial contribution but rather direct involvement for specific Special Programme projects.

34. The Executive Board endorsed the draft resource mobilization strategy. The Secretariat agreed to develop an action plan outlining activities and necessary resources to implement the strategy and to report back to the Executive Board on its implementation.

(c) Draft communications strategy

35. The Secretariat and the Communication Division of UN Environment presented the draft communication strategy as requested by the Executive Board at its second meeting contained in SP/EB.3/7.

36. The representative of the Communication Division expressed the importance integrating communication elements such as solid branding identity and communication strategy aiming towards relevant target audience into the goals and objectives of the Special Programme. Such integration would allow the Special Programme to gain more awareness among member states and donors.

37. The Executive Board agreed that the draft communication strategy is comprehensive in nature and that it would guide all Special Programme's communications, public awareness, outreach and events activities through three target audiences: recipient countries, private sector stakeholders, and donors.

38. The Executive Board recognized the need for success stories, good projects, and good applications. The Executive Board stated that the communication strategy would allow the Special Programme to attract well-developed applications and donors in a competitive environment.

39. The Secretariat and the Executive Board emphasized the need for the guidelines to be accessible electronically (through an eLearning tool) and in made available in both French and Spanish to support the application process for developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The revised guidelines should be consistent with the implementation of the relevant MEAs and include a compilation of lessons learned and examples to make it useful. The Secretariat will circulate the revised guidelines to the Executive Board for their review.

40. A proposal on the branding identity of the Special Programme was presented as part of the draft communications strategy as contained in SP/EB.3/7/Add.1. The Executive Board stated its preference to branding option 1: *The Chemicals and Waste Management Fund*. However, the Executive Board expressed the sensitiveness of using the word *Fund* and suggested that the branding identity should be changed to *The Chemicals and Waste Management Programme* which would retain the characteristic of the Special Programme since its inception.

41. The Executive Board endorsed the draft communications strategy with the following comments: i) inclusion of the framing of the Special Programme's work and objectives as the main message to be focus in the communication strategy, ii) broadening of target audience beyond developing countries by including countries with economies in transition, and iii) highlight of the unique mandate of the Special Programme.

42. The Secretariat agreed to take aboard the comments by developing the narrative associated to the communication strategy and branding identity to be presented in early 2018.

VII. Date and venue of the next meeting

43. The Executive Board considered two options for the date and venue of the fourth meeting of the Executive Board. The first option considered is November/December 2018 in Panama City, Panama. The second option considered is for the meeting to be held back to back with the 2nd Conference of Parties of the Minamata Convention on Mercury on November 19-23, 2018 in Geneva, Switzerland.

44. The Secretariat agreed to consult with the co-chairs and communicate the outcome to the Executive Board through electronic means.

VIII. Any other business

45. The Executive Board considered the issue of the date of establishment of the Special Programme. The Executive Board agreed that the Special Programme was established in September 2015 when the Special Programme Trust Fund was also established.

46. The Secretariat presented the proposed timeline for the next rounds of applications and meetings of the Executive Board. The Executive Board agreed that the Secretariat will prepare the terms of reference for the mid-term evaluation to be considered at the fourth meeting of the Executive Board, with a view of the results of the mid-term evaluation being considered and endorsed at the fifth meeting of the Executive Board in February/March 2019. The Executive Board also welcomed the proposed timeline as a realistic timeframe for the Special Programme.

47. The Executive Board agreed to launch the third and fourth round of applications in early 2018 and mid 2019 respectively.

IX. Closure of the meeting

48. The co-chairs of the Executive Board closed the meeting by 6:35 p.m. on 3 December 2017 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 MEMBERS

RECIPIENT COUNTRIES

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
Tel.: +254 (20) 273 08 08
Mbl: +254 720 549 628
E-mail: psoffice@environment.gov.ke

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
Tel.: 389 2 3251 563
E-mail: s.andonova@pops.org.mk,
suzana_andonova@yahoo.com

GRULAC

Mr. Juan Ignacio Simonelli
Waste & Chemical Cluster - Global Liaison
Environmental Control & Monitoring Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable
Development
San Martín 451, Oficina 437, Caba
C1004AAI Ciudad de Buenos Aires
Argentina
Tel.: +54 114 348 84 25
E-mail: jsimonelli@ambiente.gob.ar

LDC

Mr. Ali Abdullah Ahmed Al-Dobhani
General Director
Chemical Safety & Hazardous wastes Department
Al-Zbyri Street, P.O. Box (19719),
Environment Protection Authority (EPA)
Sana'a Republic of Yemen
Tel. : +967-1-207817, +967-711124127
Email: chemicalsafety.ye@gmail.com
baselyemen@gmail.com; alialdobhani@gmail.com

DONORS

EUROPEAN UNION

Ms. Maria Pachta
Policy Officer
Directorate-General for International Cooperation
and Development
European Commission
Rue de la Loi 41
1000 Brussels
Belgium
Tel.: +32 22 29 51 374
E-mail: maria.pachta@ec.europa.eu

FINLAND

Ms. Tuulia Toikka
Ministerial Adviser
Ministry of the Environment
Unit for International and EU Affairs
P.O Box 35, FIN-00023 GOVERNMENT
Finland
Tel: +358 40 552 4054
E-mail: tuulia.toikka@ym.fi

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
Tel.: 49 228 993 052 722
E-mail: Simone.Irsfeld@bmub.bund.de

SWEDEN

Ms. Sofia Tingstorp
Deputy Director
Chemical Unit
Ministry of Environment and Energy
Malmtoorgsgatan 3
10333 Stockholm
Sweden
Tel.: 46 70 580 56 86
E-Mail: sofia.tingstorp@gov.se

OBSERVER GOVERNMENTS

IRAN

Mr Ahmad Ghalandari
Deputy Permanent Representative to UN Environment
& UN-Habitat
Embassy of the Islamic Republic of Iran
Villa Gollestan, L.R. No. 29551,
Lower Kabete Road, P.O. Box 49170-00100
Nairobi
Tel: [0792764801](tel:0792764801)
Email: ahmadghalandari2015@gmail.com

KENYA

Mr. Leonard Tampushi
Senior Env-Officer / Coordinated Stockholm and
SAICM
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
P.O. Box 30521
00100 Nairobi
Kenya
Tel.: 254 729150239
E-mail: tampushi@gmail.com

KUWAIT

Mr Meshal Alsumaiei
Embassy of the State of Kuwait
Tel: 020 2394439
Email: kuwaitembassy@ymail.com

SRI LANKA

Mr. Anura Dissanayake,
Secretary,
Ministry of Mahaweli Development and Environment
and/ or
Ms Anzul Jhan,
Actg. High Commissioner,
Sri Lanka High Commission,
Nairobi
Email: slhckeny@africaonline.co.ke

THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. Reginald Hernaus
Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management,
International Affairs,
Lead Negotiator Chemicals and Wastes,
Visiting address: Rijnstraat 8, 2515 XP, The Hague,
The Netherlands
Mail to: P. O. Box 20901, 2500 EX, The Hague, The
Netherlands
Tel: +31 (0)70 4566485
Email: reggie.hernaus@minienm.nl

BRS, INTERIM MINAMATA AND SAICM SECRETARIATS

BRS SECRETARIAT

Mr. Frank Moser
Programme Officer
Office of the Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm
Conventions
United Nations Environment Programme
Switzerland
Tel.: +41 22 917 89 51
E-mail: frank.moser@brsmeas.org

GEF

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
E-mail: asookdeo@thegef.org

UN ENVIRONMENT

Ms Ligia Noronha
Director
Economy Division, UN Environment
Email: ligia.noronha@un.org

Mr. Tim Kasten
Deputy Director
Economy Division, UN Environment
Email : tim.kasten@un.org

Ms. Tessa Goverse
Subprogramme Coordinator (Chemicals, Waste & Air
Quality)
Economy Division UN Environment
Email: tessa.goverse@un.org

Mr. Abdouraman Bary
Regional Subprogramme Coordinator (Chemicals,
Waste & Air Quality)
Africa Office, UN Environment
E-mail: abdouraman.cary@un.org

MINAMATA SECRETARIAT

Ms. Claudia Ten have PhD
Senior Programme Coordination Officer
Secretariat of the Minamata Convention Chemicals
and Health Branch
Economy Division
United Nations Environment Programme
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 86 38
Email: Claudia.tenHave@un.org

Mr. Naysan Sshba
Director
Communications Division, UN Environment
Email : naysan.sahba@un.org

Ms. Samantha Le Royal
Communications Division, UN Environment
Email: samantha.le-royal@un.org

SPECIAL PROGRAMME SECRETARIAT

Mr. Jacob Duer
Chief
Chemicals and Health Branch, Economy Division
UN Environment
Tel: +41 22 917 8217
E-mail: jacob.duer@un.org

Ms. Nalini Sharma
Programme Management Coordination Officer
Secretariat of the Special Programme
Chemicals and Health Branch, Economy Division
UN Environment
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8343
E-mail: nalini.sharma@un.org

Mr. Juan Caicedo
Programme Management Officer
Secretariat of the Special Programme
Chemicals and Health Branch, Economy Division
UN Environment
Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 917 8191
E-mail: juan.caicedo@un.org

Annex 2: List of applications considered by the Executive Board at their third meeting, 2-3 December 2017, Nairobi, Kenya

AFRICA

Cameroon	Developing a sustainable, integrated, and coherent national programme for the sound management of chemicals and waste in Cameroon
Cote d'Ivoire	Institutional capacity building on the management of hazardous chemicals not covered by the Stockholm and Minamata Conventions
The Gambia	Elimination and environmentally sound disposal of Asbestos in The Gambia
Ghana	Strengthening institutional capacity for the sustainable sound management of chemicals and waste throughout their life-cycle and the effective implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata conventions and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) in Ghana
Kenya	Support to chemicals and waste MEAs and SAICM implementation in Kenya
Nigeria	Strengthening of the legal and institutional infrastructures for the sound management of chemicals (SMC) in Nigeria
Uganda	Strengthening national institutional capacity in sound management of chemicals and waste in Uganda

ASIA PACIFIC

Afghanistan	Enhancing the sustainable institutional capacity to regulate toxic chemicals
Bhutan	Strengthening institutional capacity to address adverse health impacts of chemicals and waste in Bhutan
Cambodia	Institutional strengthening in Cambodia for efficient and coordinated implementation of chemicals and waste management international agreements
China	Strengthening institutional capacity for the implementation of the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions and SAICM
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	Capacity building for the sound management of hazardous industrial waste in Democratic People's Republic of Korea
India	Institutional capacity building for sustainable management of chemicals and waste with special focus on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)
Indonesia	Strategic development of national institutional capacity building of environmentally sound hazardous waste management
Kazakhstan	Strengthening national capacity of the Republic of Kazakhstan in regulating chemicals through fulfilling commitments under multilateral environmental agreements
Kiribati	Strengthening legal systems, institutions and data collection infrastructures in Kiribati
Maldives	Institutional strengthening for sound management of chemicals and hazardous waste in Maldives

Pakistan	Strengthening of national legislation and capacity building of stakeholders for sound chemicals and hazardous waste management in Pakistan
Papua New Guinea	Strengthening the institutional framework and national capacity of key stakeholders in Papua New Guinea in wastes and chemical management
Sri Lanka	Special programme on institutional strengthening for chemicals and waste management in Sri Lanka
Tajikistan	Strengthening institutional capacity for national implementation of the Stockholm and Basel International Conventions and building capacity for accessing the Rotterdam Convention in Tajikistan
Vietnam	Strengthening national capacity in sound chemicals and waste management for the implementation of the Stockholm, Basel, Rotterdam, Minamata Conventions, SAICM in Vietnam

CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

Albania	Improvement of management of obsolete pharmaceutical products in Albania
Belarus	Establish a sustainable national infrastructure to join and support the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention in the Republic of Belarus
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Strengthening institutional capacities for mainstreaming quadruple synergy schemes in implementation of the National Action Plans (NAPs) for implementation of SAICM and inclusion of Minamata convention
Republic of Moldova	Improving sustainable institutional and regulatory framework for chemicals and waste management throughout their lifecycle in the Republic of Moldova
Serbia	Strengthening the synergy between Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions at national level in the Republic of Serbia

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Barbados	Improvement of chemical and pesticide waste management in Barbados with a view to support the implementation of chemicals and waste related Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)
Belize	Institutional strengthening of chemicals unit in Belize
Brazil	Strengthening institutional capacity for sound management of chemicals through the establishment of necessary structure to implement the national legislation on industrial chemicals
Chile	Development and implementation of a computerized management system to update chemical information in Chile under GHS criteria
Cuba	Strengthening the health sector capacities for the identification and management of risks associated to chemicals in Cuba
Ecuador	Strengthening of the national control system for the management of dangerous materials in Ecuador