UNITED
NATIONS

GFCF/EB.3/5

Distr.: General
31 July 2025

English only

UN environment programme | Global Framework on Chemicals

**Executive Board of the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund**
**Third meeting**
Part 1: 19-21 March 2025
International Environment House, Geneva, Switzerland and online
Part 2: 26-28 May 2025
Online

# REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE GLOBAL FRAMEWORK ON CHEMICALS[1] FUND

This meeting report provides a consolidated summary of the two sessions of the third meeting of the Executive Board of the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund, held from 19 to 21 March and from 26 to 28 May 2025. Owing to the high number of eligible applications received, the Executive Board agreed to hold the meeting in two parts to allow sufficient time for a thorough review and decision-making process. This report merges the approved agendas of both sessions; as a result, the order and numbering of agenda items may differ slightly from the original session agendas.

## 1. Opening and welcome

1. The co-chairs of the Executive Board of the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund, Santos Virgilio (Angola) and Ivo de Zwaan (the Netherlands) welcomed the Board members and registered observers to the third meeting of the Executive Board. The presence of online Board members was confirmed, and all Board members were invited to introduce themselves.

2. The Secretariat of the Global Framework on Chemicals introduced new staff members and informed all participants that Special Programme staff would be joining the meetings, as they had supported the GFC Secretariat in the review process for the first round of applications.

## 2. Organizational matters

3. The co-chairs presented the provisional agenda (GFCF/EB.3/1/Rev.1 and GFCF/EB3.2/1) and annotated provisional agenda (GFCF/EB.3/1/Add.1 and GFCF/EB3.2/1/Add.1) that were circulated on 13 March and 21 May 2025, respectively. The co-chairs explained that the primary objective of the meetings was to appraise applications from the first round for approval. It was highlighted that the focus should be on identifying high-quality proposals with strong potential for significant impact, and that the first round would serve as a "pilot", providing an opportunity to test the process. The co-chairs invited Board members and the Secretariat to raise additional points under agenda item 10, any other business. No additional points were raised, and the agenda was adopted.

4. The co-chairs elaborated on organizational matters such as meeting times, meeting language, code of conduct for in-person and online participants and observers, time keeping for interventions, decision-making and conflict of interest. The co-chairs indicated that applications, high-level reviews and appraisals would be available to Board members through OwnCloud, an online filesharing system. The Board members agreed to the proposal for the organization of work of the meeting.

## 3. Adoption of the report of the second meeting of the Executive Board

5. The co-chairs invited comments on the draft report of the second meeting of the Executive Board (GFCF/EB.2/7/Rev.1)[2], which was circulated to the Board members on 3 July 2024 and was uploaded

[1] The Global Framework on Chemicals – For a Planet Free of Harm from Chemicals and Waste (GFC).
[2] Available as document GFCF/EB.2/7/Rev.1

to the website after incorporation of the comments.

6. One Board member requested further edits to the report regarding the staffing and budget of the Fund in relation to paras 1 and 13 of the Terms of Reference. The Secretariat agreed to reflect these edits in a revised version of the report. The Board adopted the report taking note of this comment.

## 4. Update under the first round of applications

7. The Secretariat provided an update on staffing under the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund. It noted the lack of clarity in paragraph A.1 of Annex 1 to the ICCM5 Resolution V/3 on Financial Considerations. This resolution was adopted after the Programme of Work and Budget (resolution V/12) at ICCM5, and as such did not include provisions for staff to support the Executive Board or to carry out the related administrative functions required to make the Fund operational.

8. The co-chairs invited the Board to reflect on any topics discussed during the joint meeting with the Executive Board of the Special Programme, which had taken place on 19 March 2025, immediately before the first session of this meeting. In relation to the discussion on the potential collaboration between the Secretariats of the Special Programme and the Global Framework on Chemicals, one Board member noted the importance of having a clearer understanding of any legal implications, particularly, in terms of governance. The Board member further recommended that this issue be considered by the Open-Ended Working Group and the International Conference. The Secretariat committed to preparing a written document and sharing it with the Board members by email for their information.

9. The Secretariat reported on the current financial situation of the Global Framework on Chemicals Fund, referencing the detailed figures provided in document GFCF/EB.3/2. The Secretariat noted that the contribution from the ICCA originally listed in the document as a pledge from the Berlin Forum, had just been received. As of March 2025, all contributions and pledges amounted to USD 28.7 million (including 13% PSC). The Secretariat highlighted that, while this amount represents a strong initial support to the Fund, continued resource mobilization will be essential to ensure funding sustainability and to cover staff costs over at least a five-year period to enable the implementation of at least two funding rounds and respective project oversight and administrative support.

10. The co-chairs invited the Board to decide on the amount of funding to be committed under the first round. The Secretariat pointed out that, based on its current staffing capacity, it would be able to manage and oversee the implementation of up to 12 projects under the first round. This cap was proposed to ensure that sufficient funds remain available for an equivalent number of projects under the second call for applications. Board members agreed to this indicative cap and to review the proposals in detail before making final decisions on the amount of funding to be disbursed, which would depend on the quality of the proposals. The Board further agreed that all applicants should receive a response and that strong proposals not selected in the first round should be encouraged to resubmit in the second round, provided they are in line with the strategic priorities to be defined by the Board. It was noted that resubmission does not guarantee approval, as the second round will remain an open and competitive process.

## 5. Consideration of eligible and complete applications for the first round

11. This agenda item required much of the time allocated to the third meeting. Its objective was for the Board to present their appraisals of each eligible project and to determine which proposals the Board would approve for funding.

12. Owing to the high number of applications, the Board decided by silence procedure in February to split the eligible and complete applications into two phases: phase 1 included all government applications as well as all regional applications, some of which were submitted by civil society networks. Phase 2 included all other applications. The Board agreed to review 51 phase 1 applications at the first session (19-21 March) and the remaining 29 phase 2 applications at the second session (28-28 May) before making its final decisions.

13. In line with the terms of reference of the Fund, Executive Board members appraised each of the applications in advance of the meeting. To do so, the Board divided its members into groups of 3-4 individuals tasked with appraising around 16 applications per group. In parallel, the Secretariat provided high-level reviews of each application. A detailed listing of applications considered by the Board is provided in annex 2 of this report as well as in document GFCF/EB.3/2 (overview document).

14. The Secretariat kicked off the discussions under agenda item 5 by providing an overview of the applications received under the first round of funding and a breakdown of eligible and ineligible applications. Of the 105 applications, 80 were found to be eligible and complete.

15. To facilitate the Board's review during the meeting, the Secretariat split the 80 applications into batches of approximately 4 to 6 applications each, organized by commonalities such as region and economic status. At the outset of each batch, the Secretariat gave a brief introduction to the applications in the batch. Board members then took the floor to present their appraisals of each application, providing their recommendation to approve or not approve based on key impact factors, including the project's expected result, sustainable outcome, structure, clarity, multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral aspects, duplication with previous projects and of tools already available, and budget.

16. Following each presentation, there was an open discussion among Board members to adopt a final decision. The GFC and Special Programme Secretariats provided additional comments where relevant based on the high-level reviews and Special Programme past or current projects. During the meeting, minor adjustments to some of the batches were made to accommodate Board member availability and meeting dynamics.

17. Projects that the Board did not wish to fund were identified and categorized in red as "not recommended". The discussion was then focused on the remaining projects initially categorized either in yellow as "potentially recommended" or in green as "recommended", with a view to identifying high-quality projects while keeping in mind general budget limitations and the possibility to launch further application rounds. On projects that had strong elements but were not recommended, the Board provided additional feedback to share with the applicants should they wish to re-apply for the second round of funding.

18. Following an intervention by the IOMC representative noting a perceived lack of clarity regarding the eligibility of intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) to apply for funding, the Board asked the Secretariat to reach out to the five IGO applicants and invite them to resubmit their applications through an eligible entity within a specified deadline for consideration at the second session. While the existing guidelines and FAQs indicated that IGOs were not eligible as direct applicants, the Board acknowledged the need to further refine and clarify the eligibility criteria in future guidance documents to avoid similar misunderstandings.

19. The Board took its final decisions in May after reviewing the phase 2 applications. The Secretariat was requested to inform all applicants of the final decisions in June. Following consideration of all the applications submitted, including those carried forward from the first session of the meeting, the Board approved the following two projects from the Latin America and Caribbean region:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Peru, Colombia (Regional)** | Strengthening Industrial Chemicals Management through Regional Cooperation: Action Plans, Legislation, IT Systems, and Capacity Building |
| **El Salvador, Honduras (Regional)** | Strengthening capacities to implement the GHS in El Salvador and Honduras |

20. The Board also conditionally approved the following two projects from the African region:

| | |
|---|---|
| **Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Senegal (Regional)** | Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) in Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea Conakry and Senegal: Analysis of the Situation, Regulations and Possibilities of Elimination and Replacement with Healthy and Sustainable Alternatives for Effective Implementation of the Global Framework on Chemicals and Wastes (GFC). |
| **Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania (Regional)** | Building capacity for the replacement of Highly Hazardous Pesticides with agroecology across Eastern Africa |

## 6. Reflections from the first round of applications and launch of the second round

21. During both sessions of the meeting, Executive Board members were invited to share their reflections on the first round of funding with a view to adaptations for the second round.

22. The Secretariat shared key lessons learned from the first application process, highlighting areas for improvement such as the limited timeframe for submissions, the broad scope of eligible activities, and the need to enhance clarity and streamline the application form. The Secretariat also noted the complexity created by the coexistence of multiple funding mechanisms in the chemicals and waste management space, which may have led to some confusion by applicants.

23. Regarding the application form, some Board members indicated that the recommended percentages per budget category should be revised to be more practical, particularly allowing for greater flexibility to allocate funds to staff and contractual services rather than travel. In addition, the Board called for greater clarity on what is expected from applicants in demonstrating project sustainability. It was recommended that the guidance to applicants be thoroughly reviewed to clearly define project priorities, establish clearer criteria to avoid duplication with other funding mechanisms, and encourage in-country coordination, particularly with the GFC focal points. The revised guidance should also emphasize the importance of multisectoral projects, including those involving the health and labour sectors. Additionally, board members recommended allowing more time to provide feedback to applicants. A suggestion was also made to consider setting different maximum funding amounts for regional than for national projects.

24. On the organization of work, Board members pointed out that it was very challenging to appraise the applications, especially within such a short time, and that the organization of work would need to be reviewed for future rounds. One Board member suggested that the appraisal forms be more streamlined, and the Board concurred that more time was needed for providing appraisals. The Secretariat noted that, compared to other mandates, the Terms of Reference of the Fund have only given the Secretariat a mandate to screen project proposals for eligibility and completeness and to submit screened projects to the Board for appraisal and approval. It proposed that this be discussed at the Open-Ended Working Group and International Conference should the Board wish to modify this approach.

25. Concerning the review of projects, the Board considered the feedback loop that characterised the Special Programme application process, which resulted in more polished applications but relied on heavier Secretariat support and extended the timeline for the review process.

26. Another aspect discussed by Board members was the role of countries in prioritizing project proposals. The Board recommended considering the introduction of a cap on the number of applications that may be submitted by any given country. It was further suggested that submitted proposals should be prioritized by the government of the country hosting the project. While endorsement by the national focal point should remain a requirement, the importance of applicants to show support by other sectors and ministries was stressed. Future rounds should therefore focus on the multi-stakeholder characteristics of the GFC and its Fund and on engaging with health, labour and other relevant stakeholders.

27. In preparation for the second round of applications the Secretariat presented options for consideration by the Executive Board. Considering the experiences under the first funding round, the Board discussed and agreed on the following for the second funding round:

a. The application process will involve the initial submission of a short concept note, to be screened by the Secretariat and presented to the Executive Board for consideration. The Board will then shortlist selected concept notes for further project design and development. Successful applicants from the concept note stage will be invited to submit full project proposals for the Board's final appraisal and potential approval. It should be clearly stated that an approved concept note does not guarantee final project approval by the Board. Rejected concept notes will not be further considered, thereby saving unsuccessful applicants the time and effort required to develop a full project proposal. While this approach will require two meetings of the Executive Board to complete the process, at least one of these meetings may take place online.

b. Members of the Board preferred not to adopt a thematic focus for the second funding round. Given the country-driven nature of the Fund, they preferred to allow applicants to develop projects on a range of potential themes that reflect their national priorities.

c. The Board determined, however, that the application guidance and forms should be revised to provide clearer indications to the applicants as to what the Fund would and would not cover. For example, research activities and investment in technical equipment or infrastructure would not be considered for funding. This would help manage expectations and ensure the submission of more relevant applications.

d. The application forms should also reflect clearer and more condensed criteria for the next round of project appraisals. These criteria should include the sustainability of expected results, stakeholder involvement, project structure and budget reasonability. The Board chose not to adopt a quantitative approach to its appraisals, preferring a qualitive approach using text boxes rather than numbers to assess the degree to which selection criteria are met or not met.

28. Based on the discussions over the two sessions of the meeting, the Executive Board requested the Secretariat to revise the procedures and application packages for the Board's consideration, in preparation for the launch of the second funding round. The Secretariat will develop the revised application package and circulate these to the Board electronically. The revised application package will include an updated timeline for the Board's approval.

## 7. Policy on delays in finalizing implementation arrangements

29. The Executive Board was invited to discuss and adopt the policy for addressing delays in finalizing project implementation arrangements. The Secretariat introduced the draft version of the document, provided in GFCF/EB.3/4. The Board considered a reformulation of paragraph 5 submitted by a Board member regarding timelines for project cancellation in case of avoidable delay in the signature of the agreement. The Secretariat also brought to the attention of the Board that there is currently no policy in place for multi-country projects where a project partner falls out during project implementation. The Board decided that in these cases, the co-chairs would be granted the ability to take intersessional decisions on proposed changes to approved projects.

30. There was an understanding that the policy could be adjusted by the Executive Board as the Fund gains experience in project set-up and implementation. The policy including the proposed changes was circulated to all Board members between the two sessions of the meeting. At the second session, a consensus was reached, and policy was adopted. It is attached to this report (annex 3).

## 8. Update ahead of the Open-Ended Working Group

31. At the first session of the meeting, the Secretariat presented an update on activities related to the Fund to take place at the Open-Ended Working Group in June 2025. An update was delivered within the working document on resolution V/3 (UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/3[3]) as well as an information document (UNEP/GFC/OEWG.1/INF/5[4]) related to the first round of applications, as well as considerations related to the Terms of Reference and Board composition of the Fund and other suggestions to be discussed at the Open-Ended Working Group, for the Board to make a proposal to be adopted by the International Conference at its next session.

32. The Secretariat further presented the Programme of Work and budget that will be submitted to the Open-Ended Working Group, clarifying that funds from vacant posts are being reallocated to support the organization of the meeting. The Secretariat also invited feedback on whether Board members were comfortable with the staffing levels reflected in the budget approved at the second Executive Board meeting for managing the Fund. The Board requested that the document be circulated in writing and comments were provided and included. It was agreed that the proposal could be included in the working documents by the Secretariat, indicating that it remains subject to review by the Executive Board, discussion at the Open-Ended Working Group, and decision-making by the International Conference.

## 9. Next meeting of the Executive Board

33. Following the discussions on the second round of applications (cf. item 6), the Board agreed for the Secretariat to work on a detailed timeline, including the identification of meeting dates. These will then be circulated to the Board members accordingly.

## 10. Any other business

34. The co-chairs asked if there are any points to raise under any other business.

35. No other business was raised.

## 11. Closure of the meeting

36. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the first session of the meeting was closed on Friday 21 March 2025, at 17:00 CET. The second session of the meeting was closed on Wednesday, 28 May 2026 at 16:00 CEST.

[3] Final version available at: https://documents.un.org/doc/undoc/gen/k25/005/56/pdf/k2500556.pdf
[4] Final version available at: https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/47693/UNEP_GFC_OEWG.1_INF_5_GFC_Fund.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

## Annex 1: Meeting participants

**<u>First session – 19 – 21 March 2025</u>**

**Government representatives:**
Santos Virgilio (Angola, Africa), Lamin Jaiteh (The Gambia, Africa), Itsuki Kuroda (Japan, Asia-Pacific), Zaigham Abbas (for Hammad Shamimi, Pakistan, Asia-Pacific), Suzana Andonova (North Macedonia, Central and Eastern Europe), Magdalena Frydrych (Poland, Central and Eastern Europe), Vanessa Aliaga Araujo (Peru, Latin America and the Caribbean), Ivo de Zwaan (The Netherlands, Western Europe and other States), Sverre-Thomas Jahre (Norway, Western Europe and other States).

**Donors and contributors:**
Sandrine Jouan (Belgium), Juergen Helbig (European Union), Laura Niskanen (Finland), Matthias Wolf (Germany), Angeles Jimenez Redondo (Spain), Océane Dayer (Switzerland), Matt Lovatt-Wood (United Kingdom), Emilie Winch (United States of America), Chrysanthi Sofokleous (International Council of Chemical Associations).

**Observers:**
Helges Bandeira (Brazil, co-chair of the Special Programme Executive Board), Frank Moser (BRS Secretariat), Kofi Kankam (Elizka Relief Foundation), Evelyn Swain (Global Environment Facility), Susan Wilburn (Health Care without Harm), Rory O'Neill (International Trade Union Confederation), Lesley Onyon (IOMC), Sara Brosche (IPEN), Maria Irene Rizzo (Minamata Secretariat).

**Unable to participate:**
Hammad Shamimi (Pakistan, Asia-Pacific), Napoleon Garcia (El Salvador, Latin America and Caribbean States), Audun Heggelund (Norway, Western Europe and other States).

---

**<u>Second session – 26 – 28 May 2025</u>**

**Government representatives:**
Santos Virgilio (Angola, Africa), Aisha Humera Ch. (Pakistan, Asia-Pacific), Itsuki Kuroda (Japan, Asia-Pacific), Suzana Andonova (North Macedonia, Central and Eastern Europe), Magdalena Frydrych (Poland, Central and Eastern Europe), Napoleon Garcia (El Salvador, Latin America and Caribbean States), Vanessa Aliaga Araujo (Peru, Latin America and the Caribbean), Ivo de Zwaan (The Netherlands, Western Europe and other States).

**Donors and contributors:**
Sandrine Jouan (Belgium), Nathalie Buijs (Belgium, alternate), Juergen Helbig (European Commission), Peter Korytar (European Commission), Laura Niskanen (Finland), Matthias Wolf (Germany), Angeles Jimenez Redondo (Spain), Santiago Candela (Spain, alternate), Océane Dayer (Switzerland), Helena Richards (United Kingdom, alternate), Emilie Winch (United States of America), Chrysanthi Sofokleous (International Council of Chemical Associations).

**Observers:**
Oliver Wootton (IOMC), Jorge Ocana (IOMC), Lesley Onyon (IOMC).

**Unable to participate:**
Lamin Jaiteh (The Gambia, Africa), Audun Heggelund (Norway, Western Europe and other States).

---

## Annex 2: Overview of eligible and complete applications considered by the Board

**Africa**

| | Country | Country Status | Project Title |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Burundi | Least Developed Country | Capacity Building on Security and Safety in the Management of Chemical Products and Waste in Burundi |
| 2 | Cameroon (1) | Developing Economy | Promote Good Environmental Practices in Pesticide and Post-Consumer Pesticide Packaging Management in Cameroon. |
| 3 | Cameroon (2) | Developing Economy | Establishing a circular economy framework for the plastics sector in Cameroon |
| 4 | Cameroon (3) | Developing Economy | Integrating The Informal Sector for Sustainable E-Waste Management in Cameroon |
| 5 | Côte d'Ivoire | Developing Economy | Sustainable and climate-compatible management of health and environmental risks linked to the multiple uses of cyanide and mercury in Côte d'Ivoire |
| 6 | Eritrea | Least Developed Country | Enhance Human health and environment through effective chemicals management |
| 7 | Eswatini | Developing Economy | Eswatini Hazardous Chemicals Management Project: Building Capacity, Infrastructure and International Partnerships for Safe Disposal |
| 8 | Ethiopia (1) | Least Developed Country | Strengthening the Regulatory Framework and Enhancing Institutional Capacity for the Environmentally Sound Management of Chemical and Waste in Ethiopia |
| 9 | Gabon | Developing Economy | Support For Integrated and Ecological Management of Chemicals and Hazardous Waste in Gabon |
| 10 | Ghana | Developing Economy | Enhancing Ghana's capacity for life cycle management of industrial chemicals and waste to protect human health, the environment, and strengthen compliance with related Multi-Lateral Agreements on Chemicals and waste. |
| 11 | Kenya (1) | Developing Economy | Strengthening Institutional Legislations and Mechanisms for Sustainable Management and Waste Minimization |
| 12 | Kenya (3) | Developing Economy | Catalyzing Local Environmental Action Networks to Reduce Harmful Exposure to Chemicals and Waste, Strengthen Policy Accountability, And Ensure Long-Term Health and Environmental Sustainability In Kenya |
| 13 | Malawi | Least Developed Country | Strengthening Chemical Safety Management Systems Through Community-Based Monitoring and Sustainable Governance in Dowa District, Malawi |
| 14 | Mauritania | Least Developed Country | Sustainable management of chemical and hazardous waste in Mauritania |
| 15 | Nigeria (1) | Developing Economy | Building on Progress: Accelerating Multi-Stakeholder Efforts to Address Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) in Nigeria |
| 16 | Nigeria (2) | Developing Economy | From Waste to Wealth (FWW): Sustainable Chemicals Management for A Greener Tomorrow |
| 17 | Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea, Senegal) | Least Developed Country | Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs) In Benin, Burkina Faso, Guinea Conakry and Senegal: Analysis of The Situation, Regulations and Possibilities of Elimination And Replacement With Healthy and Sustainable Alternatives for Effective Implementation of the Global Framework On Chemicals and Wastes (GFC) |
| 18 | Regional (Cameroon, Togo, Benin) | Least Developed Country | Strengthening community voices: Knowledge exchange and innovation for inclusive decision-making for the sound management of chemicals in Africa |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya and Tanzania) | Least Developed Country | Building capacity for the replacement of Highly Hazardous Pesticides with agroecology across Eastern Africa |
| 20 | Regional (Nigeria, Kenya) | Developing Economy | Gender-Responsive Green Skills in E-waste Processing in Nigeria and Kenya for Environmental and Health Sustainability (Green Skills for Girls in E-Waste) |
| 21 | Regional (Togo, Mali, Senegal) | Least Developed Country | Environmentally sound management of hazardous chemicals through legislative improvements and a sustainable training program in Togo, Mali and Senegal |
| 22 | Rwanda | Least Developed Country | Strengthening Rwanda's capacity to achieve strategic goals and objectives under Global Framework on Chemicals |
| 23 | Senegal | Least Developed Country | Combating Persistent Organic Pollutants in Plastic Items (POPIT) |
| 24 | Sierra Leone (1) | Least Developed Country | Promoting Innovative Solutions on Effective Plastic Waste Management in Sierra Leone |
| 25 | Sierra Leone (2) | Least Developed Country | Promoting the Sound Management of Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) and Hazardous Waste |
| 26 | Somalia (1) | Least Developed Country | Developing Somalia’s National Solid Waste Management Policy: Strengthening Governance for Sustainable Waste and Chemicals Management |
| 27 | Somalia (2) | Least Developed Country | Strengthening Chemicals and Plastic Pollution Management and Response in Somalia: Through Sustainable Solutions for a Healthy Marine Environment in Somalia. |
| 28 | South Africa (4) | Developing Economy | Phasing out HHPs and strengthening the implementation of GHS in South Africa and the SADC Region |
| 29 | South Sudan | Least Developed Country | Comprehensive Hazardous Chemicals Environmental Monitoring and Waste Assessment Technology for Control and Health In South Sudan (CHCEMWATCH) |
| 30 | Tanzania (1) | Least Developed Country | Strengthening National Capacity for Sound Management of Chemicals and Waste in Tanzania |
| 31 | Tanzania (3) | Least Developed Country | Enabling Workers, Trade Union Leaders and Traditional Medicine Practitioners Minimize And/Or Eliminate the Use of Highly Hazardous Pesticides (HHPs), Unregistered and Banned Pesticides In Plantations And In The Traditional Medicine Sectors |
| 32 | Uganda (1) | Least Developed Country | Strengthening the Management of Chemicals and Associated Wastes in secondary schools in Uganda |
| 33 | Uganda (2) | Least Developed Country | Strengthening Uganda’s National Regulatory Capacity for Safe and Sustainable Chemicals Management in Research, Teaching and Commercial laboratory |

**Asia-Pacific**

| | **Country** | **Country Status** | **Project Title** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Bangladesh (1) | Least Developed Country | Systemic Readiness for Implementation of Globally Harmonized System (GHS) For Classification and Labelling of Chemicals in Bangladesh |
| 2 | Bangladesh (2) | Least Developed Country | Enhancing Multi-Stakeholder Partnership and Actions by Advancing the GFC Towards Minimization of Adverse Impacts from Harmful Chemicals and Waste In Bangladesh, Towards Regional Replication |
| 3 | Cambodia | Least Developed Country | Developing Cost-Effective On-Site Solutions for Laboratory Chemical Waste Management: A Replicable Model for Educational Institutions |
| 4 | China | Developing Economy | Capacity-building for the implementation of the Global Framework on Chemicals in environmental sector in China |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | India (2) | Developing Economy | Responsible Policy Initiative – Voluntary GHS Adoption by Indian Chemical Companies |
| 6 | Indonesia (2) | Developing Economy | Scaling Circular Waste Management Solutions to Reduce Environmental and Human Health Impacts from Chemicals and Waste In Badung Regency |
| 7 | Indonesia (3) | Developing Economy | Development Of a Topic Standard for Pollution to Support Indonesia's Pollution Control Initiatives |
| 8 | Iran (2) | Developing Economy | Protecting Persian Gulf Biodiversity in Nayband Bay through Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening |
| 9 | Iran (3) | Developing Economy | Strengthening the National Capacity for the Environmentally Sound Management of Industrial Wastes in Iran's Oil, Gas, and Petrochemical Facilities (Case Study: Pars Special Economic Energy Zone) |
| 10 | Jordan | Developing Economy | Sustainable Management of chemicals in Industrial sector |
| 11 | Kyrgyzstan (1) | Country with Economy in Transition | Protecting The Environment and Human Health in Kyrgyzstan by Minimising Harm from Chemicals and Waste |
| 12 | Malaysia | Developing Economy | Strengthening Chemical and Waste Management through Port Reception Facilities (PRF) Towards IMO MARPOL Annex V and Circular Economy Compliance in Malaysia |
| 13 | Maldives | Small Island Developing State | Chemicals Management Advancement Programme (C-MAP) in the Maldives |
| 14 | Nepal | Least Developed Country | Reducing Chemical Footprint in Farming System in Municipalities of Two Highly Affected Districts of Nepal |
| 15 | Pakistan (1) | Developing Economy | Promoting Safe Disposal of Pharmaceutical Waste and Mitigation of Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) In Pakistan |
| 16 | Pakistan (2) | Developing Economy | Strengthening Governance for Chemical Management and Developing Chemical Data Collection and Management in Pakistan |
| 17 | Regional (Vietnam & another country) | Developing Economy | Development of an Implementation Programme for the electronics industry sector and immediate implementation actions |
| 18 | Sri Lanka (1) | Developing Economy | Safe And Sustainable Chemical Management in Sri Lanka: Ground-Level Interventions and Capacity Building |
| 19 | Sri Lanka (2) | Developing Economy | Development of the first-ever pharmaceutical pollution monitoring and drug take-back system in Sri Lanka |
| 20 | Sri Lanka (3) | Developing Economy | Onsite Sodium Hypochlorite Generators in Small Scale Water Treatment Plants |
| 21 | Sri Lanka (4) | Developing Economy | Strengthening Groundwater Protection and Recharge Through Sustainable Chemical Management in Tube Wells in Puttalam Water Supply Scheme in Northwestern Province And Pothuvil Water Supply System In Eastern Province Sri Lanka. |
| 22 | Sri Lanka (5) | Developing Economy | Use Of Distillery Waste as Cattle Feeds |
| 23 | Sri Lanka (6) | Developing Economy | Towards A Toxic-Free Future: Utilizing Tea and Rubber Industrial Waste for Batik Wastewater Remediation (TREAT Batik) |
| 24 | Tajikistan | Country with Economy in Transition | Digital Integrated Lifecycle Management of Chemicals and Waste: Improvement of the Legal and Institutional Framework |
| 25 | Türkiye | Developing Economy | Advancing Sustainable Viticulture in Türkiye By Reducing Chemical Pesticides Through Local Production, Integrated Pest Management, And Non-Chemical Alternatives |
| 26 | Uzbekistan (1) | Country with Economy in Transition | From Challenges to Change: Advancing Chemical and Waste Management for Uzbekistan's sustainable development |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 27 | Viet Nam (1) | Developing Economy | Enhancing the foundational capabilities towards the sustainable development of the chemical industry in Vietnam according to the directions and goals of GFC |
| 28 | Viet Nam (2) | Developing Economy | Strengthening the national capacity on integrated management of hazardous chemicals in the plastic product value chain in Vietnam towards sustainable development |

**Central and Eastern Europe**

| | Country | Country Status | Project Title |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Country with Economy in Transition | Strengthening Chemical Management and Environmental Health in Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| 2 | Moldova | Country with Economy in Transition | Strengthening Chemicals Compliance and Trade Opportunities In The Republic Of Moldova |
| 3 | Montenegro | Country with Economy in Transition | Establishment of a National Poison Control Centre in Montenegro as a Core of Chemical Safety |
| 4 | North Macedonia | Country with Economy in Transition | Development of a National plan of action for enhancing legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms and capacities to support and achieve the safe and sustainable management of chemicals throughout their life cycle with regional component focused on use of chemicals in the agricultural sector |
| 5 | Regional (Albania, North Macedonia) | Country with Economy in Transition | Addressing Forever Chemicals in the Western-Balkan region - multisector coalitions developing effective and inclusive good practices for reduction and substitution of harmful chemicals and waste |
| 6 | Serbia | Country with Economy in Transition | Building capacities for Identification, prioritization and risk management related to key issues of importance for the GFC in Serbia |
| 7 | Ukraine (1) | Country with Economy in Transition | Combatting Ukraine's Illegal Trade in Pesticide |
| 8 | Ukraine (2) | Country with Economy in Transition | Sustainable Wastewater Solutions: Modernizing Of Sewage Treatment Plants Infrastructure in Rava-Ruska for Cleaner Waterways And Healthier Communities |

**Latin America and the Caribbean**

| | Country | Country status | Project Title |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Belize | Small Island Developing State | From Policy to Action: Transforming Chemicals Management in Belize by Strengthening National Capacities for Sustainable Development and Environmental Protection |
| 2 | Brazil | Developing Economy | Tools for the Proper Management of Chemical Substances in Brazil |
| 3 | Chile | Developing Economy | Strengthening of National Institutions for the Control of Illicit traffic of Chemicals |
| 4 | Ecuador | Developing Economy | Diagnosis and development of an action plan for the management of chemicals to harmonize criteria in Ecuador and promote best practices. |
| 5 | Guatemala | Developing Economy | Transition From Chemical to Organic Agriculture And The Return Of Themayan People's Agricultural Knowledge And Practices |
| 6 | Paraguay | Developing Economy | Strengthening National Capacities for the Sound Management of Industrial Chemicals in Paraguay |
| 7 | Regional 1 (Argentina, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, | Developing Economy | "Textile Think Tank": Regional Multi-country Project to address chemical pollution from textiles including innovation, sustainable by design and circular economy strategies. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Uruguay) | | |
| 8 | Regional 2 (El Salvador, Honduras) | Developing Economy | Strengthening capacities to implement the GHS in El Salvador and Honduras |
| 9 | Regional 3 (Peru, Colombia) | Developing Economy | Strengthening Industrial Chemicals Management through Regional Cooperation: Action Plans, Legislation, IT Systems, and Capacity Building |
| 10 | Saint Kitts and Nevis | Small Island Developing State | Saint Kitts and Nevis Solid Waste Infrastructure Framework and Training (S.W.I.F.T) |

**Multi-country project across three regions**

| | **Country** | **Country Status** | **Project Title** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regional (Colombia, Viet Nam, Kenya) | Developing Economy | Developing an Environmental Impact Assessment Tool to Facilitate Global Adoption of Biopesticides |

## Annex 3: Policy on delays in finalizing implementation arrangements

1. All newly approved projects should aim to have the appropriate project agreements signed within six months of approval by the Board.

2. In cases where the signature of the agreement was delayed beyond six months, the Secretariat would report to the co-chairs, identifying the reasons for the delay if known. The Secretariat would continue to work towards signature of the agreement, taking into account any advice provided by the co-chairs of the Executive Board, and while providing appropriate support and taking into account the capacity available within the recipient country.

3. Where more than 9 months had passed from approval by the Board without the implementation arrangements being finalized:

    a. The Secretariat would inform the recipient and/or implementing entity that failure to finalize the implementation arrangements within a reasonable period of time (ideally no longer than three months from the date of the notification) placed the project at risk of being cancelled.

    b. The Secretariat would inform the co-chairs of the delay and of the reasons for the delay, if known.

4. If it appeared that the delay was outside of the control of the recipient country or was unavoidable (e.g. force majeure), the co-chairs might instruct the Secretariat to continue working with the country to finalize the arrangements. Depending on the situation, it might be necessary to revisit the implementation arrangements to ensure that the project could indeed be implemented successfully; this might require approval of the Executive Board (e.g. for changes to implementing entities or approved activities). In such cases, the Executive Board might wish to make use of a silence procedure during the inter-sessional period, which would allow for proposed decisions to be circulated electronically and adopted on a no-objection basis.

5. Where it appeared that the delay was avoidable or where the recipient country or applicant had not been responsive on the matter, the project will be cancelled twelve months after approval by the Board, unless the recipient country submits a letter explaining the delay and requesting a decision by the Executive Board. The Executive Board might, either at its next meeting or through the silence procedure, take a decision to cancel the project or to provide the applicant a maximum of six additional months to finalize implementation arrangements, before the project is automatically cancelled. The funds earmarked for the project would then become available to support future applications under the Fund.

6. The approach adopted by the Executive Board would be spelled out clearly in the communication sent to applicant countries informing them of the approval of the projects by the Executive Board. The Secretariat would monitor progress on this issue going forward and provide updates to the Board at future meetings and would engage as needed with the co-chairs on each specific case.