



SC

UNEP/POPS/COP.4/25

Distr.: General
30 January 2009



Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Original: English

**Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants**
Fourth meeting
Geneva, 4–8 May 2009
Item 5 (h) of the provisional agenda*
**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference
of the Parties: financial resources**

Report of the Global Environment Facility to the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention**

Note by the Secretariat

As referred to in paragraph 6 of document UNEP/POPS/COP.4/24, set out in the annex to the present note is the report of the Global Environment Facility to the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention. The report has been reproduced without formal editing by the Secretariat.

* UNEP/POPS/COP.4/1.

** Mandate for the action described in the present note contained in: Stockholm Convention, Articles 13 and 14; reports of the Conference of the Parties on the work of its first meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.1/31), annex I, decisions SC-1/9 and SC-1/11; on the work of its second meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.2/30), annex I, decision SC-2/11; and on the work of its third meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.3/30) annex I, decision SC-3/13.

K0950358 140309

<p>For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.</p>



Global Environment Facility

February 10, 2009

REPORT OF THE GEF TO THE FOURTH MEETING OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON
PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) describes GEF activities during the period from January 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008 in response to Convention guidance.

The report highlights the various steps recently undertaken by the GEF to improve its effectiveness, in particular: the simplifications to the project cycle introduced to reduce project preparation time; and the process of regular review and update of the focal area strategies, including POPs, to ensure relevance and responsiveness to country needs. The report also provides an overview of the main monitoring and evaluation activities during the reporting period.

As of October 31, 2008, the GEF had committed US\$ 360 million to projects in the POPs focal area since adoption of the Stockholm Convention in May 2001. This cumulative GEF POPs allocation had leveraged some US\$ 440 million in co-financing to bring the total value of the GEF POPs portfolio to US\$ 800 million. During the reporting period, January 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008, 38 new project activities were approved, totalling US\$ 143.1 million and leveraging co-financing commitments of US\$ 280.5 million.

The emphasis under the GEF-4 strategy for POPs is on implementation, with the GEF supporting projects submitted by partner countries to implement their NIPs. A large number of countries have now developed their initial NIP and the demand for GEF funding in that area is growing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Consultations with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention

II. SIMPLIFICATION OF GEF PROJECT PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

The Project Cycle

Awareness-Raising on GEF Programs and Procedures

Conflict Resolution

III. GEF-4 STRATEGY FOR PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS

Support to Activities Relevant to the Sound Management of Chemicals

IV. PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN THE POPs FOCAL AREA

Projects Approved (January 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008)

Project Preparation Activities

Progress in the NIP Program

Expected activities to the remainder of GEF-4, 30 June 2010

Some Challenges with Implementation

Portfolio Highlights and Response to Convention Guidance

Effectiveness evaluation

Best Available Techniques / Best Environmental Practices

DDT

The Small Grants Program

Analysis of co-financing in POPs projects

Update on Incremental Costs

V. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

POPs Focal Area Tracking Tool

Annual Monitoring Review

Mid-term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework

GEF Annual Performance Report

VI. THE FIFTH GEF REPLENISHMENT

VII. OUTLOOK

ANNEX A: REPORTS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED BY THE GEF TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION

ANNEX B: SYNTHESIS OF PROJECTS APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

ANNEX C: LIST OF PROJECTS (EXCLUDING NIPs) APPROVED SINCE ADOPTION OF THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION

ANNEX D: LIST OF COUNTRIES RECEIVING GEF FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR INITIAL NIP

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
APR	Annual Project Review
BAT/BEP	Best Available Techniques / Best Environmental Practices
COP	Conference of the Parties
CSP	(GEF) Country Support Program
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSP	Full-sized Project
GEF	Global Environment Facility
LDCs	Least Developed Countries
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSP	Medium-sized Project
NDI	(GEF) National Dialogue Initiative
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIP	National Implementation Plan (for the Stockholm Convention)
SGP	Small Grants Program
PIF	Project Identification Form
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
RAF	Resource Allocation Framework
SIDS	Small Islands Developing States
SP	(GEF) Strategic Program
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (to the GEF)
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report has been prepared by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). It covers the period from January 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008. The report describes GEF activities in the area covered by the Convention during this period and provides responses to Convention guidance, particularly GEF-related decisions from the third session of the COP. The report complements previous reports of the GEF to the Conference of the Parties (see Annex A).

2. The Parties are also referred to the *GEF Annual Report 2006-2007* which will be available at the 4th Session of the COP. This report and other recent GEF publications and documents are available on the GEF website (www.theGEF.org), including *GEF engagement in the Mediterranean Region*, *Mainstreaming gender at the GEF*, and *GEF global action on Persistent Organic Pollutants*. Publications of the Independent Office of Evaluation of the GEF are available on the GEF website under "Evaluation Office \ Publications", including the *Annual Performance Report*.

Consultations with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention

3. Pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding between the COP and the Council of the GEF, the cooperation with the Stockholm Convention Secretariat that has been taking place since adoption of the Convention has continued. The Stockholm Convention Secretariat participates in all Council meetings and addressed the GEF Council a number of times. The Secretariat is regularly invited to comment on all project proposals before they are approved by the GEF, and on the development of the POPs focal area. Specifically, the Stockholm Secretariat was a member of the Technical Advisory Group set up by the GEF CEO to review and revise the GEF POPs focal area strategy, as well as the strategies for ozone layer depletion and for addressing the cross-cutting issue of sound chemicals management. The Secretariat will similarly be a partner in this work for the elaboration of the GEF-5 strategies. In addition the Stockholm Secretariat is a regular participant to the GEF POPs task force¹.

II. SIMPLIFICATION OF GEF PROJECT PROCEDURES AND PROCESSES

4. Since taking office in August 2006 as the CEO and Chairperson of the GEF, Ms. Monique Barbut has embarked on a series of initiatives to enhance the effectiveness of the GEF and to implement the policy recommendations of the fourth replenishment. To implement the CEO's vision of a GEF that is *strategic, innovative, equitable, accessible, and focused*, the GEF has introduced a range of specific actions, including:

- Reformulating the focal area strategies, including that for POPs;
- Introducing a new project cycle that limits the time a proposal may take to move from concept approval to endorsement of the full project document to no more than 22 months;
- Leveling the playing field between GEF Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies by abolishing corporate budgets for Implementing Agencies as of Fiscal Year

¹ The GEF POPs Task Force includes representatives from the GEF Agencies, Stockholm Convention Secretariat, and Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP).

2008 and increasing project cycle management fees from 9% to 10% for all GEF Agencies;

- Ensuring that GEF Agencies work according to their comparative advantage so as to be able to deliver the required services to recipient countries;
- Creating avenues for direct dialogue between countries and the GEF Secretariat, as well as an official position in the Office of the CEO specifically to ensure that country concerns are responded to;
- Enhancing the effectiveness of corporate programs, such as the National Dialogue Initiative, Country Support Program, and Small Grants Program; and
- Strengthening the GEF corporate image and public communications and overhauling the data management system and the website.

The Project Cycle

5. Streamlining GEF project procedures and process is one of the key elements of the GEF-4 reform agenda. To this end, a new project cycle² was approved by the GEF Council in June 2007 with the objective of processing a proposal from concept approval to CEO endorsement in less than 22 months without compromising project quality or undermining financial accountability. The new project cycle consists of the following steps:

- Council approval of the work program, consisting of project concepts (Project Identification Forms – or “PIFs”) cleared by the CEO;
- CEO endorsement following Council review of fully prepared projects; and
- Secretariat monitoring of portfolio performance during implementation, and evaluation oversight of the GEF Evaluation Office.

6. Besides reducing the number of steps in the project cycle, there is an on-going effort to limit documentation requirements at each steps of the project cycle, to the extent possible, and to shift the focus therefore from formal documentation requirements at time of approval to monitoring during project implementation and evaluation. For example with dropping the requirement for a full incremental costs analysis.

Awareness-Raising on GEF Programs and Procedures

7. A variety of mechanisms have been put in place to support recipient countries in their engagement with the GEF including sub-regional workshops, the National Dialogue Initiative (NDI), the Country Support Program (CSP), and the Council Member Support Program. The changes brought forth by the new policy and process reforms introduced in 2006 to streamline and enhance the effectiveness of GEF programming have necessitated enhanced dialogue between recipient countries and the GEF Secretariat.

8. GEF sub-regional workshops were held, including for: Eastern and Central Europe in March 2007 and April 2008; East and South East Asia in April 2007, and Asia in May 2008; East and South Africa, and West and Central Africa in May 2007 and in June 2008; Latin America in October 2007 and October 2008; the Caribbean in October 2007 and July 2008; the Pacific in September 2007; and South Asia, Middle East and North Africa in December 2007 and November 2008. Details of the GEF Country Support Program and summaries of the sub-regional consultations can be found at www.gefcountrysupport.org/report. The CSP has developed a web-

² The GEF Project Cycle document is available at http://thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=17634

based dynamic and interactive Knowledge Facility for GEF focal points. The CSP also supports twice yearly constituency meetings at which the GEF Secretariat and the GEF agencies provide information to raise awareness on GEF programs and procedures and respond to concerns from focal points.

9. In addition, the National Dialogue Initiative held fifteen national workshops during the reporting period. To increase their usefulness, future NDIs will put emphasis on support to on-going and long-term processes rather than being perceived as a stand-alone event. GEF focal points will be encouraged to take stock of national strategies, experiences, commitments, and concerns related to global environmental issues during the dialogue preparation phase, and plan for follow-up actions to be taken after the dialogue.

10. The GEF Council approved in November 2007 a Communications and Outreach Strategy to strengthen GEF's corporate image and public communications so that the GEF can better leverage its funding, partnerships, and knowledge, and contribute to building broad support for action on the global environment. The strategy also places a renewed emphasis on ensuring that maximum use is made of the potential for GEF projects to raise public awareness and share information regarding activities to reduce exposure to, and releases of, POPs.

Conflict Resolution

11. During the reporting period, the position of *Conflict Resolution Commissioner* was created within the GEF Secretariat. The commissioner³ is an independent voice who reports directly to the CEO and works together with member countries and agencies to help resolve disputes and address complaints and other issues of importance to GEF operations. Complaints usually emanate from various sources. They can come from a contract dispute, lack of communication, the perception or wrong doing, genuine concerns or a simple miscommunication. Regardless of their causes, they have potential negative impacts on GEF performance and the Conflict Resolution Commissioner can help bring a timely settlement. Parties wishing to launch a complaint or ask for dispute settlement are encouraged to send a formal request in the form of a letter or an e-mail.

III. GEF-4 STRATEGY FOR PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS

12. The GEF Council approved the POPs focal area strategy⁴ for POPs in September 2007. The focal area strategies and associated strategic programs replace the operational programs of the past, and in particular Operational Program # 14 on POPs. The POPs focal area strategy was elaborated with the support of a Technical Advisory Group comprising independent experts and representatives of the GEF's Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel and of the Convention Secretariat, with extensive consultations with GEF Council members and other stakeholders. The focal area strategies are to be kept up to date for focus on impact, responsiveness to country needs and Convention guidance, and evolving knowledge and scientific and technological developments. The process of developing the GEF-5 strategy is being launched and this work will continue throughout 2009 in parallel to the replenishment discussions. As previously, the technical and policy input of the Stockholm Secretariat will be crucial for the quality of the output and to help ensure that COP guidance is fully reflected in these strategies.

³ Mr. Sekou Toure, Conflict Resolution Commissioner, Global Environment Facility, MSN G 6-602, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20433-002; Tel: +1 202 458-4059; Fax: +1 202 212 9553; Email: Stoure1@theGEF.org

⁴ Available at <http://www.thegef.org/interior.aspx?id=84> (in languages)

13. The GEF-4 strategy is rooted in COP guidance and incorporates the guidance received to date developed by the COP at its first, second, and third meetings; it seeks to support GEF eligible countries in their effort to achieve the Convention's objective to protect human health and the environment from POPs. The Strategy outlines a long-term objective, and associated impacts and related indicators, *"to assist eligible partner countries to implement their obligations under the Stockholm Convention and to achieve the purposes of the Convention, including to reduce and eliminate production, use, and releases of POPs"*.

14. Three Strategic Programs are defined for the GEF-4 period, with their associated outcomes and related indicators:

- Strengthening capacities for National Implementation Plan (NIP) implementation, including assisting those countries that lag farthest behind to establish basic, foundational capacities for sound management of chemicals;
- Partnering in investments needed for NIP implementation to achieve impacts in POPs reduction and elimination;
- Partnering in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies and best practices for POPs reduction and substitution.

Support to Activities Relevant to the Sound Management of Chemicals

15. The strategy directly answers the requests from COP-3 to *"give special consideration to support those activities identified as priorities in NIPs which promote capacity-building in sound chemicals management, so as to enhance synergies in the implementation of different multilateral agreements and further strengthen the links between environment and development objectives"* by establishing that GEF support to capacity strengthening for NIP implementation should *"build upon and contribute to strengthening a country's foundational capacities for sound management of chemicals more generally"*. The strategy further notes that *"cooperation and coordination will be encouraged to enhance synergies with countries' responses to related multilateral environmental agreements addressing chemicals issues"*.

16. This element is also taken up with the cross-cutting sound chemicals management framework strategy also adopted by Council in September 2007, through its Program: *Articulating the chemicals-related interventions supported by the GEF within countries' frameworks for chemicals management*. The cross-cutting strategy also seeks to promote the integration of sound chemicals management practices in the projects in the focal areas of biodiversity, climate change, international waters, and land degradation.

IV. PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN THE POPs FOCAL AREA

17. The GEF, as the principal entity entrusted with the operations of the financial mechanism of the Stockholm Convention, on an interim basis, provides financing to country-driven projects according to guidance approved by the Conference of the Parties on policy, strategy, program priorities, and eligibility. GEF-financed projects are developed, implemented, and evaluated with the support of ten Agencies: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), World Bank (WB), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), African Development Bank (AfDB), Asian Development Bank (ADB), European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), and International Fund for

Agriculture Development (IFAD). Information on all GEF projects is available at the GEF website under⁵ “Projects\Project Database”.

18. By the end of the reporting period, October 31, 2008, the GEF had committed US\$ 360 million to projects in the POPs focal area⁶. This cumulative GEF POPs allocation had leveraged some US\$ 440 million in co-financing to bring the total value of the GEF POPs portfolio to US\$ 800 million.

19. In addition, it should be noted that GEF resources provided through other focal areas (biological diversity, climate change, land degradation, ozone layer depletion, and international waters) can have cross-cutting benefits supportive of the objectives of the Stockholm Convention on POPs through the development of human resources and institutions, or can be directly supportive of activities broadly related to POPs issues, such as integrated pest management or addressing land-based sources of pollution⁷.

Projects Approved (January 1, 2007 to October 31, 2008)

20. In the reporting period, 33 projects were approved by the GEF in the POPs focal area, in addition to a number of project preparation grants (PPG). Table 1 provides a breakdown of these projects by project type. Tables 2– 5 provide more detailed information for each project, while Annex B includes a summary of the objectives and activities of each full-sized and medium-sized project approved during the reporting period. All projects approved since adoption of the Stockholm Convention are listed in Annex C.

21. As indicated in Table 1, the GEF allocation during the reporting period in the area of POPs was US\$ 143.1 million in financing out of total project costs of over US\$ 423 million. Over US\$ 280 million was leveraged in co-financing for project activities from the recipient countries, GEF agencies, bilateral partners, and the non-governmental and private sectors.

Table 1: Projects approved in the POPs focal area, 1 January 2007 to 31 October 2008

Type of activity	Number of activities	GEF financing* (US\$ millions)	Co-financing (US\$ millions)	Total financing (US\$ millions)
Full-sized projects	22	129.4	263.2	392.6
Medium-sized projects	11	11.5	16.8	28.3
Enabling activities (NIPs) expedited processing	5	2.2	0.5	2.7
Total	38	143.1	280.5	423.6

* Including Agency fee

⁵ Or directly at <http://gefonline.org/home.cfm>

⁶ US\$ 300 million were allocated to POPs under GEF-4 (July 2006- June 2010).

⁷ For example with recently approved projects: in the Land Degradation focal area “Peru: Promoting Sustainable Land Management in Las Bambas” that will, *inter alia*, reduce excessive uses of agrochemicals; in the Biodiversity focal area “Bosnia-Herzegovina: Mainstreaming Karst Peatlands Conservation Concerns into Key Economic Sectors; or in the International Waters focal area “Implementing Sustainable Integrated Water Resource and Wastewater Management in the Pacific Island Countries”.

22. In January 2009, with eighteen months left in the GEF-4 replenishment period, approximately 60% of resources under the POPs focal area had been programmed for projects in eligible countries. By way of comparison, the figure is more than 70% and 80% for the International Waters and Land Degradation focal areas, respectively, and is around 50% for the Biodiversity and Climate Change focal areas. The *Mid-term review of the GEF Resource Allocation Framework*⁸ prepared by the GEF Evaluation Office and discussed by the GEF Council at its November 2008 meeting had noted that “the resource utilization is higher in the non-RAF focal areas”. The lower figures for the RAF focal areas of Biodiversity and Climate Change can be explained in part by the requirement that commitments made to a country during the first half of a replenishment period should not exceed 50 percent of the indicative allocations of the country. This is however not the only determinant of resource utilization for a focal area and the *Mid-term review* further notes that utilization rates have also been influenced by other factors. In response, the Council at its November 2008 meeting “requested the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF agencies and STAP and other stakeholders, to present steps to improve RAF design”.

23. Table 4 lists the full-sized projects and Table 5 the medium-sized projects approved during the reporting period. All but four of these projects received preparation funding from the GEF. The projects address a number of Stockholm Convention implementation priorities, including PCBs management and disposal, alternatives to DDT for disease vector control, and demonstration of BAT/BEP to reduce releases of dioxins and furans.

24. Table 3 lists the five new enabling activity projects (for the development of NIPs) approved during the reporting period under expedited procedures. Annex D lists all the countries receiving GEF funding for the development of their initial NIP.

Project Preparation Activities

25. As a first step in project development, the GEF often provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop the project concept into a fully developed project proposal. The old terminology of project development facility grants (PDF-A and PDF-B) has been replaced by a single project preparation grant (PPG). With the new project cycle where GEF Council funding commitment comes at the early stage of approval of a PIF, PPGs are typically approved at the time of PIF approval or shortly thereafter. All but four of the PIFs for medium and full-sized projects approved during the reporting period were accompanied by project preparation funding – including eleven PPGs approved during the reporting period⁹ and listed in Table 2.

Progress in the NIP Program

26. As of October 31, 2008, the GEF has funded or is funding the preparation of the initial NIP for the Stockholm Convention in 135 countries. Table 6 provides an overview of implementation progress. As of to date, more than one hundred countries are at the stage where their NIP has been endorsed and submitted, or is at the stage of final review and endorsement. Six countries are in the drafting process, and another two countries have completed all fact finding activities, inventories, etc, and are in the process of defining their priorities. As reflected on the Stockholm Convention’s

⁸ [http://thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__\(PDF_DOC\)/GEF_C34/GEFME-C34.2-RAF_MTR.pdf](http://thegef.org/uploadedFiles/Documents/Council_Documents__(PDF_DOC)/GEF_C34/GEFME-C34.2-RAF_MTR.pdf)

⁹ Projects that received preparation funding during an earlier reporting period are projects that had entered the pipeline following the old project cycle and that were “graduated” to the new project cycle. In the future for new projects no such time lag between PPG approval and Council PIF approval is expected.

website, sixty-six of these countries, party¹⁰ to the Convention, have already submitted their NIP to the Convention Secretariat – a significant increase since the last GEF report to the COP.

Expected activities to the remainder of GEF-4, 30 June 2010

27. There is no more formal GEF pipeline with the new project cycle. Therefore the GEF will no longer report on pipeline and any associated commitment. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that approximately half of available GEF-4 resources for POPs have been committed by Council at time of writing, a little over halfway in the replenishment period. Looking forward, dialogue with recipient countries and discussions with the GEF agencies in the framework of the POPs task force point to growing demand from recipient countries and to full utilization of POPs resources by the end of the GEF-4 replenishment period.

Some Challenges with Implementation

28. There are still relatively few projects that have been under implementation for any significant time. Nevertheless, early lessons can already be drawn based on yearly monitoring and other reports from projects. Some of these are not uncommon for development projects. Others are more specific to POPs. These include: delays in implementation typically related to general lack of capacity and readiness of various project stakeholders, possibly leading to financing shortfalls; substantial variations of costs for transport and disposal of POPs wastes; limited capacity of local companies to handle POPs wastes; inventories that increase beyond original estimates as the project is implemented and more is known of reality on the ground; issues related to permitting and siting of hazardous wastes disposal facilities; as well as challenges related to the management of contaminated sites.

29. In addition, and notwithstanding paragraph 27 above, there are signs that some countries are facing difficulties in transitioning from the NIP development process to the next stage of developing project proposals for funding from the GEF or other sources, to implement the NIP. This concerns in particular LDCs and other countries with limited capacity. In response, the GEF Secretariat and the Agencies are taking steps to enhance access to GEF POPs resources for LDCs and SIDS in the remainder of the replenishment period.

Table 2: Project Preparation Grants approved 1 January 2007 to October 31 2008

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing US\$ million
Armenia	Technical Assistance for Environmentally Sustainable Management of PCBs and Other POPs Waste in the Republic of Armenia	UNIDO	0.025
Azerbaijan	Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs	UNIDO	0.106
Belarus	Persistent Organic Pollutant Stockpile Management and Technical/Institutional Capacity Upgrading	World Bank	0.285
Brazil	Establishment of PCB Waste Management and Disposal System	UNDP	0.162
China	Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of Obsolete POPs Pesticides and Other POPs Wastes	UNIDO	0.231
Kazakhstan	Design and Execution of a Comprehensive PCB Management Plan for Kazakhstan	UNDP	0.095

¹⁰ Following COP guidance, eligibility for NIP development was extended to countries signatories to the Stockholm Convention, or in the process of becoming a party to the same.

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing US\$ million
Mexico	Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs	UNDP	0.170
Mongolia	Capacity Building For Environmentally Sound PCBs Management And Disposal	UNIDO	0.130
Nicaragua	Improved Management and Release Containment of POPs Pesticides in Nicaragua	UNDP	0.045
Philippines	Integrated POPs Management Project: Dioxins and Furans, PCB and Contaminated Sites Management	World Bank	0.240
Regional (Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan)	DSSA Demonstrating and Scaling Up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the Control of Vector-borne Diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia	UNEP	0.195

Table 3: Enabling activities approved under expedited processing, 1 Jan 07 to 31 Oct 2008

Country	Agency
Angola	UNIDO
Congo D.R.	UNDP
Cook Islands	UNDP
Eritrea	UNIDO
Swaziland	UNIDO

Table 4: Full-sized projects approved by the GEF Council, 1 Jan 2007 to October 31 2008

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing* US\$ million	Co-Financing US\$ million
Azerbaijan	Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs	UNIDO	2.4	4.4
Belarus	Persistent Organic Pollutant Stockpile Management and Technical/Institutional Capacity Upgrading	World Bank	6.3	11.4
Brazil	Establishment of PCB Waste Management and Disposal System	UNDP	5.4	9.5
China	Improvement of DDT-based production of Dicofol and introduction of alternative technologies including IPM for leaf mites control in China	UNDP	6.9	11.7
China	Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of Obsolete POPs Pesticides and Other POPs Wastes	UNIDO	11.2	31.5
China	Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Waste in China	UNIDO	13.2	33.1
China	Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP) in China	UNIDO	6.0	9.8
Ghana	Capacity Building for PCB Elimination	UNDP	3.6	3.6
India	Development of a National Implementation Plan in India as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).	UNIDO	3.9	7.1
Kazakhstan	Design and Execution of a Comprehensive PCB	UNDP	3.8	10.6

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing* US\$ million	Co-Financing US\$ million
	Management Plan for Kazakhstan			
Mexico	Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs	UNDP	5.3	10.8
Mongolia	Capacity Building For Environmentally Sound PCBs Management And Disposal	UNIDO	3.0	5.3
Morocco	Safe Management and Disposal of PCBs	UNDP/UNIDO	5.6	7.6
Philippines	Integrated POPs Management Project: Dioxins and Furans, PCB and Contaminated Sites Management	World Bank	9.8	17.7
Regional Mediterranean	Implementation of Agreed Actions for the Protection of the Environmental Resources of the Mediterranean Sea and Its Coastal Areas (PCB component)	UNEP	3.2	8.2
Regional West Africa	Demonstration of a Regional Approach to Environmentally Sound Management of PCB Liquid Wastes and Transformers and Capacitors Containing PCBs	UNEP	6.1	9.6
Regional (Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan)	DSSA - Demonstrating and Scaling Up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the Control of Vector-borne Diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia	UNEP	2.4	3.7
Regional (Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iran)	DSSA - Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa	UNEP	6.1	8.4
Tunisia	Demonstrating and Promoting Best Techniques and Practices for Managing Healthcare Waste and PCBs	World Bank	6.4	17.0
Vietnam	PCB Management Demonstration Project	World Bank	8.1	10.5
Vietnam	Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots in Vietnam	UNDP	5.5	25.4
Vietnam	Building Capacity to Eliminate POPs Pesticides Stockpiles	UNDP/FAO	5.1	6.5

* Including GEF Agency fee and project preparation funding

Table 5: Medium-sized projects approved, 1 January 2007 to 31 October 2008

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing* US\$ million	Co-Financing US\$ million
Armenia	Technical Assistance for Environmentally Sustainable Management of PCBs and Other POPs Waste in the Republic of Armenia	UNIDO	0.9	1.8
China	Rapid Assessment of Chemical Contamination of the Wenchuan Earthquake in Sichuan Province	World Bank	1.1	0.5
Global	POPs Monitoring Reporting and Information Dissemination Using Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs)	UNEP	1.0	2.5
Macedonia	Demonstration project for Phasing-out and Elimination of PCBs and PCB-Containing Equipment	UNIDO	1.1	1.8
Mauritius	Sustainable management of POPs in Mauritius	UNDP	1.0	0.9

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing* US\$ million	Co-Financing US\$ million
Nicaragua	Improved Management and Release Containment of POPs Pesticides in Nicaragua	UNDP	1.0	2.1
Regional Eastern Europe, Caucasus, and Central Asia	Capacity Building on Obsolete Pesticides in EECCA Countries	FAO	1.1	1.4
Regional (Egypt, Jordan, Yemen, Sudan)	Promotion of Strategies to Reduce Unintentional Production of POPs in the PERSGA Coastal Zone	UNIDO	1.1	2.0
Romania	Disposal of PCB Wastes in Romania	UNIDO	1.1	1.0
Uruguay	Development of the National Capacities for the Environmental Sound Management of PCBs in Uruguay	UNDP	1.1	1.1
Vietnam	Introduction of BAT and BEP methodology to demonstrate reduction or elimination of unintentionally produced POPs releases from the industry in Vietnam	UNIDO	0.9	1.6

* Including GEF Agency fee and project preparation funding

Table 6: Progress in NIP development: status as of 31 October 2008.

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5*	Total
No countries	5	11	2	6	111	135

* The GEF guidelines and the guidance document for developing a NIP for the Stockholm Convention recommend that a 5-phase process be followed in developing a NIP. Phase I is the establishment of a coordinating mechanism and process organisation; phase II is the development of POPs inventories and assessment of national infrastructure and capacity; phase III deals with priority assessment and objectives setting; Phase four is to formulate the NIP and associated action plans; and phase five sees NIP endorsement and submission. In this table, countries with a draft NIP are accounted for under phase 5.

Portfolio Highlights and Response to Convention Guidance

Effectiveness evaluation

30. In response to the COP, reference to the Global Monitoring Plan (GMP) was made in the GEF-4 strategy for POPs and discussions were held with the Convention Secretariat and UNEP to ascertain how best the GEF could provide support to this effort through country driven and sustainable implementation activities in eligible countries, consistent with the GEF's mandate. It was envisaged that the GEF might support a limited number of sub-regional medium-sized projects to strengthen capacities in developing countries and countries with economies in transition and enhance their participation to the GMP. To date, the GEF Secretariat has received requests for four PIF that were processed expeditiously for approval for the Eastern and Southern African region, for West Africa, for Latin America and the Caribbean, and for the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The full project document for the latter was recently submitted for CEO endorsement and is approved at time of writing.

Best Available Techniques / Best Environmental Practices (BAT/BEP)

31. GEF support to measures to promote and demonstrate BAT/BEP is included in the GEF-4 strategy, in particular in Strategic Program #3 on *Partnering in the demonstration of feasible, innovative technologies and best practices for POPs reduction and substitution*. The strategy states that “it is expected that activities promoted through strategic program 3 could move up to strategic program 2 (NIP implementation on a more systematic manner) in future phases of the GEF”. During the reporting period, GEF support to BAT/BEP activities included five projects that specifically demonstrate and promote BAT/BEP for the reduction and releases of un-intentionally produced POPs.

DDT

32. At its April 2008 meeting the GEF Council adopted the Program Framework Document for *Demonstrating and Scaling-up of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT in Vector Management Global Programme* presented by UNEP in partnership with the World Health Organization (WHO). The note describes the coherence, scope, and overall objective behind a series of already approved, on-going, or planned projects supported by UNEP and WHO addressing alternative approaches to DDT use in vector control for malaria and other vector-borne diseases. The objective of this suite of projects is to reduce the reliance on DDT without increasing the occurrence of vector-borne diseases, and to promote alternative vector control management practices and strengthen capacities of countries to sustainably implement these.

33. Taken as a whole, it is expected that these projects will provide a unique set of demonstrated alternatives to DDT for vector control and will constitute a peer-reviewed and stakeholder endorsed dataset of suite of alternatives in various geographical, cultural, social, climatic, and eco-epidemiological regions in the developing world. Complementary activities include work in Mauritius focusing in particular on resistance management with UNDP, and the World Bank’s effort to involve the private sector in the framework of the GEF’s public-private partnership initiative.

The Small Grants Program (SGP)

34. The SGP is GEF’s window for small-scale activities at the community level to support the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. It has piloted innovative demonstration models through community-based interventions, developing communities’ capacities, and strengthening partnerships to generate impact in POPs reduction. During the reporting period, the SGP funded 95 POPs projects in: Asia and the Pacific (17); Africa (25); Latin America and Caribbean (28); Europe and CIS (20); and Arab States (5). Projects might address prevention of open burning of plastics and other solid waste, integrated pesticide management, organic farming, or awareness raising and capacity building activities; the SGP website¹¹ offers a description of all activities. SGP pilot activities also contribute to increased awareness of POPs through UNDP’s practice network and the media.

¹¹ <http://sgp.undp.org/index.cfm?module=projects&page=FocalArea&FocalAreaID=POP>

Analysis of co-financing in POPs projects

35. Following COP request, the previous report included an initial analysis of co-financing in GEF projects. The present analysis includes a much larger number of projects: 62, including the 22 projects that were analysed in the COP-3 report. To increase sample size, the 62 projects include projects approved during previous reporting periods, as well as projects that have been approved, but are not yet under implementation or even endorsed. Nevertheless the limitations mentioned previously still largely apply: small sample size and imperfect availability of data or data definition¹². Moreover, there are few projects already completed where realised co-financing could be validated through a terminal evaluation of the project.

36. There are many sources of co-financing. The current analysis follows the five following categories: Government; GEF Agencies and other multilateral organizations; bilateral organizations; private sector; NGOs and other sources. Types of co-finance include grants, loans, and committed in-kind supports. “Government” includes sub-sovereign entities and beneficiaries; “NGOs and others” includes resources from academic institutions and contributions from foundations and experts.

37. The distribution of co-financing through the five selected categories is as follows: Government: 56%; GEF agencies and other multilaterals: 5%; Bilaterals: 13%; Private sector: 19%; NGOs and others: 6 %. Co-financing in the cohort of 66 projects analysed amounts to approximately 62% of the total funding on average, the remaining 38% of the financing package being provided by the GEF grant. This is an increase in co-financing committed to GEF projects over the 50% previously reported from the initial cohort of 22 projects, and is fully expected with the shift from preparation of NIPs to implementation.

38. The percentage contributions for all these categories vary widely across projects, and it is difficult at this point to establish significant correlations or trends. The average ratio of contributions from the private sector is at 19% of the total, but it can be much higher for specific projects – more than 65% of the co-financing in 11 projects typically in the form of contributions from participating enterprises, for example for equipment replacement. This confirms the initial finding presented at COP3 that shows that there is significant potential to harness the private sector to support the implementation of the Stockholm Convention in developing countries and countries with economies in transition. As would be expected, projects that are more of a capacity building nature seem to include a higher percentage of government contribution, whilst PCB management projects have a greater than average contribution from the private sector.

Update on Incremental Costs

39. The GEF COP-3 report included a discussion of the approach to applying the incremental costs principle in the POPs focal area. In addition, and complementary to that discussion, the GEF Council adopted in June 2007 *revised Operational Guidelines for the Application of the Incremental Cost Principle*¹³. The guidelines provide for a simplified demonstration of the “business-as-usual” scenario, and a discussion of “incremental reasoning” that puts the emphasis on the fit with focal area strategies and co-funding in relation with the impact/value-added of the proposed GEF intervention. The “incremental costs analysis annex” is no longer a requirement.

¹² For example: is co-financing from a parastatal to be counted as “government” or “private sector”?

¹³ GEF/C.31/12 available at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=17634

V. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

POPs Focal Area Tracking Tool

40. The POPs task force developed the GEF POPs portfolio tracking tool to facilitate the reporting on progress in the implementation of the GEF-4 POPs strategy, and focal area results and impacts. The tracking tool includes some 40 indicators to track progress towards achieving results for some 20 types of interventions, typical of Convention priorities in line with the strategy. The tracking tool is being field tested for the first time through this year's Annual Monitoring Review (AMR) exercise. It will be further improved based on feedback received from the project implementers.

41. The indicators encompass enabling environment indicators (e.g., regulatory frameworks in place or increased capacity for enforcement) and stress reduction indicators (e.g., number and unit cost of tons of PCB destroyed in an environmentally sound manner, or amount and unit cost of avoided releases of by-products). These indicators can be aggregated from different but related projects to provide an overview of the results at the focal area level. Individual POPs projects should include, at the minimum, one of these indicators in their results matrix. Individual projects typically also include other indicators to track other dimensions of expected project results, but these could differ between projects and may not contribute to the broad overall assessment of focal area-wide achievements.

Annual Monitoring Review

42. The AMR report is the principal reporting instrument of the GEF Secretariat's monitoring system and provides a snapshot of the overall health of the active portfolio of projects each year. The AMR is a key part of the GEF's Results-based Management (RBM) Framework that monitors project implementation progress, progress towards achieving global environmental objectives, and baseline identification and tracking. The first such report¹⁴ was discussed at the Spring 2008 Council and provides an overview of key findings arising out of the AMR 2007 process, which covers the GEF's portfolio of projects that began implementation on or before June 30, 2006 and were under implementation for at least part of FY 2007. The majority of projects included in this first AMR were therefore approved in GEF-3. The second AMR report will be submitted to the spring 2009 Council meeting.

Mid-term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework

43. The Council at its November 2008 meeting reviewed the "Mid-Term Review of the Resource Allocation Framework (RAF)¹⁵". The review identifies positive and negative aspects to the implementation of the RAF in the biodiversity and climate change focal areas so far. An important finding is that "the sense of ownership is enhanced in individual allocation countries". The GEF Council "*requested the GEF Secretariat, in collaboration with the GEF agencies and STAP and other stakeholders, to present steps to improve RAF design and indices for the climate change and biodiversity focal areas for GEF-5, and furthermore to present scenarios for possible expansion of the RAF, if feasible, to all focal areas for GEF-5 for consideration by the Council at the June 2009 GEF Council meeting*¹⁶". The GEF Secretariat will continue to consult with the Stockholm Secretariat in carrying-out future RAF analysis and adjustment where it concerns POPs.

¹⁴ Available at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=20612

¹⁵ Available at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=22710

¹⁶ Joint Summary of the Chairs, available at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=17146

GEF Annual Performance Report (APR)

44. In contrast with the AMR that provides a snapshot of projects under implementation and is prepared by the GEF Secretariat as a monitoring tool, the Annual Performance Report (APR) is prepared by the independent GEF Office of Evaluation and presents an account of some aspects of project results, of processes that may affect project results, and of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangements in completed projects. The 2007 APR report¹⁷ includes information on GEF project outcomes, sustainability, co-financing, quality of M&E and quality of terminal evaluations. In that APR, the Evaluation Office also presents an assessment of the extent capacity development activities in GEF projects are relevant, effective and efficient, and the results and sustainability of results of these activities.

45. The 2006 Annual Performance Report¹⁸ similarly includes information on GEF project outcomes, sustainability, co-financing, quality of M&E and quality of terminal evaluations. It also looks for the first time at the quality of supervision of GEF projects by the respective implementing agencies.

VI. THE FIFTH GEF REPLENISHMENT

46. The Council at its November 2008 meeting launched the process of replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund by requesting “*the Trustee of the GEF Trust Fund, in cooperation with the CEO/Chairperson of the Facility, to initiate discussions on the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund with the convening of a planning meeting in Washington on November 14, 2008, for the negotiations of the fifth replenishment of resources of the GEF Trust Fund*”¹⁹. That planning meeting agreed on a calendar that would see replenishment negotiations take place throughout 2009 with a view to a conclusion that would allow a seamless transition from GEF-4 to the next phase of the GEF starting July 2010. Implementing the provisions of the GEF Instrument regarding POPs as well as chemicals management will be important considerations. The GEF-5 POPs strategy that will be prepared with the help of the Stockholm Convention Secretariat will be an input to this process, as will be the *Assessment of funding needs for Parties that are developing countries or countries with economies in transition to implement the Convention over the period 2010–2014* that the GEF looks forward to receiving from the COP.

VII. OUTLOOK

47. By the end of the reporting period, the GEF has committed US\$ 360 million to projects in the POPs focal area and has leveraged additional financing from project partners leading to an overall portfolio of over US\$ 800 million. Under GEF-3 (July 2002 – June 2006), efforts focused on supporting NIP development in eligible countries. Under GEF-4, activities are characterized by a shift from preparation to implementation with the GEF supporting projects submitted by partner countries to implement their NIPs. With 18 months remaining under GEF-4 as this report is written, the evidence is that the demand for GEF POPs resources is strong. A very large number of countries have now developed their initial NIP – many have submitted their NIP to the Convention, while a number are at the final stages of review and endorsement. Through these first years of GEF support to the Stockholm Convention, both delivery capacity with GEF Agencies and absorptive capacity at the country level have been strengthened. At the same time, GEF processes have been

¹⁷ Available at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=20612

¹⁸ Available at http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=17634

¹⁹ Joint Summary of the Chairs http://www.thegef.org/interior_right.aspx?id=17146

simplified to facilitate effectiveness and access. All these factors point to the strong prospects over the coming years for GEF POPs activities in support of Stockholm Convention implementation in developing countries.

ANNEX A: REPORTS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED BY THE GEF TO THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION

Report of the GEF to the third session of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNEP/POPS/COP.3/INF/3, March 28, 2007)

Report of the GEF to the second session of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNEP/POPS/COP.2/28, February 3, 2006)

Report of the Global Environment Facility to the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNEP/POPS/COP.1/INF/11, February 15, 2005)

Activities of the Global Environment Facility in Support of the Early Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants – Prepared for the seventh session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (UNEP/POPS/INC.7/INF/11, June 12, 2003)

Report of the Global Environment Facility to the sixth session of the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (UNEP/POPS/INC.6/INF/9, June 10, 2002)

ANNEX B: SYNTHESIS OF PROJECTS APPROVED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD JANUARY, 1, 2007 TO OCTOBER 31, 2008

FULL SIZED PROJECTS

Azerbaijan: Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Ecology and natural Resources

GEF funding US\$ 2.4 million; Co-financing US\$ 4.4 million

Total project financing US\$ 6.8 million

The overall objective of the project is to comply with the Stockholm Convention through implementing the PCB-related action plans of the NIP in order to manage PCB wastes in an environmentally sound manner. Addressing regulations and standards, strengthening of institutions at the national and local levels, enforcement capacity, and awareness raising, as well as safe disposal of 530 tons of PCB contaminated equipment.

Belarus: Persistent Organic Pollutant Stockpile Management and Technical/ Institutional Capacity Upgrading

IMPLEMENTATION: World Bank

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection

GEF funding US\$ 5.8 million; Co-financing US\$ 11.4 million

Total project financing US\$ 17.2 million

The overall objective of the project is to support the environmentally sound management of POPs in Belarus consistent with the country's obligations under the Stockholm Convention, and specifically support the eligible near term priority activities identified in the NIP and its Action Plans. In particular, the project will undertake the re-packaging of 2,760 tons of obsolete pesticides including DDT and mixtures containing POPs and will secure 712 tons of DDT contained in burial sites.

Brazil: Establishment of PCB Waste Management and Disposal System

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environment

GEF funding US\$ 5.4 million; Co-financing US\$ 9.5 million

Total project financing US\$ 14.9 million

The objectives of the project are to enhance the capacity to manage and dispose of PCB oils, PCB containing equipment, other PCB waste and PCB contaminated soils in a sustainable manner. The project will help upgrade local facilities and technologies and dispose of approximately 1000 tons of PCB equipment.

China: Improvement of DDT-based production of Dicofol and introduction of alternative technologies including IPM for leaf mites control

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environmental Protection (FECO)

GEF funding US\$ 6.9 million; Co-financing US\$ 11.7 million

Total project financing US\$ 18.6 million

The objectives of the project are: 1) to assess and demonstrate a suite of IPM-based interventions in pilot areas covering the major crops and ecological conditions; 2) to close down all “non-closed” dicofol production systems to eliminate the use of about 2,800 tons per year of DDT as intermediate in the production of dicofol; 3) to enforce the optimization, supervision and monitoring on the closed-system dicofol production plants to minimize DDT residue and control the release of POPs wastes and other pollutants during dicofol production; 4) to develop national program for disseminating the project achievements.

China: Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of Obsolete POPs Pesticides and Other POPs Wastes

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environmental Protection (FECO)

GEF funding US\$ 11.2 million; Co-financing US\$ 31.5 million

Total project financing US\$ 42.7 million

The project will enable environmentally sound management and disposal of targeted obsolete POPs pesticides and associated wastes in fulfillment of China’s commitments under the Stockholm Convention. In accordance with the Stockholm Convention and Basel Convention guidelines, the project will directly provide treatment of a minimum of 10,000 tons of identified targeted POPs pesticide wastes and 1,000 tons of PCDD/PCDF rich fly ash. The project will also introduce regulatory reforms and strengthen national capacity to identify, assess, manage, and treat other such wastes in an environmentally sustainable manner.

China: Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Waste

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environmental Protection (FECO)

GEF funding US\$ 13.2 million; Co-financing US\$ 33.1 million

Total project financing US\$ 46.3 million

The objective of the project is to minimize the generation and emissions of un-intentionally produced POPs (principally PCDDs/PCDFs) from the medical waste treatment sector. The project will simultaneously explore ways to reduce emissions of other POPs and globally harmful contaminants generated by the medical waste sector, such as hexachlorobenzene (HCB), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), mercury, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH).

China: Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (NIP)

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environmental Protection (FECO)

GEF funding US\$ 6.0 million; Co-financing US\$ 9.8 million

Total project financing US\$ 15.8 million

The objective of the project is to create an enabling regulatory and policy environment in China by establishing laws, regulations, and standards; strengthening institutions for monitoring; promoting technology transfer; facilitating data and information collection; enhancing enforcement; and raising awareness of stakeholders on POPs issues.

Ghana: Capacity Building for PCB Elimination

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency

GEF funding US\$ 3.6 million; Co-financing US\$ 3.6 million

Total project financing US\$ 7.2 million

The project aims at strengthening the capacities of government officials and PCB holders, mainly from electricity companies, to address PCB identification, analysis, monitoring and management of existing sources, as well as their elimination. It will dispose of 160 tons of PCB- containing transformers, including 40 tons of pure PCB and approximately 5 tons of PCB-containing capacitors.

India: Development of a National Implementation Plan as a first step to implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environment and Forests

GEF funding US\$ 3.9 million; Co-financing US\$ 7.1 million

Total project financing US\$ 11.0 million

The overall objective of the full project is to develop the NIP for India to meet its obligation with the Convention. To stand by this commitment, the Project will establish inventories on the production, use, trade, stockpiles and wastes of, and sites contaminated by, the chemicals listed in the Annexes of the Convention and existing in India, and develop strategies and action plans for their reduction and elimination.

Kazakhstan: Design and Execution of a Comprehensive PCB Management Plan

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environmental Protection

GEF funding US\$ 3.8 million; Co-financing US\$ 10.6 million

Total project financing US\$ 14.4 million

The Republic of Kazakhstan is the second among the CEIT countries with 980 tons PCB-containing oils and 255,000 tons PCBs contaminated soils. The project will enhance technical capacities for management, safeguarding and disposal of PCBs; strengthening legal, policy and administrative framework and safeguarding PCB stockpiles.

Mexico: Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Secretaria de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales

GEF funding US\$ 5.3 million; Co-financing US\$ 10.8 million

Total project financing US\$ 16.1 million

The project will: develop and implement strategies for strengthening Mexico's institutional capacity within central and state governments for environmentally sound management and destruction of PCBs; upgrade interim PCB storage facilities with particular emphasis on access to facilities by small- and medium-size enterprises (SMEs); establish and demonstrate a nationally-coordinated servicing system for PCB management; and raise awareness regarding legal obligations and best practices for PCB management and destruction in the private and public sectors through outreach and training.

Mongolia: Capacity Building for Environmentally Sound PCBs Management and Disposal

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Nature and Environment

GEF funding US\$ 3.0 million; Co-financing US\$ 5.3 million

Total project financing US\$ 8.3 million

The project will create capacity for environmentally sound management of PCBs; eliminate PCB releases from the electrical equipment; avoid cross-contamination of electrical equipment; and dispose of 2,300 tons of PCB wastes.

Morocco: Safe Management and Disposal of PCBs

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP/UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministère de l'aménagement du territoire de l'eau et de l'environnement

GEF funding US\$ 5.6 million; Co-financing US\$ 7.6 million

Total project financing US\$ 13.2 million

The objectives of the project are to develop and implement a PCB management plan, and to enhance the legal, administrative and technical capacity of Morocco to manage and dispose of PCB oils and PCB containing equipment in a sustainable manner once they are deemed waste. A management system for cross-contaminated PCB-containing equipment will be established for the decontamination of cross-contaminated PCB- containing equipment.

Philippines: Integrated POPs Management Project: Dioxins and Furans, PCBs and Contaminated Sites Management

IMPLEMENTATION: World Bank

EXECUTING AGENCY: Environmental Management Bureau

GEF funding US\$ 9.8 million; Co-financing US\$ 17.7 million

Total project financing US\$ 27.6 million

The project will assist the Philippines meet its obligations under the Stockholm Convention related to PCBs, UPOPs, and contaminated sites, and contribute to the development of capacity for the sound management of chemicals in general. It will strengthen the regulatory and institutional framework and build capacity for POPs monitoring and sound PCB management. In that respect, around 10,000 on-line transformers will be tested and labeled and 100-150 PCB off-line equipment safely dismantled, handled, packed, and stored.

Tunisia: Demonstrating and Promoting Best Techniques and Practices for Managing Healthcare Waste and PCBs

IMPLEMENTATION: World Bank

EXECUTING AGENCY: Agence Nationale des Déchets, Ministry of Environment

GEF funding US\$ 6.4 million; Co-financing US\$ 17.0 million

Total project financing US\$ 23.4 million

The proposed project designed within the framework of an integrated solid waste management plan will address the sound management of two particularly critical waste streams, namely healthcare waste and PCBs. The objectives are the development of a sound and integrated program for the management of healthcare waste in Tunisia, from its generation at healthcare facilities to its final treatment and disposal; and the implementation of a national strategy for the management of PCBs, including stocks of PCB oils and on-line electrical systems.

Vietnam: PCB Management Demonstration Project

IMPLEMENTATION: World Bank

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and Ministry of Industry

GEF funding US\$ 8.1 million; Co-financing US\$ 10.5 million

Total project financing US\$ 18.6 million

The project development objective is to put in place a PCB management system that reduces the risks to Vietnam's people and ecosystems posed by contamination from unmanaged PCBs. This will be done by improving the regulatory and institutional framework for PCB management, by demonstrating the safe management and disposal of PCBs in key sectors, and by designing a national PCB management program for the rest of Vietnam.

Vietnam: Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

GEF funding US\$ 5.5 million; Co-financing US\$ 25.4 million

Total project financing US\$ 30.9 million

Viet Nam has among the worst dioxin contaminated sites in the world. The project will effectively contain/remediate the highly dioxin contaminated material in the hotspots areas and address the technical, institutional, financial as well as societal root causes for enabling Viet Nam to address additional sites of concern.

Vietnam: Building Capacity to Eliminate POPs Pesticides Stockpiles

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP/FAO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

GEF funding US\$ 5.1 million; Co-financing US\$ 6.5 million

Total project financing US\$ 11.6 million

The proposed project will provide assistance to Vietnam to eliminate POPs pesticides stockpiles, and carry out pilot treatment of sites that are contaminated with POPs pesticides. The total amount of POPs pesticides destroyed is likely to approach 3,000 tons

Regional (Mediterranean): Strategic Partnership for the Mediterranean Large Marine Ecosystem-Regional Component: Implementation of Agreed Actions for the Protection of the Environmental Resources of the Mediterranean Sea and its Coastal Areas (PCB Component)

IMPLEMENTATION: UNEP

EXECUTING AGENCY: UNEP/MAP

COUNTRIES: Albania, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Syria

GEF funding US\$ 3.2 million; Co-financing US\$ 8.2 million

Total project financing US\$ 11.4 million

(Overall project GEF funding: US\$ 12.9 million; total project financing US\$36.5 million)

Building on the Stockholm Convention NIPs and on existing initiatives in the Mediterranean region, the program will provide the first harmonized initiative on PCBs to meet the obligations of the Stockholm and the Barcelona Conventions compatible with requirements under the Basel Convention. The aim of these activities is to introduce environmentally sound management at all stages of the lifecycle of electrical equipment containing or contaminated by PCBs.

Regional (West Africa): Demonstration of a Regional Approach to Environmentally Sound Management of PCB Liquid Wastes and Transformers and Capacitors Containing PCBs

IMPLEMENTATION: UNEP

EXECUTING AGENCIES: The Basel Convention Regional Centre in Dakar and UNOPS

COUNTRIES: Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Congo DR, Mauritania, Morocco, Guinea Bissau, Guinea.

GEF funding US\$ 6.1 million; Co-financing US\$ 9.6 million

Total project financing US\$ 15.7 million

The project aims at reducing environmental and human health risks from PCBs releases through the demonstration of a regional approach to the introduction of cost-effective and socially acceptable environmentally sound management of PCB oils, equipment and wastes held by electrical utilities in participating countries. Including through the establishment of a regional centre for the treatment of 2,580 tons PCB contaminated equipment.

Regional: Demonstrating and Scaling Up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the Control of Vector-borne Diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia

IMPLEMENTATION: UNEP

EXECUTING AGENCIES: WHO-Europe Office, Milieukontakt International, national Ministries (Health, Agriculture, Environment, Emergency Situations) and local NGOs in the participating countries

COUNTRIES: Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan

GEF funding US\$ 2.4 million; Co-financing US\$ 3.7 million

Total project financing US\$ 6.1 million

The project objective is to eliminate the need to apply DDT in vector management without increasing the occurrence of Vector Borne Diseases, while at the same time to promote appropriate vector control management practices through strengthened capacities of countries and sustained implementation of environmentally sound alternatives.

Regional: Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa

IMPLEMENTATION: UNEP

EXECUTING AGENCIES: WHO Regional Office for Eastern Mediterranean (EMRO); Ministries of Health of the participating countries

COUNTRIES: Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iran

GEF funding US\$ 6.1 million; Co-financing US\$ 8.4 million

Total project financing US\$ 14.5 million

The long-term objective of the project is to reduce the reliance on DDT without increasing the occurrence of vector-borne diseases, and to promote appropriate vector control management practices by strengthening capacities of countries to sustainably implement environmentally sound alternatives. The project objectives are to: (i) demonstrate the viability, availability, efficiency and cost-effectiveness of the alternatives to use of DDT; (ii) promote the replication of the good practices and demonstrated alternatives in the countries selected and elsewhere; and (iii) build capacity in each country to plan and design application of alternatives based on the principles of integrated vector management.

MEDIUM SIZED PROJECTS

Armenia: Technical Assistance for Environmentally Sustainable Management of PCBs and Other POPs Waste

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Nature Protection

GEF funding US\$ 0.9 million; Co-financing US\$ 1.8 million

Total project financing US\$ 2.7 million

The project will reduce the use and releases of PCBs and other POPs to the environment through the development and implementation of a national PCB and POPs pesticides management system. This will efficiently assist Armenia to implement the Stockholm Convention by strengthening institutions, regulations, and enforcement, and enhancing the capacities for the sound management of POPs at national and local levels.

China: Rapid Assessment of Chemical Contamination of the Wenchuan Earthquake in Sichuan Province

IMPLEMENTATION: World Bank

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environmental Protection (FECO)

GEF funding US\$ 1.1 million, Co-financing US\$ 0.5 million

Total project financing US \$ 1.6 million

This project's development objective is to support the country's emergency responses to the Wenchuan Earthquake by identifying and assessing potential environmental impacts and risks associated with the releases of POPs and hazardous chemicals and wastes in the five out of a total of forty hardest hit counties in Sichuan Province.

Macedonia: Demonstration project for Phasing-out and Elimination of PCBs and PCB-Containing Equipment

IMPLEMENTATION: UNEP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning

GEF funding US\$ 1.1 million, Co-financing US\$ 1.8 million

Total project financing US \$ 2.9 million

The proposed project aims to reduce and eliminate the threats to human health and the environment posed by PCBs in Macedonia by establishing an environmentally sound management system for disposal of PCBs and PCB-containing equipment.

Mauritius: Sustainable management of POPs

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environment

GEF funding US\$ 1.0 million, Co-financing US\$ 0.9 million

Total project financing US \$ 1.9 million

The objective of this project is the implementation of the first two priorities from Mauritius's NIP: (1) Disposal of obsolete POPs chemicals and decontamination of associated POPs-contaminated areas (2) Development of alternative strategies for malaria vector management with reduced - or no - reliance on DDT.

Nicaragua: Improved Management and Release Containment of POPs Pesticides

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources

GEF funding US\$ 1.0 million, Co-financing US\$ 2.1 million

Total project financing US \$ 3.1 million

The project aims at minimizing the risk to humans and the environment of exposure to POPs through strengthened governmental, institutional and stakeholder capacity for life-cycle management of these substances.

Romania: Disposal of PCB Wastes

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: National Research-Development Institute for Environmental Protection

GEF funding US\$ 11 million, Co-financing US\$ 1.0 million

Total project financing US \$ 2.1 million

The objective of this project is to assist Romania to comply with its obligations under the Stockholm Convention with respect to PCBs. The project will develop an environmentally sound management system for PCBs and will pilot-test it in three demonstration areas.

Uruguay: Development of the National Capacities for the Environmental Sound Management of PCBs

IMPLEMENTATION: UNDP

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Housing, Land planning and the Environment

GEF funding US\$ 1.1 million, Co-financing US\$ 1.1 million

Total project financing US \$ 2.2 million

The objective of the project is to overcome the current barriers which impede implementation of the PCB-related obligations of the Stockholm Convention in Uruguay. The project foresees the strengthening of an environmentally sound management system of PCBs based on a consensus between relevant government authorities, the private and public sectors and NGOs.

Vietnam: Introduction of BAT and BEP methodology to demonstrate reduction or elimination of unintentionally produced POPs releases from the industry

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

GEF funding US\$ 0.9 million, Co-financing US\$ 1.6 million

Total project financing US \$ 2.5 million

The overall objective of the proposed project is to assist Vietnam to comply with its obligations under Article 5 of the Stockholm Convention, for the reduction of releases of un-intentional POPs from the industrial sector and other processes through the implementation of BAT and BEP options at enterprise and sector level.

Regional: Capacity Building on Obsolete Pesticides in EECCA Countries

IMPLEMENTATION: FAO

COUNTRIES: Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova, Mongolia, Macedonia, Romania., Georgia

GEF funding US\$ 1.1 million, Co-financing US\$ 1.4 million

Total project financing US \$ 2.5 million

The project will facilitate viable and environmentally sound measures for the identification, handling and disposal of pesticides stockpiles and wastes, and incorporation of strategies for prevention and management of obsolete pesticides into national policies with a strong emphasis of regional and sub-regional approaches.

Regional: Promotion of Strategies to Reduce Unintentional Production of POPs in the PERSGA Coastal Zone

IMPLEMENTATION: UNIDO

EXECUTING AGENCY: Regional Organization for the Conservation of the Environment of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden

COUNTRIES: Egypt, Yemen, Jordan, Sudan

GEF funding US\$ 1.1 million, Co-financing US\$ 2.0 million

Total project financing US \$ 3.1 million

The project will reduce and/or eliminate UPOPs in key sectors of industry (cement, incineration, metallurgy and pulp and paper) recognized as important source categories in Annex C of Article 5 of the Stockholm Convention, through the introduction of BAT/BEP strategies in the industrial sectors on the coasts in PERSGA eligible participating countries.

Global: POPs Monitoring Reporting and Information Dissemination Using Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers

IMPLEMENTATION: UNEP

Executing Agency: UNITAR

GEF funding US\$ 1.0 million, Co-financing US\$ 2.5 million

Total project financing US \$ 3.5 million

The objective of the project is to demonstrate the use of PRTRs as environmental management tools to assist countries in meeting their Stockholm Convention obligations regarding reporting, information exchange, and progress monitoring.

ANNEX C: LIST OF PROJECTS (EXCLUDING NIPS) APPROVED SINCE ADOPTION OF THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION, MAY 2001, AS OF OCTOBER 31, 2008

Armenia: Technical Assistance for Environmentally Sustainable Management of PCBs and Other POPs Waste (UNIDO); total \$2.7m, GEF \$0.9m

Azerbaijan: Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs (UNIDO); total \$6.8m, GEF \$2.4m

Belarus: Persistent Organic Pollutant Stockpile Management and Technical/Institutional Capacity Upgrading (WB); total \$17.1m, GEF \$5.8m

Brazil: Development of a National Implementation Plan as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNEP); total \$3.5m, GEF \$1.9m

Brazil: Establishment of PCB Waste Management and Disposal System (UNDP); total \$14.9m, GEF \$5.4m

China: Alternatives to DDT Usage for the Production of Anti-fouling Paint (UNDP); total \$24.2m, GEF \$12.2m

China: Demonstration of Alternatives to Chlordane and Mirex in Termite Control (WB); total \$28.3m, GEF \$14.6m

China: PCB Management and Disposal Demonstration (WB); total \$31.8m, GEF \$18.6m

China: Improvement of DDT-based production of Dicofol and introduction of alternative technologies including IPM for leaf mites control (UNDP); total \$18.6m, GEF \$6.9m

China: Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of Obsolete POPs Pesticides and Other POPs Wastes (UNIDO); total \$42.7m, GEF \$11.2m

China: Environmentally Sustainable Management of Medical Waste in China (UNIDO); total \$46.37m, GEF \$13.2m

China: Strengthening Institutions, Regulations and Enforcement Capacities for Effective and Efficient Implementation of the National Implementation Plan (UNDP); total \$15.8m, GEF \$6.0m

China: Rapid Assessment of Chemical Contamination of the Wenchuan Earthquake in Sichuan Province (WB); total \$1.6m, GEF \$1.1m

Ghana: Capacity Building for PCB Elimination (UNDP); total \$7.2m, GEF \$3.6m

India: Development of a National Implementation Plan as a First Step to Implement the Stockholm Convention (UNIDO); total \$11.0m, GEF \$3.9m

Kazakhstan: Design and Execution of a Comprehensive PCB Management Plan (UNDP); total \$14.4m, GEF \$3.8m

Latvia: Environmentally Sound Disposal of PCBs Containing Equipment and Waste (UNDP)
total \$2.8m, GEF \$1m

Macedonia: Demonstration project for Phasing-out and Elimination of PCBs and PCB-Containing Equipment (WB); total \$2.9m, GEF \$1.1m

Mauritius: Sustainable management of POPs (UNDP); total \$1.9m, GEF \$1.0m

Mexico: Environmentally Sound Management and Destruction of PCBs (UNDP);
total \$16.1m, GEF \$5.3m

Moldova: POPs Management and Destruction Project (WB); total \$12.9m, GEF \$6.7m

Mongolia: Capacity Building for Environmentally Sound PCBs Management and Disposal (UNIDO); total \$ 8.3m, GEF \$ 3.0m

Morocco: Safe Management and Disposal of PCBs (UNDP/UNIDO);
total \$13.2m, GEF \$5.6m

Nicaragua: Improved Management and Release Containment of POPs Pesticides (UNDP);
total \$3.1m, GEF \$1.0m

Philippines: Global Programme to Demonstrate the Viability and Removal of Barriers that Impede Adoption and Successful Implementation of Available, Non-Combustion Technologies for Destroying Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNIDO);
total \$12.3m, GEF \$4.6m

Philippines: Integrated POPs Management Project: Dioxins and Furans, PCB and Contaminated Sites Management (WB); total \$17.7m, GEF \$9.8m

Romania: Disposal of PCB Wastes (UNIDO); total \$2.1m, GEF \$1.1m

Slovak Republic: Global Programme to Demonstrate the Viability and Removal of Barriers that Impede Adoption and Successful Implementation of Available, Non-Combustion Technologies for Destroying Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNDP/UNIDO);
total \$20.8m, GEF \$10.7m

Tunisia: Demonstrating and Promoting Best Techniques and Practices for Managing Healthcare Waste and PCBs (WB); total \$23.4m, GEF \$6.4m

Uruguay: Development of the National Capacities for the Environmental Sound Management of PCBs in Uruguay (UNDP); total \$2.2m, GEF \$1.1m

Vietnam: PCB Management Demonstration Project (World Bank); total \$18.6m, GEF \$8.1m

Vietnam: Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hotspots (UNDP);
total \$30.9m, GEF \$5.5m

Vietnam: Building Capacity to Eliminate POPs Pesticides Stockpiles (UNDP/FAO); total \$11.6m, GEF \$5.1m

Vietnam: Introduction of BAT and BEP methodology to demonstrate reduction or elimination of unintentionally produced POPs releases from the industry (UNIDO); total \$2.5m, GEF \$0.9m

Regional (Albania, Egypt, Lebanon, Libya, Syria): Implementation of Agreed Actions for the Protection of the Environmental Resources of the Mediterranean Sea and its Coastal Areas – PCB component (UNEP); total \$11.4m, GEF \$3.2m
(Overall project total: \$36.5m, GEF \$12.9m)

Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo, Congo DR, Mauritania, Morocco, Guinea Bissau, Guinea): Demonstration of a Regional Approach to Environmentally Sound Management of PCB Liquid Wastes and Transformers and Capacitors Containing PCBs in West Africa (UNEP); total \$15.7m, GEF \$6.1m

Regional (Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan): Demonstrating and Scaling Up Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for the Control of Vector-borne Diseases in Southern Caucasus and Central Asia (UNEP); total \$6.1m, GEF \$2.4m

Regional (Sudan, Morocco, Yemen, Djibouti, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iran): Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT and Strengthening of National Vector Control Capabilities in Middle East and North Africa (UNEP); total \$14.5m, GEF \$6.1m

Regional (Ghana, Nigeria): Project to develop appropriate strategies for identifying sites contaminated by chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and/or C of the Stockholm Convention (UNIDO); total \$4.7m, GEF \$2.7m

Regional (Ethiopia, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, Tunisia): Africa Stockpiles Program, Phase I (WB/FAO); total \$60.7m, GEF \$25.7m

Regional (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Madagascar): Demonstrating Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability of Environmentally-sound and Locally Appropriate Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Control in Africa (UNEP); total \$6.8m, GEF \$3m

Regional (Benin, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal): Reducing Dependence on POPs and other Agro-Chemicals in the Senegal and Niger River Basins through Integrated Production, Pest and Pollution Management (UNEP/FAO); total \$9.3m, GEF \$4.5m (joint IW/POPs)

Regional (Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama): Regional Program of Action and Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Vector Control in Mexico and Central America (UNEP); total \$13.9m, GEF \$7.5m

Regional (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova, Mongolia, Macedonia, Romania., Georgia): Capacity Building on Obsolete Pesticides in EECCA Countries (FAO); total \$2.5m, GEF \$1.1m

Regional (Egypt, Jordan, Sudan, Yemen): Promotion of Strategies to Reduce Unintentional Production of POPs in the PERSGA Coastal Zone (UNIDO); total \$3.1m, GEF \$1.1m
Global: Action Plan Skills Building for 15 LDCs to assist with National Implementation Plan Development under the Stockholm Convention (UNDP); total \$1.4m, GEF \$0.7m

Global: Action Plan Skills Building for 25 LDCs to assist with National Implementation Plan Development under the Stockholm Convention (UNDP); total \$2m, GEF \$1m

Global: Assessment of Existing Capacity and Capacity Building Needs to Analyze POPs in Developing Countries (UNEP); total \$1.3m, GEF \$0.4m

Global: Demonstrating and Promoting Best Techniques and Practices for Reducing Health-Care Waste to Avoid Environmental Releases of Dioxins and Mercury (UNDP); total \$24.6m, GEF \$11m

Global: Fostering Active and Effective Civil Society Participation in Preparations for Implementation of the Stockholm Convention - NGO-POPs Elimination Project (UNEP/UNIDO); total \$2m, GEF \$1m

Global: Support for the Implementation of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (UNEP); total \$1.8m, GEF \$0.9m

Global: POPs Monitoring Reporting and Information Dissemination Using Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers (PRTRs) (UNEP); total \$3.5m, GEF \$1.0m

**ANNEX D: LIST OF COUNTRIES RECEIVING GEF FUNDING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF
THEIR INITIAL NIP, AS OF OCTOBER 31, 2008**

Country	Agency	Country	Agency	Country	Agency
Albania	UNDP	Oman	UNEP	Peru	UNEP
Algeria	UNIDO	Pakistan	UNDP	Philippines	UNDP
Angola	UNIDO	Ghana	UNIDO	Poland	UNIDO
Antigua and Barb.	UNEP	Guatemala	UNIDO	Romania	UNIDO
Argentina	UNEP	Guinea ¹	UNEP	Russian Federation	UNEP
Armenia	UNIDO	Guinea-Bissau	UNEP	Rwanda	UNIDO
Azerbaijan	UNIDO	Haiti	UNEP	Samoa	UNDP
The Bahamas	UNEP	Honduras	UNDP	Sao Tome & Principe	UNIDO
Bangladesh	UNDP	Hungary	UNIDO	Senegal	UNEP
Barbados ¹	UNEP	India ²	UNIDO	Serbia	UNEP
Belarus	World Bank	Indonesia	UNIDO	Seychelles	UNIDO
Belize	UNDP	Iran	UNDP	Sierra Leone	UNIDO
Benin	UNEP	Jamaica	UNDP	Slovak Republic	UNDP
Bolivia	UNIDO	Jordan	UNEP	Slovenia ¹	UNEP
Botswana	UNIDO	Kazakhstan	UNDP	South Africa	UNEP
Brazil ²	UNEP	Kenya	UNEP	Sri Lanka	UNEP
Bulgaria ¹	UNEP	Kiribati	UNEP	St. Lucia	UNEP
Burkina Faso	UNDP	Korea DPR	UNDP	Sudan	UNDP
Burundi	UNIDO	Kyrgyzstan	UNEP	Suriname	UNDP
Cambodia	UNEP	Lao PDR	UNIDO	Swaziland	UNIDO
Cameroon	UNEP	Latvia	UNDP	Syria	UNEP
Cape Verde	UNEP	Lebanon ¹	UNEP	Tajikistan	UNEP
Central African Rep.	UNIDO	Lesotho	UNIDO	Tanzania	UNIDO
Chad	UNIDO	Liberia	UNIDO	Thailand	UNEP
Chile ¹	UNEP	Lithuania	UNDP	Togo	UNIDO
China ²	UNIDO	Macedonia	UNIDO	Tonga	UNEP
Colombia	World Bank	Madagascar	UNEP	Trinidad and Tobago	UNDP
Comoros	UNDP	Malaysia ¹	UNEP	Tunisia	UNEP / UNIDO
Congo	UNIDO	Malawi	UNIDO	Turkey	UNIDO
Congo DR	UNDP	Mali ¹	UNEP	Tuvalu	UNEP
Cook Islands	UNDP	Marshall Islands	UNEP	Uganda	UNEP
Costa Rica	UNEP	Mauritania	UNEP	Ukraine	UNEP
Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	Mauritius	UNDP	Uruguay	UNEP
Croatia	UNIDO	Mexico	World Bank	Vanuatu	UNEP
Cuba	UNEP	Micronesia ¹	UNEP	Venezuela	UNIDO
Czech Republic	UNIDO	Moldova	World Bank	Vietnam	UNDP
Djibouti	UNIDO	Mongolia	UNIDO	Yemen	UNEP
Dominica	UNEP	Montenegro	UNEP	Zambia ¹	UNEP
Dominican Rep.	UNDP	Morocco	UNDP	Zimbabwe	UNEP
Ecuador ¹	UNEP	Mozambique	UNEP		
Egypt	UNIDO	Nauru	UNEP		
El Salvador	UNDP	Nepal	UNIDO		
Eritrea	UNIDO	Nicaragua	UNDP		
Ethiopia	UNIDO	Niger	UNIDO		
Fiji	UNEP	Nigeria	UNIDO		
Gabon	UNIDO	Palau	UNEP		
Gambia	UNEP	Panama	UNEP		
Georgia	UNDP	Papua NewGuinea ¹	UNEP		
Niue	UNDP	Paraguay	UNEP		

Notes: 1. Part of pilot project "Development of National Implementation Plans for the management of POPs"
2. Full-sized project under implementation