

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY  
UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME  
PROJECT DOCUMENT**

**SECTION 1: PROJECT IDENTIFICATION**

- 1.1 **Title of Sub-Programme:** 4.3 Chemicals
- 1.2 **Title of Project:** Development of National Implementation Plans for the Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants
- 1.3 **Project No:** GF/XG/  
GF/XG/-/Barbados (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Bulgaria (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Chile (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Ecuador (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Guinea Conakry (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Lebanon (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Malaysia (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Mali (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Micronesia (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Papua New Guinea (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Slovenia (see annex J)  
GF/XG/-/Zambia (see annex J)
- 1.4 **Geographical Scope:** Global
- 1.5 **Implementation:** Internal (Chemicals)
- 1.6 **Duration:** 24 months  
Commencing: 1 April 2002  
Completion: 31 March 2004
- 1.7 **Cost of Project:** (Expressed in US Dollars)

	2002	2003	2004	Total
Cost to UNEP/GEF Trust fund:	3,116,115	2,105,350	613,535	5,835,000
Cost of Counterpart Contribution:				
Germany	179,000	41,000	-	220,000
Sweden	130,000	141,000	-	271,000
Switzerland*	60,000	-	-	60,000
To be secured***	51,000	80,000	-	131,000
Co-Financing ( In kind ):				
UNEP**	20,000	50,000	20,000	90,000
IOMC organizations & other IGO's	30,000	80,000	40,000	150,000
World Bank****	20,000	50,000	10,000	80,000
Participating Countries Contribution ( in-kind )	300,000	1,100,000	400,000	1,800,000
Grand total	3,906,115	3,647,350	1,083,535	8,637,000

In addition to co-financing reflected in the cost of project table, an additional 168,000 US dollars are contributed as additional in kind contributions as shown in the following footnotes. This brings the total co-financing to 2,970,000 USD compared to 2,980,000 of the original budget at the time of the submission of the project brief to the GEF Council.

\*138,000 US dollars are allocated for activities related to PCB inventory taking activities from funds received from the Government of Switzerland under PO/3100-97-49-2220.

\*\*30,000 US dollars is allocated from UNEP's Trust Fund [PO Trust Fund (PO/3100-97-03)] for case study activities.

\*\*\*131,000 US dollars are to be secured during the course of the implementation of the project by UNEP Chemicals.

\*\*\*\*The World Bank has taken a greater role than anticipated in the development of the guidelines envisaged under the project brief, thus 80,000 US dollars initially allocated for activities related to the development of the guidelines have been redirected to other activities. 80,000 US dollars are reflected as an in-kind-contribution from the World Bank.

Signature:  
For the  
United Nations Environment Programme

---

E. F. Ortega  
Chief, Budget and Financial  
Management Service. UNON

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## PROJECT BRIEF AS APPROVED BY GEF\*

### 1. IDENTIFIERS:

**PROJECT NUMBER:** *[Implementing Agency Project Number not yet assigned]*  
**PROJECT TITLE:** **Development of National Implementation Plans for the Management of Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)**  
**IMPLEMENTING AGENCY:** United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
**EXECUTING AGENCIES:** United Nations Environment Programme (Chemicals Unit)  
National Executing Agencies of participating countries  
**REQUESTING COUNTRIES:** **Barbados, Bulgaria, Chile, Ecuador, Guinea/Conakry, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Slovenia and Zambia**  
**ELIGIBILITY:** The countries are eligible under paragraph 9(b) of the GEF Instrument. The project is consistent with the provisions of the Stockholm Convention.  
**GEF FOCAL AREAS:** International Waters  
**GEF PROGRAMMING FRAMEWORK:** #10-Contaminant-Based Operational Programme

---

### 2. SUMMARY:

The objective of the project is to strengthen national capacity to manage persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and to assist countries in meeting their obligations under the Stockholm POPs Convention. The project will assist twelve pilot countries in developing a National Implementation Plan (NIP) for POPs management, thus enabling them to reduce and eventually eliminate their POPs emissions. These NIPs are expected to meet the initial reporting obligations of these countries towards the Convention. Generic and technical guidelines for the development of NIPs and the adoption of POPs management options will be developed based on the experience gained and the lessons learned in the pilot countries. These widely applicable guidelines and the experience gained will greatly facilitate the further development of NIPs in other countries. A large number of countries will participate in sub-regional consultations organised around the pilot countries, such that experience will be shared and other countries will be encouraged to sign and ratify the Convention and prepare their NIP.

### 3. COSTS AND FINANCING (Million US \$)

<b>GEF:</b>	<b>Project</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>5,485,000 US\$</b>
	<b>PDF-B</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>350,000 US\$</b>
	<b>EA Administrative Costs</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>350,000 US\$</b>
	<b>Subtotal GEF</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>6,185,000 US\$</b>

---

<b>Co-financing:</b>	<b>PDF-B (all sources)</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>150,000 US\$</b>
	<b>UNEP (in kind)</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>90,000 US\$</b>
	<b>UNIDO</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>10,000 US\$</b>
	<b>IOMC organisations and other IGOs (in kind)</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>150,000 US\$</b>
	<b>Participating Countries (in kind)</b>	<b>:</b>	<b>1,800,000 US\$</b>

<b>Germany</b>	:	<b>330,000 US\$</b>
<b>Switzerland</b>	:	<b>60,000 US\$</b>
<b>To be identified</b>	:	<b>540,000 US\$</b>
<b>Subtotal Co-financing</b>	:	<b>3,130,000 US\$</b>
<hr/>		
<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	:	<b>9,315,000 US\$</b>
<hr/>		

#### **4. OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ENDORSEMENTS:**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Name and function</b>	<b>Dated</b>
Barbados	Mrs A Haynes, Permanent Secretary Ministry of Environment, Energy and Natural Resources	6/4/01
Bulgaria	Mr Neno Nenov, Deputy Minister Ministry of Environment and Water	3/4/01
Chile	Ms Adriana Hoffmann Jacoby, Executive Director National Environmental Commission	5/4/01
Ecuador	Mr Rodolfo Rendon, Minister of Environment	28/3/01
Guinée	Ms Kadiatou N'Diaye, Director National Environmental Directorate	6/4/01
Lebanon	Mr Michel Moussa, Minister of Environment	2/4/01
Malaysia	Dr. Nadzri Yahya, Deputy Director a.i. Conservation and Environmental Management Division For Secretary General Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment	8/5/01
Mali	Mr Abdoulaye Koné, Head Division of Norms and Regulations	29/3/01
Federated States of Micronesia	Mr Jeem S. Lippwe, Department of Foreign Affairs	2/4/01
Papua New Guinea	Mr Wari Lamo, Director Office of Environment and Conservation	2/4/01
Slovenia	Mr Emil Ferjancic, Head, International Relations Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning	19/3/01
Zambia	Mr Lubinda Aongola, Director, Planning and Information Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	2/4/01

\* As foreseen at the time of the submission of the project for CEO approval Malaysia has joined the project by time of CEO endorsement, thus the Project Document has been adjusted such as to include Malaysia.

**5. IA CONTACT:** Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaflaf, Director, Division of UNEP/GEF Co-ordination  
Office, UNEP, Nairobi, Tel: 254 2 624165; Fax: 254 2 624041;  
ahmed.djoghlaflaf@unep.org

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IA	Implementing Agency
IGO	Intergovernmental Organizations
IFCS	Inter-Governmental Forum on Chemical Safety
INC	Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee
IOMC	Inter-Organisational Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals
IPCS	International Programme on Chemical Safety
LRTAP	Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution Convention
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NIP	National Implementation Plan
OP	Operational Programme
PDF	Project Preparation and Development Facility
POPs	Persistent Organic Pollutants
PTS	Persistent Toxic Substances
RBA	Regionally Based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Chemicals
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNITAR	United Nations Institute for Training and Research
WHO	World Health Organization
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### BACKGROUND & CONTEXT - BASELINE COURSE OF ACTION

1. The introduction of chemicals that are generally referred to as "persistent toxic substances" (PTS) into the environment and their resulting accumulation and harmful effects is a major issue that gives rise to concerns at the local, national, regional and global scales. Many of the substances of greatest concern are organic compounds characterised by persistence in the environment, resistance to degradation, and acute and chronic toxicity. In addition many are transported through atmospheric, aquatic or migratory species transport over long distances and are thus globally distributed, detectable even in areas where they have never been used. The lipophilic character of these substances causes them to be incorporated and accumulated in the tissues of living organisms leading to body burdens that pose potential risks of adverse health effects. The persistence and bioaccumulation of PTS also result in increase over time of concentrations in consumers at higher trophic levels, including humans. Other toxic chemicals, which are less persistent but for which there are continuous releases resulting in essentially persistent exposure of biota, raise similar concerns.

2. Persistent toxic substances can be manufactured substances for use in various sectors of industry, pesticides, or by-products of industrial processes and combustion. The sub-group of the persistent toxic substances referred to as "persistent organic pollutants" (POPs) have been identified by the international community for immediate international action. These chemicals have serious health and environmental effects, which may include carcinogenicity, reproductive impairment, developmental and immune system changes, and endocrine disruption, thus posing a threat of lowered reproductive success and in extreme cases possible loss of biological diversity.

3. Following the recommendations of the Intergovernmental Forum on Chemical Safety, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Governing Council decided in February 1997 (Decision 19/13 C) that immediate international action should be initiated to protect human health and the environment through measures which will reduce and/or eliminate the emissions and discharges of an initial set of twelve persistent organic pollutants (POPs). Accordingly, an intergovernmental negotiating committee (INC) was established with a mandate to prepare an international legally binding instrument for implementing international action on certain persistent organic pollutants. Five sessions of the INC have been held and the final text of the legally binding instrument agreed. In addition the financial mechanism for the Convention as well as ways for contracting parties to implement their obligations have been outlined.

4. The Basel Convention regulates the transboundary movement of hazardous waste, which may include PTS. Some PTS are covered under the recently adopted Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade. FAO has initiated a process to identify and manage the disposal of obsolete stocks of pesticides, including PTS, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

5. In order to gain a better understanding of the damage and threats posed by PTS in various regions, a GEF financed project entitled "Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances" was initiated in September 2000 by UNEP. The objectives of the project are i) to

deliver a comprehensive regionally based assessment of the damage and threats posed by persistent toxic substances; and ii) to evaluate and agree on the priorities amongst chemical related environmental issues at the regional level in order to focus subsequent interventions on the most important and pressing issues. The results of the regional analyses will be available by May 2002. In addition to this priority-setting programmatic project, the GEF and its Implementing Agencies have been developing demonstration projects that address known POPs/PTS priorities at the country level. Of particular relevance to the proposed project are the UNEP/CAR-RCU “Reducing pesticide runoff to the Caribbean Sea” PDF-B, and the UNEP/PAHO “Comprehensive Action Programme to Phase-out DDT in Mexico and Central America” PDF-B. The countries participating to these projects are going through an exercise of “needs assessment” for specific substances, and will be testing alternatives and implementing infrastructure reforms which may be used as models.

6. The text of the Convention to address the regional and global threats posed by POPs has been agreed and the GEF has been designated as the principle implementing entity for the interim financial mechanism (Article 14 of the Convention). To address the obligations required by the Convention, actions at the national level aimed at managing and eliminating POPs are required. One specific obligation for countries is the development of a National Implementation Plan (NIP). Given that POPs are used and emitted in a variety of economic sectors, including industry, manufacturing and agriculture, the development of appropriate responses is a complex undertaking. It will require a comprehensive approach and actions at various levels. Often however, governments lack guidance on the best approaches to tackling the problems caused by POPs, and/or lack the financial resources necessary to implement basic management measures. In order to develop a suitable approach for assisting countries in this task, detailed information is necessary with regard to specific country needs, available options for managing and eliminating POPs, and human and other resources needed to implement these options effectively.

7. A PDF-B grant to prepare this project was approved by the GEF Secretariat in October 1999 under the name “Assessing National Management Needs of Persistent Toxic Substances”. It was foreseen at the time that the “project would place an emphasis, but not be limited to, the 12 POPs that are the subject of the INC negotiations”. In the light of the designation of the GEF as interim financial mechanism for the Convention, it was felt by UNEP that the project should in fact more closely mirror the immediate objectives of the Convention, and in particular should be focused on the 12 initial POPs. This is reflected in the new name for the project.

8. The current GEF programming context is the Contaminant-Based Operational Programme (OP 10) that makes direct reference to contaminants that are so persistent that they can be considered to be “*global contaminants*” and states that “*The GEF may support activities that help to characterise the nature, extent and significance of these contaminants and support the agreed incremental costs of processes and measures that demonstrate prevention or reduction of releases in recipient countries*”. In addition, the GEF Council at its 16<sup>th</sup> meeting has taken note of the draft elements of an Operational Programme on POPs designed specifically to meet the needs of the Convention. The proposed elements state that “Development of action plans for complying with the obligations of the POPs convention and for setting priorities for initiating future activities on POPs” will be supported. Indeed, the GEF Secretariat and the GEF agencies have prepared for Council approval a document entitled “Guidelines for Initial Enabling

Activities". The activities proposed in this project are fully aligned with the proposed guidelines. Moreover, the widely applicable guidelines that will result from the project will ensure the impact of the proposed activities at the programme level.

## **RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES (ALTERNATIVE)**

9. This project comprises targeted activities that will prepare countries and the International community to meet the obligations set under the POPs Convention. The assistance provided to this initial set of twelve pilot countries will prepare the GEF and its agencies for the systematic execution of enabling activities in all GEF eligible countries, much in the way that the UNEP/GEF pilot biosafety enabling activity project paved the ground for the systematic assistance to all GEF eligible countries.

10. At the national level, the objectives for the participating countries are i) the capacity to implement the POPs Convention through the development -or strengthening- of a National Implementation Plan for the management of POPs; and ii) the elaboration of detailed specific action plans that will identify effective national responses, processes and measures that would reduce releases of POPs. These NIPs are expected to meet the initial reporting obligations of the participating countries towards the Convention. Countries' capacity for managing the broader group of PTS will also be strengthened through this exercise.

11. At the global level, the objectives are i) to facilitate the implementation of the POPs Convention for its other parties through peer-reviewed generic guidelines for developing a NIP for the management of POPs; and ii) tools for the identification and selection of suitable options for POPs management and elimination. Further, the project will provide countries and the various donors with a rationale for assigning priorities as to the main assistance needs of countries, as well as cost estimates of various options aimed at the control or elimination of POPs.

12. The lessons learned from the pilots will be assessed and made available to all countries as the project progresses. This will allow the GEF and its agencies to offer rapidly and systematically assistance in the execution of enabling activities to all other countries, whilst benefiting from the experience of the first pilots. The results will also inform the first Conference of the Parties of the POPs Convention, which will meet within one year of the entry into force of the Convention.

## **Country Participation**

13. The project will be organized around twelve countries representing the core pilot project group where most project activities will be implemented. Sub-regional consultations will be held with the other GEF eligible countries around each pilot country. Thus, all countries will be involved with some level of participation which should facilitate their signature and ratification of the Convention, and will prepare them to develop their own NIPs. To support their preparation, they will receive small financial allowances to undertake an overview of their POPs related problems.

14. The countries that will participate in the project as the core pilot group are: Barbados, Bulgaria, Chile, Ecuador, Guinea/Conakry, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mali, Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Slovenia and Zambia. The selection of countries was made by the PDF-B Steering Group on the basis of guidelines and criteria developed by the Steering Group and amended by a meeting of experts held in the framework of the PDF-B (see Annex F for detailed description of process and rationale for choices).

15. The Steering Group identified a number of characteristics which needed to be represented in the group of participating countries in order to ensure that the pilot projects would be successful, that countries selected would be widely representative, and for ease of transferability of the experience gained to other countries at a later stage. The selection was done in a way to ensure the coverage of the three main groups of POPs (i.e. pesticides, industrial chemicals, and contaminants/by products), the various levels of development/socio-economic circumstances (i.e. least developed country, industrialising country, intensive pesticide use/agricultural economy, small island developing state (SIDS), and economy in transition) and an adequate geographic balance.

#### **PROJECT COMPONENTS/ACTIVITIES AND EXPECTED RESULTS**

16. The main outputs of the project for the twelve pilot countries will be NIPs for managing POPs. Activities in each country will include an assessment of POPs relevant chemical management infrastructures, the establishment of POPs inventories, and the identification of suitable management options for POPs that are adapted to the prevailing circumstances. The countries will also prepare elements of a prioritised and costed action plans for management and remediation actions.

17. The major output at the global level are peer reviewed general and technical guidelines which will assist governments in managing and eliminating POPs. These guidelines will include the lessons learned in the twelve pilot studies, and documented possible management approaches.

18. The components and activities leading to these outputs and, ultimately, to the project's outcomes and objectives are described below and summarised in the project logframe matrix (annex B).

#### **COMPONENT 1: National Implementation Plans for POPs Management**

19. The NIPs will be elaborated on the basis of the approach developed by the workshop "Framework for a National Action Plan for POPs management", and amended by the four "National Experts" workshops held in the framework of the PDF-B (see Annex D for "Framework for developing National Implementation Plans". The framework was developed to take into account the broader group of PTS, but is directly applicable to the more focussed activities necessary to prepare the ground for the implementation of the POPs Convention. The framework was adopted by the GEF POPs Task Force, comprising the GEF Secretariat, the three Implementing Agencies, FAO, UNIDO, and the interim Secretariat to the POPs Convention, as

part of the initial guidelines for enabling activities presented to Council for approval. A set of guidance documents will be provided to the pilot countries at the commencement of project activities to assist them in initiating work.

20. The development of the NIPs will involve evaluation of the options for management and/or elimination of POPs and identification of effective methods for the reduction/resolution of outstanding problems. Such evaluation will have to encompass not only technical considerations, but also socio-economic circumstances, policy aspirations and the legislative, management and technical infrastructure available within the countries. Particular care will be taken to utilise where possible existing structures, working groups etc (for example existing inter-ministerial committees). Similarly, the on-going work of international organisations, such as FAO for example, will not be replicated but relied upon.

21. The following activities will be carried out in each of the participating countries:

- *Determination of coordinating mechanisms and organisation of process (step 1)*
  - ⇒ identification and sensitisation of the key national stakeholders;
  - ⇒ organization of a national coordinating structure (multi-stakeholder national coordinating committee) and focal point;
  - ⇒ identifying and assigning responsibilities for the various aspects of POPs management;
  - ⇒ workplan development; and
  - ⇒ public information and awareness raising (to be continued throughout the project).
  
- *Establishment of a POPs inventory and assessment of national infrastructure and capacity (step 2)*
  - ⇒ preparation of a National Profile (or core sections thereof as they relate more specifically to POPs);
  - ⇒ preliminary inventory of production, distribution, use, import and export;
  - ⇒ preliminary inventory of stocks and contaminated sites; assessment of opportunities for disposal of obsolete stocks;
  - ⇒ preliminary inventory of releases to the environment;
  - ⇒ assessment of infrastructure capacity and institutions to manage POPs, including regulatory controls; needs and options for strengthening them;
  - ⇒ assessment of enforcement capacity to ensure compliance;
  - ⇒ assessment of social and economic implications of POPs use and reduction; including the need for the enhancement of local commercial infrastructure for distributing benign alternative technologies/products;
  - ⇒ assessment of monitoring and research and development capacity;
  - ⇒ identification of POPs related human health and environmental issues of concern, including their transboundary nature; and
  - ⇒ basic risk assessment as a basis for prioritisation of further action taking into account, *inter alia*, potential releases to the environment and size of exposed population.

- *Priority setting and determination of objectives (step 3)*
  - ⇒ development of criteria for prioritisation, taking into account health, environmental and socio-economic impact and the availability of alternative solutions; and
  - ⇒ determination of national objectives in relation to priority POPs or issues .
- *Formulation of a **prioritised and costed** National Implementation Plan, and specific Action Plans on POPs (step 4)*
  - ⇒ identification of management options, including phasing out and risk reduction options;
  - ⇒ need for introduction of technologies, including technology transfer; possibilities of developing indigenous alternatives;
  - ⇒ assessment of the costs and benefits of management options;
  - ⇒ preparation of initial funding request package for implementation, including cost estimates and incremental costs; and
  - ⇒ development of a national strategy for information exchange, education, communication and awareness raising, taking into account risk perception of POPs by the public, particularly the least educated.
- *Endorsement of NIP by stakeholders (Step 5)*
  - ⇒ preparation of an information document/report to be submitted to stakeholders for comments; and
  - ⇒ organisation of workshops and dissemination of information to obtain commitment of stakeholders and decision-makers.

#### *Involvement of Civil Society*

22. The adverse health effects from POPs are felt on the public at large, and particularly the least educated. It is therefore important to involve civil society in such a project. This is indeed recommended to the Parties of the Convention (Article 7 “Implementation Plans”). Organisations representing civil society, however, lack the capacity to engage meaningfully in discussions on POPs management, particularly in developing countries. In order to strengthen the capacity of civil society to intervene, small grants will be offered to grass-root organisations in each pilot country for on-the-ground activities (e.g. education, awareness raising).

#### **COMPONENT 2: Development of Global Guidelines for National Implementation Plans**

23. At the start of the project, existing methodologies will be compiled by UNEP from specialised national, non-governmental and international organizations. These specific methodologies may be applicable to some of the planned country-level activities (for example UNEP dioxins tool kit, or FAO format for pesticides inventory). They will be provided to the participating countries, supplemented where appropriate.

24. After completion of the different steps of the NIP development in the participating countries, the above-mentioned guidelines will be integrated, complemented with additional

guidelines, and reviewed in the light of the lessons learned and experience gained in the twelve countries. The experience gained by the World Bank in developing Action Plans for POPs for a number of countries will also be capitalised upon. The World Bank has participated actively in the Steering Group for the preparation of this project and this good working relationship with UNEP on POPs related matters will continue in the future.

25. There are a number of steps and milestones in the development of the NIPs. The experience gained in each phase will be assessed as soon as it becomes available, as project execution progresses (for example POPs inventory, tools for prioritisation etc). This will enable other countries that wish to start their NIP development in the interim period to benefit fully from the experience gained in the pilot countries, without having to wait for project completion. The guidelines will be submitted to the COP for review and endorsement and will be made widely available to facilitate the development of NIPs in all other GEF eligible countries.

26. The experience gained in developing NIPs in the participating countries will also provide examples of the costs of such activities. The development of such cost-norms will assist the financial mechanism for the Convention to expedite the processing of enabling activity requests.

27. The following activities will be carried out at the global level under the responsibility of the international executing agency, UNEP Chemicals:

- Compilation and expansion (where needed) of methodologies;
- Evaluation of existing management options for different POPs and recommendation of most effective methods;
- Development of tools for priority setting;
- Review of lessons learned and consolidation of the framework guidelines for the development of National Implementation Plans;
- Evaluation of the costs of developing the NIPs (“cost-norms” for POPs enabling activities) ; and
- Evaluation of the financial and technical assistance needed to implement the Plans.

28. Technical expertise to revise the guidelines and review outputs and lessons learned will be provided by consultants and experts who may need to meet during the project. Provision is made for four technical expert meetings after completion of key steps of the project, to ensure timely delivery of the guidelines for the use of other countries.

### **COMPONENT 3: Dissemination and Sub-regional Consultations**

29. Over the course of the project, 2 sub-regional consultations will be held with other GEF eligible countries around each of the twelve pilot countries (22 meetings in total). These consultations will be attended by senior technical experts responsible for chemical management. The first meeting will be held towards the end of the POPs inventory phase, and the second meeting will be held prior to the adoption of the NIP. These meetings will serve the following purposes:

- The pilot countries will be able to submit the difficulties that they encounter, and possibly benefit from the experience and knowledge in other countries.
- The other non-pilot countries will be encouraged to think about how they might prepare for implementation of the Convention, and will be alerted about the difficulties faced by the pilot countries.
- To assist countries in understanding the implications of signature and ratification of the Convention with a view to facilitating its entry into force.
- It will become apparent, in some cases, that regional solutions are best adapted to the problem at hand.
- Replicability and future use of the guidelines will be ensured through all countries being aware of their existence and interested in using them.

30. The non-pilot countries that so desire will receive a small financial allowance to undertake a fact finding exercise on national problems related to POPs and their management. This will maximise their active participation to the sub-regional meetings and will ensure that there is a meaningful dialogue between them and the pilot countries. It is expected that this allowance for preparation to the sub-regional meetings will be offered to those countries that have not yet conducted a UNITAR/IOMC National Profile, or a previous case study with UNEP or POPs Action Plan with the World Bank.

31. Therefore a total of 112 GEF eligible countries will be involved in project activities:

- twelve GEF eligible countries that are the core countries where most project activities are taking place. They will receive an allocation of US\$ 350,000, on average.
- 50 additional GEF eligible countries will receive on average US\$ 10,000 for a fact-finding study for a preliminary assessment of existing capacity and needs.
- An additional 50 GEF eligible countries that will participate in the sub-regional meetings. (The budget allocation for sub-regional meetings, US\$ 500,000, allows for the participation of representatives from a total of 100 countries to two meetings.)

32. In addition, every opportunity to make use of existing meetings to promote the objectives of the project will be seized. This includes the regional/sub-regional workshops on the management of POPs and their releases that UNEP Chemicals is organising within its regular programme of work, as well as meetings of the INC that are likely to take place in the interim period.

#### *Communication strategy and Dissemination*

33. A detailed communication strategy will be drafted by the Project Manager to be reviewed by the Steering Group. This will take into account both the short term communication needs at the country level, and longer term needs at the country as well as regional and global levels. The NIPs and the guidelines will be widely disseminated in hard copy and electronically. The results of the overall project, and particularly the guidelines which will contain the wealth of experience acquired through this project, as well as the NIPs, will be made available to the first meeting of the COP of the POPs Convention in order to inform the debates about reporting requirements and time-frame.

## COMPONENT 4: Project Co-ordination and Management

### *National Level*

34. Countries will be encouraged to execute the project through a **multi-sectoral National Coordinating Committee** comprising the main actors in government (ministries of environment, industry, agriculture, health, labour, and others as appropriate), as well as representatives of industry and the civil society (environmental NGOs, academia, trade unions, etc). Countries will be encouraged to make use of existing mechanisms and committees and to avoid as much as possible establishing new institutional structures. The National Coordinating Committee will facilitate co-ordination of the project activities amongst national stakeholders, provide guidance and support to the execution of the project, and oversee the work of the national coordinator. Individual members will be responsible for overseeing specific components of the NIP development. Collectively, the National Coordinating Committee will assemble and finalise the NIP.

35. Each country will designate an institution that will act as **the focal point** for the national components of the project. This institution will provide a **National Coordinator** whose choice should be discussed with UNEP, and endorsed by the National Coordinating Committee. The National Coordinator will act as Secretary to the National Coordinating Committee and oversee overall project execution and coordination with UNEP (Terms of Reference in Annex E). It is expected that country-based activities will be executed in a decentralised manner, with various governmental and/or non-governmental agencies being responsible for executing activities in their area of expertise (e.g., the Ministry of agriculture might be responsible for pesticides inventory).

### *International Co-ordination and Project Management*

36. Although the project activities are carried out mainly at the national level, there is a need to provide assistance to the pilot countries and at the same time ensure the smooth organization of training and other capacity building activities. It is also beneficial to organise the exchange between countries of the technical expertise that may exist in one of the pilot countries. This can best be achieved through regional and international collaboration.

37. The project intends to make full use of the expertise and products already available in various relevant agencies. The PDF-B has therefore identified existing resources and expertise that may be useful during the pilot projects. In addition, UN and other intergovernmental agencies as well as development agencies will be invited to take on specific activities where they have expertise, under the responsibility of UNEP Chemicals. Although these organisations will be encouraged to provide such assistance as in-kind contribution to the project, part of this may be done on a compensatory basis.

38. **A Project Manager** will be appointed at UNEP Chemicals (Terms of Reference Annex E). The Project Manager will act as Secretary for the Steering Group and will be responsible for managing all aspects of project execution including facilitation of in-country activities, and dissemination of results and progress.

39. **The project Steering Group** will be composed of UNEP Chemicals, UNEP GEF Coordination Office, the other GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP and the World Bank), FAO, UNIDO, UNITAR, the Secretariat of the Basel Convention, environmental NGO and industry representatives, and the major donors to the project.

40. The Steering Group will advise the Project Manager, promote buy-in to the project from the organizations involved and co-ordinate with other projects to avoid duplication and overlap. The Steering Group will suggest corrective actions, if necessary.

41. The Steering Group will meet three times:

- i. At the onset of the project, to review and endorse the management and work plan, to review and endorse the guidance documents offered to countries and to provide additional guidance as needed;
- ii Month 14-16 in the project, to review progress in implementation, resolve difficulties and suggest corrective actions as needed; and
- iii Towards the end of the project, to review the NIPs, to assess lessons learnt, and review and endorse the final guidelines.

42. The National Coordinators will be invited to the 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Steering Group and will meet separately twice more to facilitate experience sharing between the pilot countries, and discuss and resolve difficulties.

## **RISKS AND SUSTAINABILITY**

43. The Logical Framework Matrix (Annex B) details the project-related risks and assumptions. The first major risk to the project is that the decision-makers in the participating countries do not buy-in to the project. This risk is alleviated with the initial sensitisation phase amongst the key government stakeholders at the commencement of the project, and the increased importance of Chemicals issues on the international agenda (POPs Convention).

44. The second major risk is that the different stakeholders in the participating countries, particularly outside government, do not participate in the project. These risks are minimized by the establishment of a national multi-stakeholder Coordinating Committee and the decentralized approach to the national activities. It is also expected that the project will catalyse POPs related activities in the countries and that the National Implementation Plans will be used by countries and donor agencies as a basis for further implementation activities, thus providing an incentive for all concerned stakeholders to get involved.

## **STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION AND IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

45. The primary stakeholders are the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Health and Industry, or the respective agencies involved with the management of chemicals; members of the public at large as well as organizations that may represent them such as non-governmental organizations or trade-unions; the various sectors of industry that use, produce or dispose of persistent toxic substances, and the agricultural sector. These various stakeholders were involved in the project preparation phase, through the participation of individuals from environment, agriculture and health sectors, environmental NGOs, industry and academia, to the various expert meetings organized in the framework of the PDF-B. The involvement of this wide variety of actors is central to the execution of the proposed project which relies on a multi-stakeholder National Coordinating Committee to drive the process in the participating countries, and on different specialized agencies being responsible for specific activities.

46. In addition, as described in component 1, the capacity for civil society to be engaged in Chemicals management activities will be strengthened through allowing grass-root organisations to undertake small projects in each of the twelve participating countries.

47. The principle Executing Agency for this project, responsible for overall project execution and international collaborative arrangements is UNEP through its Chemicals Unit. The Chemicals Unit is the Chair of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals, and is executing the GEF funded “Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances”. It is thus in an ideal position to ensure that the project meets its objectives of serving the future POPs Convention, and in ensuring synergies with related activities. At the national level, the project is executed by a multi-stakeholder Coordinating Committee comprising representatives of the relevant line ministries and other sectors of society. Although one particular agency will be designated as project focal point, specific activities will be executed by specialised agencies/government departments according to their expertise. In addition, relevant international organisations, UN, intergovernmental, or NGOs, will be tasked with specific capacity building / technical assistance delivery according to their mandate and expertise.

## **INCREMENTAL COSTS AND PROJECT FINANCING**

48. The proposed activities are enabling activities that will build the capacity of, and prepare the participating countries to meet their obligations under the future POPs Convention. Accordingly their costs are fully incremental in the context of GEF funding. Cash co-financing, however, is available from a number of donor countries to support the GEF in this endeavor. In addition, the proposed activities rely on a significant in-kind contribution from the participating countries.

49. a) The current budget of the umbrella project is presented in Annex A. The total project cost (excluding all PDF-B costs) is estimated at 8.637 million US dollars, of which 5.835 million US dollars are requested from the GEF, 2.12 million US dollars represents in-kind contributions from the participating countries and international organizations, and 682,000 US dollars is cash

co-financing. Cash co-financing has been secured from Germany (220,000 US dollars), Switzerland (60,000 US dollars), and Sweden (271, 000 US dollars). 131,000 US dollars remain to be secured during the course of the project. In addition to this total, UNEP is also providing co-financing of 168,000 US dollars from Trust Funds: 30,000 US dollars for case study activities (Trust Fund PO/3100-97-03) and 138,000 US dollars for activities related to PCB inventory taking activities from funds received from the Government of Switzerland (Trust Fund PO/3100-97-49-2220). When taking this contribution into account, the total costs of project related activities (excluding PDF-B costs) is 8.805 million US dollars, compared to the estimated project costs of 8.815 million US dollars in the project brief approved by the GEF Council in May 2001. The World Bank has taken a greater role than anticipated in the development of the guidelines envisaged under the project brief. This is reflected in 80,000 US dollars showing as in-kind-contribution from the World Bank. As a consequence, the 80,000 US dollars from the GEF originally allocated for activities related to the development of the guidelines have been redirected to other activities.

b)The original approved budget is presented in Annex A1. The total project cost was estimated at 9.31 million US dollars, of which, 6.18 million US dollars were requested from the GEF. 2.19 million US dollars represented in-kind contributions from the participating countries and international organizations, and 940,000 US dollars cash co-financing. Cash co-financing was to be secured so far from Germany (330,000 US dollars), Switzerland (60,000 US dollars), and from UNIDO (10,000 US dollars). 540,000 US dollars remained to be secured by time of CEO endorsement. Additional in-kind contributions were to be identified from inter-governmental organizations and other institutions.

49. It is expected that pilot countries will need assistance in the form of or specialist expertise during the project. Funds have therefore been allocated for this purpose and for the compensation of international organizations who undertake activities beyond their agreed in-kind contribution. The Executing Agency, UNEP Chemicals, will provide in-kind support to the Project Manager, for World Wide Web dissemination of results, and for monitoring and evaluation.

50. The specific budget for each country was jointly determined by the country representatives and UNEP, and endorsed by the multi-stakeholder National Coordinating Committee in each country. The total amount of funds allocated to each country differs, and depends on the size and existing infrastructure of the country, and the amount of relevant work already done. At the outset, countries will receive 75% of the funds allocated to the first year of activities to initiate work and prepare a POPs inventory as well as an assessment of the POPs management infrastructure. Further disbursements of funds will be made on the basis of an expenditure statement and report of activities and achievements.

51. The GEF Council will be deciding in the future on a ceiling for enabling activities for POPs. Once this ceiling is approved, a pilot country that has received less will have the possibility to apply for a supplement of funding up to the ceiling, if this is judged necessary.

## **MONITORING, EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION**

52. Monitoring of progress in execution of the project will be undertaken through UNEP and GEF requirements of quarterly and half-yearly reports on substantive and financial matters.

54. A mid-term evaluation will be undertaken under the supervision of the UNEP/GEF Co-ordination Office to diagnose problems and suggest necessary corrections. It will evaluate the efficiency of project management, including delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity and timeliness. The Steering Group will receive the outcome of the evaluation and discuss any required remedial action, if necessary. A terminal desk evaluation of the project will be undertaken by UNEP in accordance with internal procedures. Evaluation of the overall performance of the project will also be undertaken within the framework of the Monitoring and Evaluation Programme of the GEF Secretariat.

55. Cash Advance Requirements

N/A

### **SECTION 3: INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK**

56. Institutional framework

This Internal Project will be implemented under the general guidance and direct supervision of the Director of UNEP Chemicals Unit, who will be overall responsible for the formulation of internal and external project documents attached to this project.

All correspondence regarding substantive matters should be addressed to:

UNEP:

Mr. James Willis  
Director, Chemicals, UNEP  
11-13 Chemin des Anemones  
CH-1219 Chatelaine  
Geneva, Switzerland  
Fax: 41 22797 3460

Mr. Stefano Bologna  
Senior Programme Officer  
UNEP/GEF  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254-2-623967  
Fax: 254-2-624041

With copies to:

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif  
Director  
Division of GEF Coordination, UNEP  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya

Fax: +254-2-624041

Correspondence regarding financial and budgetary matters should be addressed to:

Mr. E. F. Ortega  
Chief, Budget and Financial Management Service, UNON  
P.O. Box 67578  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Fax: +254-2-623755

With a copy to:

Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif  
Director  
Division of GEF Coordination, UNEP  
P.O. Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Fax: +254-2-624041

Mr. James Willis  
Director, Chemicals, UNEP  
11-13 Chemin des Anemones  
CH-1219 Chatelaine  
Geneva, Switzerland  
Fax: 41 22797 3460

Mr. Victor Ogbuneke  
Fund Management Officer  
Division of GEF Coordination, UNEP  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Fax 254 2 624041

#### **SECTION 4: REPORTING MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

##### 57. Evaluation

The Director of UNEP Chemicals will maintain systematic overview of the implementation of the project by means of monthly project monitoring meetings or other form of consultation, as well as by regular quarterly progress reports. A final report of the project will be prepared by the Director of UNEP Chemicals.

##### 58. Quarterly Progress Reports

From June 2002 and every three months thereafter, UNEP Chemicals will submit Quarterly Progress Reports to Director of the Division of GEF Coordination, UNEP, with copies to the Chief, BFMS, on the progress in project execution as per **Annex K** of the project document.

59. Final Reports

Within 60 days of the completion of the project, UNEP Chemicals, shall submit a Final Report in the UNEP format to the Director of the Division of GEF Coordination, UNEP with copies to the Chief, Budget and Financial Management Service and the Chief, Programme Coordination and Management Unit. The report should indicate the principal factors, which have determined the success or failure of the project in meeting the objectives set forth in the project document as per **Annex L**.

60. Financial Reports

N/A

61. Other Terms and Conditions

Inventory of Non-expendable equipment purchased against UNEP project funds

UNEP Chemicals will maintain records of non-expendable equipment (items costing US\$ 1,500 or more as well as items of attraction such as pocket calculators) purchased with UNEP funds, and will submit an inventory of all such equipment to the Budget and Funds Management Service once a year, attached to the progress report as per **Annex O**. A final inventory of equipment will be submitted to the Budget and Funds Management Service, within 60 days of the completion of the project.

62. Responsibility for cost overruns

The Director of UNEP Chemicals is authorized to enter into commitments or to incur expenditures up to a maximum of 20 per cent over and above the annual amount foreseen in the project budget under any sub-budget line, provided the total cost of the UNEP annual contribution to the project is not exceeded. This may be done without prior authorization, but once the need for these additional funds become apparent, The Director of UNEP Chemicals shall inform within thirty days, the Chief, budget and Funds Management Services, about shifts made and these have to be reflected in a revision to the project document not later than three months after the shifts have been made.

No commitment over and above the amounts authorized in the sub-allotments shall be entered into unless specifically authorized by UNEP.

63. Publications

By including provisions for the publication in the UNEP component of the umbrella project document, UNEP thereby affirms itself as copyright-holder of toolkits and guidelines that are

outcomes under the umbrella project and material UNEP deems relevant and equally expresses its intention to consider the text for inclusion in the its publications programme.

All final publications must be produced/published, according to UNEP's publication manual with the approval of the UNEP Editorial Committee to ensure peer review of manuscripts, and distribution and marketing strategies. Both cover and title page of all substantive reports will carry the approved UNEP logo and title “ United Nations Environment Programme” together with the GEF logo and title “ Global Environmental Facility”. The final report will also acknowledge explicitly the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and other donors as a source of funds for the project .UNEP thereby affirms itself as copyright-holder of the said manuscripts.

10 Copies of all substantive and technical reports produced in accordance with the schedule of work will be submitted to UNEP/GEF Division, including 5 copies for forwarding to the GEF Secretariat.



**Table 1: Generic Timetable for Implementation**

	2002												2003												2004				
	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	J	J	A	
Project Manager on Board			X																										
Steering Group meetings			X										X											X					
<b>Development of NIPs</b>																													
Organisation of process																													
Inventory /Capacity assesmt.																													
Priority setting																													
Formulation of NIP																													
Adoption of NIP																													
<b>Sub-regional meetings (2x12)</b>																													
<b>Global guidelines</b>																													
Preliminary methodologies																													
Global guidance consolidation																													
Technical expert meetings				X								X					X									X			

## LIST OF ANNEXES

- Annex A: Incremental Cost**  
This is a pilot enabling activity, and is therefore considered fully incremental in the context of GEF funding. The budgets for the umbrella project document is included here.
- Annex A1: Budget of the Project Brief at the time of submission for CEO approval is included here.**
- Annex B: Logical Framework Matrix**
- Annex C: STAP Roster Technical Review**
- Annex C1: Implementing Agency Response to STAP/Council/Implementing Agency Comments**
- Annex D: Framework for Developing National Implementation Plans**
- Annex E: Terms of Reference for Project Manager and National Coordinators**
- Annex F: Criteria and Clusters for Pilot Country Selection**
- Annex G: List of the Publications Prepared under the PDF-B Grant**
- Annex H: Letters of Support and Endorsements of PDF-B Survey Form from Participating Countries Line Ministries and other Stakeholders**
- Annex I: Brief Description of POPs Issues in the Twelve Participating Countries**
- Annex J: 12 Sub Projects :**
- GF/XG/-/Barbados**
  - GF/XG/-/Bulgaria**
  - GF/XG/-/Chile**
  - GF/XG/-/Ecuador**
  - GF/XG/-/Guinea Conakry**
  - GF/XG/-/Lebanon**
  - GF/XG/-/Malaysia**
  - GF/XG/-/Mali**
  - GF/XG/-/Micronesia**
  - GF/XG/-/Papua New Guinea**
  - GF/XG/-/Slovenia**
  - GF/XG/-/Zambia**
- Annex K: Format for the Quarterly Progress Report**
- Annex L: Format for Final Report**
- Annex M: Format for Report on Expenditures**
- Annex N: Format for Statement of Cash Advance**
- Annex O: Format for Report on Equipment Inventory**



**ANNEX A - PROJECT BUDGET** (This is a pilot enabling activity, and is therefore considered fully incremental in the context of GEF funding.)

	2002				2003			2004	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Grand Total
	GEF	Germany	Swiss	Sweden	GEF	Germany	Sweden	GEF	GEF	Germany	Swiss	Sweden	to be ID****	
<b>10 PERSONNEL COMPONENT</b>														
1100 Project Personnel														-
1101 Project Manager P4	100,000				152,100			97,900	350,000	-	-	-		350,000
<b>1199 total</b>	<b>100,000</b>	-	-	-	<b>152,100</b>	-	-	<b>97,900</b>	<b>350,000</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>350,000</b>
1200 Consultants														
1201 Consultant (Compilation and review of guidelines)***	-	10,000			-			-	-	10,000	-	-	20,000	30,000
1202 Consultant (Consolidation and editing of guidelines)	50,000		40,000		-			-	50,000	-	40,000	-		90,000
<b>1299 total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	-	-	-	-	-	<b>50,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	-	<b>20,000</b>	<b>120,000</b>
1300 Administrative Support														
1321 Temporary Assistance	20,500				41,000			41,000	102,500	-	-	-		102,500
<b>1399 total</b>	<b>20,500</b>	-	-	-	<b>41,000</b>	-	-	<b>41,000</b>	<b>102,500</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>102,500</b>
1600 Travel on Official Business														
1601 Travel for Project Manager	50,000				40,000			50,000	140,000	-	-	-		140,000
<b>1699 total</b>	<b>50,000</b>	-	-		<b>40,000</b>			<b>50,000</b>	<b>140,000</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>140,000</b>
<b>1999 component total</b>	<b>220,500</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	-	<b>233,100</b>	-	-	<b>188,900</b>	<b>642,500</b>	<b>10,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>	-	<b>20,000</b>	<b>712,500</b>
<b>20 SUB CONTRACT COMPONENT</b>														
2100 Sub-contracts (MOUs/Las for cooperating agencies)														
2101 Support to Civil Society ( 50 Small Grants )	150,000	-			-	-		-	150,000		-	-		150,000
2102 Subcontracts (Fact finding studies 50 countries)**, ****	250,000			110,000					250,000			110,000		360,000
2103 MOU's IGO's	128,250								128,250					128,250
<b>2199 total</b>	<b>528,250</b>	-	-	<b>110,000</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>528,250</b>	-	-	<b>110,000</b>	-	<b>638,250</b>
2200 MOU with Countries														
2201 Barbados	133,050	5,000			138,000	5,000		8,950	280,000	10,000	-	-		290,000
2202 Bulgaria	156,200	5,000			134,500	14,000		7,300	298,000	19,000	-	-		317,000
2203 Chile	225,750	10,000			206,000	9,000		14,250	446,000	19,000	-	-		465,000
2204 Ecuador	236,900	19,000			139,000	-		19,100	395,000	19,000	-	-		414,000
2205 Guinea Conakry*	160,950	19,000			80,000	-		26,050	267,000	19,000	-	-		286,000
2206 Lebanon	156,250	19,000			149,250	-		28,500	334,000	19,000	-	-		353,000
2208 Malaysia	224,000	19,000			156,000	-		19,000	399,000	19,000	-	-		418,000
2207 Mali*	150,000	15,000			103,000	4,000		18,000	271,000	19,000	-	-		290,000
2209 Micronesia	243,600	15,000			117,000	4,000		9,400	370,000	19,000	-	-		389,000
2210 Papua New Guinea	153,090	19,000			113,000	-		20,910	287,000	19,000	-	-		306,000
2211 Slovenia	91,375	5,000		20,000	59,000	5,000		9,625	160,000	10,000	-	20,000		190,000

	2002				2003			2004	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Grand Total
	GEF	Germany	Swiss	Sweden	GEF	Germany	Sweden	GEF	GEF	Germany	Swiss	Sweden	to be ID****	
2212 Zambia	188,950	19,000			140,250	-		22,800	352,000	19,000	-	-		371,000
<b>2299 total</b>	<b>2,120,115</b>	<b>169,000</b>		<b>20,000</b>	<b>1,535,000</b>	<b>41,000</b>		<b>203,885</b>	<b>3,859,000</b>	<b>210,000</b>		<b>20,000</b>		<b>4,089,000</b>
<b>2999 component total</b>	<b>2,648,365</b>	<b>169,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>130,000</b>	<b>1,535,000</b>	<b>41,000</b>		<b>203,885</b>	<b>4,387,250</b>	<b>210,000</b>		<b>130,000</b>		<b>4,727,250</b>
<b>30 TRAINING COMPONENT</b>														
3300 Meetings/Conferences														
3301 National Coordinators Meeting (2)	-	-			-	-		-	-	-	-	-	50,000	50,000
3302 Steering Groups Meetings (3)	-	-	20,000		20,000	-		-	20,000	-	20,000	-	20,000	60,000
3303 Regional meetings (12)	150,000				80,000		141,000	88,000	318,000	-	-	141,000	21,000	480,000
3398 Expert meeting for development of guidelines(4)	2,500	-			25,000			22,500	50,000	-	-	-	20,000	70,000
<b>3399 total</b>	<b>152,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,000</b>		<b>125,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>141,000</b>	<b>110,500</b>	<b>388,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>141,000</b>	<b>111,000</b>	<b>660,000</b>
<b>3999 component total</b>	<b>152,500</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,000</b>		<b>125,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>141,000</b>	<b>110,500</b>	<b>388,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>141,000</b>	<b>111,000</b>	<b>660,000</b>
<b>40 EQUIPMENT COMPONENT</b>														
4100 Expendable equipment														
4101 Office Supplies	750				1,500			1,500	3,750	-	-	-		3,750
<b>4199 total</b>	<b>750</b>				<b>1,500</b>			<b>1,500</b>	<b>3,750</b>					<b>3,750</b>
4200 Non-expendable equipment														
4201 Computer Equipment	12,000				-				12,000	-	-	-		12,000
4202 Office Equipment	1,500				-				1,500	-	-	-		1,500
<b>4299 total</b>	<b>13,500</b>								<b>13,500</b>					<b>13,500</b>
<b>4999 component total</b>	<b>14,250</b>				<b>1,500</b>			<b>1,500</b>	<b>17,250</b>					<b>17,250</b>
<b>50 MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT</b>														
5100 Operation and Maintenance of Equipment														
5102 Rental and maintenance of photocopy equipment	500				750			750	2,000	-	-	-		2,000
<b>5199 total</b>	<b>500</b>				<b>750</b>			<b>750</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>2,000</b>
5200 Reporting Cost														
5201 Translation, publications & dissemination of reports & guidelines	50,000				180,000			78,000	308,000	-	-	-		308,000
<b>5299 total</b>	<b>50,000</b>				<b>180,000</b>			<b>78,000</b>	<b>308,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>308,000</b>
5300 Sundry														
5301 Communication	5,000				5,000			5,000	15,000	-	-	-		15,000
5302 Other ( Contingency and Misc. Administrative Charges)	25,000				25,000			25,000	75,000	-	-	-		75,000
<b>5399 total</b>	<b>30,000</b>				<b>30,000</b>			<b>30,000</b>	<b>90,000</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>		<b>90,000</b>
<b>5999 component total</b>	<b>80,500</b>				<b>210,750</b>			<b>108,750</b>	<b>400,000</b>					<b>400,000</b>
<b>99 GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>3,116,115</b>	<b>179,000</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>130,000</b>	<b>2,105,350</b>	<b>41,000</b>	<b>141,000</b>	<b>613,535</b>	<b>5,835,000</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>60,000</b>	<b>271,000</b>	<b>131,000</b>	<b>6,517,000</b>

\* Additional 28,000USD funded by the Swiss Govt through PO/3100-97-49-2220 earmarked 8,000 USD for Mali and 20,000 USD for Guinea

\*\*\*\*30,000 USD from UNEP's PO Trust Fund PO/3100-97-03

\*\* Additional 110,000 USD funded by the Swiss Govt. through project PO/3100-97-49-2220 earmarked for undertaking National Inventories on PCB's

\*\*\*\*\* To be secured during the course of the project

\*\*\* Additional 80,000 USD in-kind contribution from the World bank

**ANNEX A 1 – OVERALL BUDGET AT THE TIME OF WORK PROGRAMME APPROVAL BY GEF COUNCIL**

Component	in 000 US \$	GEF	Co-financing						Total	
			Cash				In-kind			
			Germ.	Switz.	to be ID	UNIDO	Countr y	UNEP		IGOs
<b>1. NIPs development</b>										
1.1 Determination coord. mechanisms & organisation of process		1432	-	-	-	-	420	-	-	1852
1.2 POPs inventory and assessment of infrastructure and capacity		1065	210	-	-	10	700	-	-	1985
1.3 Priority setting and determining POPs management objectives		465	-	-	-	-	120	-	20	605
1.4 Formulation of a National Implementation Plan on POPs		641	-	-	-	-	500	-	-	1141
1.5 Adoption of NIP by stakeholders		262	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	262
Support to Civil Society (50 small grants)		150	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150
<b>Total</b>		<b>4015</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1740</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5995</b>
<b>2. Development of Guidelines</b>										
Compilation		20	-	-	-	-	-	10	50	80
Review		20	30	-	-	-	-	5	40	95
Expert meetings		70	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	90
Consolidation and editing		50	-	40	-	-	-	5	40	135
Translation		100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
<b>Total</b>		<b>260</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>500</b>
<b>3. Dissemination and Sub-regional Consultations</b>										
Fact finding studies (50 countries)		250	-	-	250	-	-	10	-	510
2x11 Regional meetings		210	-	-	290	-	-	-	-	500
Translation		80	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80
Website activities		-	-	-	-	-	-	25	-	25
National Reports (printing, distribution)		50	-	-	-	-	45	-	-	95
Final Report (printing, distribution)		20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
Translation		90	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90
<b>Total</b>		<b>700</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1320</b>
<b>4. Co-ordination and Management</b>										
3 Steering Group Meetings		20	20	20	-	-	-	-	-	60
2 National Co-ordinators Meeting		-	50	-	-	-	15	-	-	65
Project Manager		350	-	-	-	-	-	15	-	365
Secretary to project manager		-	-	-	-	-	-	20	-	20
Travel Project Manager		140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	140
<b>Total</b>		<b>510</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>650</b>
<b>Executing Agency Administrative Costs</b>		<b>350</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>350</b>
<b>PDF-B</b>		<b>350</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>500</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>6185</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1800</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>9315</b>

## ANNEX B - LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX

SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	CRITICAL ASSUMPTION AND RISK
<b>Overall Objective</b>			
To protect human health and the environment through prompt implementation of the Stockholm POPs Convention	Reduction of releases of POPs in the environment; Reduction of the number of reported acute adverse human health incidents.	Environmental monitoring programmes (not within project lifetime); Reports from poison centres.	That financial and technical assistance will be available to implement the NIPs.
<b>Outcomes</b>			
Faster and easier development of NIPs for other countries using the guidelines	Other countries and GEF agencies refer to the guidelines	Enabling activities project proposals	That the guidelines are produced in a timely manner
Other countries are encouraged to sign and ratify the POPs Convention	Increased number of countries sign and/or ratify the Convention	No of signatures, instruments of ratification received	None
Pilot countries have the capacity to meet their obligations under the POPs Convention.	Reporting capacity meeting the needs of the POPs convention.	Acknowledgement of satisfactory reporting from the POPs Convention Interim Secretariat	None
Strengthened national capacity to manage Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and other chemicals in the pilot countries.	Reform in legislation, infrastructure, etc.	Update of National Profile	That chemical management structures and resources developed under the project remain devoted to POPs management. The risks are of staffing and government instability.
Objective basis for POPs management priorities in the pilot countries.	Priorities identified during the project are used as the basis for national action.	Project proposals	That sectoral interests override agreed priorities
Enhanced knowledge and understanding of national POPs problems amongst decision makers, managers, industry, and the public at large.	Increased importance of chemicals problems on the political agenda; Increased national activities on chemicals / POPs problems	Government declarations	That conclusions and recommendations contained in the NIP receive broad-base national acceptance.
<b>Results</b>			
Generic and technical guidelines for NIP development and managing/eliminating POPs are available to all countries.	Compilations of methodologies and guidelines are made available	National chemical managers in all countries receive at least a copy of the final guidelines.	That the other GEF eligible countries are aware of the existence of the guidelines. This risk is alleviated by the existence of the sub-regional meetings. That the solutions proposed can be applied in all GEF eligible countries.
National Implementation Plans for the Convention, including prioritised and costed action plans for management and	National Implementation Plans and their associated costs are produced.	Adoption of NIPs (NIPs are published and distributed).	National policy reflects the identified priorities

SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	CRITICAL ASSUMPTION AND RISK
remediation actions.			
<b>Components/Activities</b>			
<i>Component 1: Development of National Implementation Plans for POPs Management</i>			
Determination of co-ordinating mechanisms and organisation of process (step 1).	Functional National Co-ordinating Committee; Assignment of responsibilities; Agreed workplan.	Progress report to UNEP	That National Agencies confirm their commitment to the project. The risk that they do not is alleviated by the importance attached to multi-agency/government department endorsement in the country selection process.
Establishment of POPs inventory and assessment of national infrastructure and capacity (step 2).	Major sources of POPs in the country and infrastructure are assessed.	Task teams reports	That industry and the private sector collaborate and provide the needed information. The risk can be alleviated through their participation in the National Co-ordinating Committee.
Priority setting and determination of objectives (step 3).	The national co-ordinating committee agrees on priority chemicals and environmental issues.	Minutes of National Co-ordinating Committee meetings.	That National Agencies confirm their commitment to the project. The risk that they do not is alleviated by the importance attached to multi-agency/government department endorsement in the country selection process.  That there is good co-operation and response from industry and other stakeholders.
Formulation of a NIP, and specific Action Plans on POPs (step 4).	The national co-ordinating committee agrees on the workplan; Task teams are mandated to execute their tasks.	Minutes of National Co-ordinating Committee meetings; National Implementation Plans are produced.	Same as above
Endorsement of NIP by stakeholders (step 5).	National stakeholders buy-in to the NIP	Declarations from trade associations; Meeting reports.	None foreseen if all stakeholders are involved in NIP development through the National Co-ordinating Committee.
Support to civil society	Small project are executed by local NGOs	Project reports	That governments and NGOs work together. The risk that they do not is alleviated by the commitment from participating countries to working with NGOs.
<i>Component 2: Development of Global Guidelines for National Implementation Plans</i>			
Review of lessons learned and experience gained / consolidation of guidelines	Lessons and experience from the pilot countries are assessed and integrated with the initial guidelines.	Expert meetings reports and publication of global guidelines.	None
Assessment of resource requirements to develop National Implementation Plans	Average “cost norms” for NIP development are produced	Experts meetings reports	That the differences between countries are not so great that the exercise is meaningless. This

SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	CRITICAL ASSUMPTION AND RISK
(NIPs)			risk is relatively high. The independent review of the pilot biosafety project, for example, concluded that the development of “cost-norms” had turned out to be “perhaps virtually impossible”.
Compilation and review of existing methodologies	Methodology and guidelines from various international organisations and development agencies are identified and compiled.	Initial set of guidelines provided to pilot countries at start of project	That IGOs and others collaborate and support the project. This assumption should be met as the PDF has benefited from the active participation from other agencies.
<i>Component 3: Dissemination and Sub-regional Consultations</i>			
Sub-regional consultations	Neighbouring countries share experience with the pilot countries.	Meeting attendance and reports.	That countries are willing to collaborate. UNEP’s experience in organising sub-regional workshops on POPs related issues, including during the preparation for this project, is that this is generally the case. Moreover, countries’ participation is facilitated by small grants for fact-finding exercise.
Dissemination	Results are disseminated widely at the national level, including to the public, decision-makers, managers, industry and NGOs; Results are disseminated widely at the global level, including progress reports to meetings of the INC, and at the COP.	Publication of reports, brochures, CD-ROM, films, radio programmes etc; Meeting reports.	That targeted communication activities can change people’s perceptions and actions.
<i>Component 4 Project Co-ordination and Management</i>	Setting-up national co-ordinating committees; Hiring of national co-ordinators; Hiring of project manager; Meetings of the Steering Committee.	Issuance of contracts; Publication of meeting reports.	That the appraisal phase proceeds expeditiously such that in-country activities may start in 2001.

## **ANNEX C - STAP ROSTER TECHNICAL REVIEW**

### **STAP EXPERT REVIEW OF GEF PROJECT BRIEF ENTITLED**

#### **“DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs)”**

J.M. Bewers  
March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2001

#### **General Observations**

This is a proposal for the pilot preparation of National Implementation Plans for the management of Persistent Organic Pollutants by 12 countries. The substances concerned are those addressed in the draft International Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) to be considered for signature at a Diplomatic Conference in May 2001 in Stockholm. These comprise a group of 12 substances that are either manufactured or by-products of industrial processes.

Overall, the project proposal is straightforward and represents an appropriate initial response to the requirements for dealing with POPs issues by countries that become Contracting Parties to the new POPs Convention. It is predicated on the reasonable assumption that developing countries will need guidance in the development of National Implementation Plans to deal with POPs in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Convention. As such, it defines procedures that will be used by a selected short list of developing countries to formulate National Action Plans. This will provide valuable experience for other states that will face similar responsibilities in becoming Contracting Parties to the POPs Convention.

The project contains a number of positive features that deserve highlighting. First, the project expressly allows for countries in the vicinity of the recipient countries to be included in local and/or regional consultations. Second, considerable attention has been paid to defining the nature of the national consultation processes and the types of stakeholder that are to be included in these consultations, including public and non-governmental organization involvement. Third, the entire process is designed to build on and refine a set of international guidelines for the preparation of National Action Plans by states intending to become Contracting Parties to the POPs Convention.

In summary, this project proposal constitutes a well-conceived, thoughtfully prepared and logical response to encouraging countries both to accede to the new Convention and to satisfy their associated responsibilities in a coordinated and systematic manner.

#### **Specific Comments**

Inevitably, there are aspects of the proposal that deserve more specific comment. In this context the guidance to STAP Reviewers has been used as a means of categorizing comments.

## **Scientific and Technical Soundness**

This project brief has been prepared on the basis of a PDF-B. It has also benefited from activities in other GEF project preparative phases, such as the Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances PDF-B, and the negotiations that have taken place through the International Negotiating Committee leading to the preparation of the draft POPs Convention. Accordingly, there exists considerable supporting background to the proposal to ensure that it is sound from technical and scientific standpoints and, more particularly, aligns with the provisions of the draft international convention. Nevertheless, allowance has been made, by specific reference, for the development of National Implementation Plans for POPs to be addressed within the larger context of Persistent Toxic Substances. This improves the scientific validity of the proposal through the strengthening of its toxicological context.

While Annex F provides the basis on which the selection of countries was made, it unfortunately does not document the specific nature of the selection process that resulted in the identification of the 12 participating countries. In this context, it might be noted that there is greater emphasis on pesticides and other manufactured chemicals in the proposal than on the inadvertent by-products, chlorinated dibenzo-*p*-dioxins and chlorinated dibenzofurans that are also covered by the draft POPs Convention. This is probably understandable in the context of the developing nature of the proposed participating countries; nevertheless confidence in the scientific basis of the proposal would have been more convincing if the actual process of country selection had been included to demonstrate how the desire to address all classes of substances addressed by the POPs Convention had been considered.

## **Global Environmental Benefits**

The global benefits of the proposed project are abundantly clear. It should contribute much to the refinement of international guidelines to accelerate the pace at which prospective Contracting Parties to the POPs Convention are able to meet obligations imposed on Contracting Parties. Furthermore, it will provide a measure of the effort and costs of formulating National Implementation Plans so that countries are more prepared for the demands associated with accession to the Convention. The proposed project activities imply no consequences that might adversely affect the environment.

## **Alignment with the Goals and Operational Strategy of the GEF**

The proposed project aligns well with the existing strategic guidance adopted by the GEF, both the Operational Strategy and the Operational Program descriptions. Without any further amendment the project aligns well with Operational Program 10 in that it deals with priority contaminants. It addresses an international concern about the adverse effects of chemicals and contains a strong element of “demonstration” of potential benefit to other developing countries. Thus, even without the recent commitment of the GEF to the “development of action plans for complying with the obligations of the POPs Convention and for setting priorities for initiating future activities on POPs” to provide support to the implementation of the POPs Convention, the project ideally aligns with existing GEF goals and strategies. The recent commitment by the GEF

to create an Operational Program envelope to provide for projects to implement the provisions of the new convention merely strengthens this alignment.

### **Program Priorities, GEF Council Guidance and the Provisions of Relevant Conventions**

The previous paragraph covers most of the issues to be addressed here. The fact that the proposed project deals specifically with procedures for fulfilling responsibilities under the POPs Convention merely makes its relevance to a priority international issue that much more evident. Furthermore, this project proposal stems from a previous preparative activity addressing a larger range of substances that remain of general concern in a number of international agreements. This increases its relevance to the international community.

### **Regional Context**

The proposed project has no single regional alignment. It is a global project based on the pilot demonstration development of National Implementation Plans for ameliorating the damage and threats posed by persistent toxic substances. The only relevant question under this heading might be “Are the countries that have been selected for participation appropriate in both global and regional contexts?” This question can only be authoritatively addressed on the basis of the debate that resulted in the 12 countries being selected. As this information is not provided, as noted previously, a judgement of appropriateness could only be made superficially on the basis of the regional distribution of the beneficiaries. In this respect, the regional distribution appears appropriate in the context of my limited knowledge of national circumstances and the diversity and similarity of practices within the regions from which the countries were selected.

### **Replicability of the Project**

The very nature of the project implies replicability to the benefit of other developing countries throughout the world. The wise inclusion of provisions for liaison with neighbours of the countries selected for participation further enhances the potential benefits to be derived from the project.

### **Sustainability of the Project**

This is not a pertinent issue in respect of this project. The project proposal has been specifically designed as a means of accelerating the ability of countries to accede to the draft POPs Convention. Accordingly, the sustainability of the activity is inextricably bound up with the future of the Convention and, ultimately, will become a part of the GEF projects supporting the implementation of the Convention. Once the GEF Operational Program is established and the Convention comes into force, project directions and sustainability issues will become part of the guidance provided by meetings of Contracting Parties.

### **Linkages to Other Focal Areas**

The other GEF Focal Area to which the project relates is Biodiversity because of the concerns about the effects of persistent chemical accumulations in organisms, especially higher trophic

chain organisms. At this stage, however, this relationship only needs to be acknowledged. The relevance to Biodiversity, however, does not warrant changes to the project as outlined in the project brief.

### **Linkages to Other Programs and Action Plans at Regional and Sub-Regional Levels**

Although the primary focus of the proposed project is the implementation of the POPs Convention, it has direct linkages to regional, sub-regional and national activities in relation to the Global Program of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Sources of 1995. It also has direct association with other GEF initiatives under Operational Program 10 that are referred to in the project brief such as the PDF-Bs on “*Regionally-based Assessment of Persistent Toxic Substances*”, “*Reducing pesticide runoff to the Caribbean Sea*” and the “*Comprehensive Action Programme to Phase-out DDT in Mexico and Central America*”. In addition, many of the UNEP Regional Seas Action Plans and other regional Marine Protection Agreements among developed countries have major activities directed at assessments and control of POPs. The proponents are clearly aware of these other activities as well as the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals. Equally, the proponents are aware of other international agreements that bear on the topic of chemical safety such as the Basel and Rotterdam Conventions.

### **Other Beneficial or Damaging Environmental Effects**

None.

### **Degree of Involvement of Stakeholders in the Project**

Considerable effort has been made to specify how broad stakeholder involvement and buy-in to the process of preparing National Implementation Plans is to be promoted, including where necessary, the allocation of some funding through grants to so-called “grass-roots” organizations. In this respect, the project is extremely well conceived.

### **Capacity-Building Aspects**

Implicitly, this project deals with capacity building in representative countries. It also extends to knowledge improvement and capacity building in neighboring countries and, ultimately, to facilitating extended capacity building at a global level. As noted previously, the sustainability of the capacities developed within this project will become a matter of concern to the Contracting Parties to the POPs Convention. One of the major advantages of this project is that it actually considers and allows for capacity building in the broader sense – in relation to a larger suite of persistent toxic substances, including those that result in sustained long-term exposures because of their continuous release to the environment, rather than purely the twelve POPs. This reflects the foresight with which other previous GEF interventions in Operational Program 10 have been fostered to deal with the larger range of potentially damaging substances rather than confining the focus to the existing list of 12 substances of immediate relevance to the draft POPs Convention.

## **Innovativeness of the Project**

The project proposal is not really innovative in the conventional sense of the word. However, it does have some novel features that show that considerable thought has gone into its design such as the broad selection of participating countries, the provisions for the involvement, through consultation, of other neighboring countries, and the manner in which it promotes and facilitates broad governmental and non-governmental institution, industry sector and public involvement.

## **Other Matters**

### **Preparation of Methodologies**

It is not wholly clear what guarantees are provided regarding the compilation of a manual of existing methodologies from specialised national, non-governmental and international organizations for provision to the participating countries at the beginning of the project (*i.e.*, prior to August 2001) (Paragraph 22 and Implementation Timetable of the proposal). The concept of doing this is a good one, but there appears to be no specific reference to a commitment by an individual or organization to undertake this work prior to the commencement of the project. This also extends to some of the responsibilities covered under Paragraph 26 of the proposal beyond those expressly covered by the consultative processes built into the project.

### **Mid-Term Review**

The prior commitment to the conduct of a mid-term review of the project contained in the proposal is appropriate.

### **Timetable**

Overall, the timetable seems reasonable. However, the timing of the Second Steering Group Meeting (January 2003) does not permit either the priority-setting exercise or the second stage of the global guidance consolidation to have been completed beforehand. Consideration should be given to adjusting the timetable by delaying the Second Steering Group Meeting to allow these elements to be completed and considered during the meeting.

### **Accountability**

The project proposal includes draft terms of reference for the Project Manager and National Coordinators. These appear to be appropriate. However, issues of accountability and authority do not appear to have been considered in the proposal as a whole. Some consideration should be given to such issues in the context of problem resolution within the project brief.

## ANNEX C1

### IMPLEMENTING AGENCY RESPONSE TO STAP/COUNCIL/IMPLEMENTING AGENCY COMMENTS COMMENTS

#### **Council comments**

The fully supportive comments from **The Constituency comments for Australia, New Zealand and the Republic of Korea** are noted with appreciation by UNEP.

#### **Comments from Germany**

Germany review states: “ *We would like to stress that it is important to develop these guidelines in a way that other Implementing and Executing agencies may use them for their enabling activities in the field of POPs as well.*”

UNEP agrees. As stated in paragraph 25 the guidelines will be made widely available to facilitate the development of enabling activities in the development of the NIPs in all GEF eligible countries. It is intended that they will be developed in such a way that other Implementing and Executing agencies may use them for their POPs enabling activities. The composition of the steering group of the project (para.39) and their expected input and endorsement of the guidelines will ensure that the produced guidelines are available for the use of Implementing/Executing agencies.

*“Adaptation of activity planning to the situation in the proposed pilot countries will be necessary”*

UNEP agrees. As per paragraph 20, activities planned in each country will be country specific and in accordance of the situation and needs present in the country within the framework of the development of their NIP.

#### **Comments from Switzerland**

Switzerland notes: “ *we share the concerns regarding the focus in the initial phase (before the project manager is appointed), the fostering of local governments’ and societies interest, and most importantly the definition of respective accountability in view of the well designed, but complex project structure.*”

UNEP notes the concern regarding the focus in the initial phase and has taken measures to ensure the appropriate management of the project before the project manager is appointed. The criteria for the selection of the countries as well as the guiding principles for country selection has been described in annex F of the project document.

UNEP agrees that fostering of local governments and societies participation is an essential element in the success of the programme. These concerns were taken into account during project design phase and are reflected in particular in paragraphs 34 and 35 of component 4 of the project brief.

UNEP would like to note that the reporting and monitoring and evaluation aspects of the implementation of the project have been addressed in the internalized sub-project documents. In addition, it is now clear that UNEP Chemicals is the executing agency responsible for components 2, 3, and the coordination mechanism and project management elements of component 4.

## **World Bank**

The World Bank notes its participation to the PDF-B Steering Group, and offers continuing collaboration on POPs with UNEP, which UNEP accepts with appreciation. The World Bank, in its review, raises a number of points as follows:

*“We want to note that this project was originally approved as a PDF-B to Assess National Management Needs for Persistent Toxic Substances and now it has changed to assessing national management needs of POPs. We agree with this revision, but the change in the concept (as entered in the GEF pipeline) should be reflected in the document and an explanation for the change should be provided.”*

A new paragraph has been introduced (para. 7) to justify the change of name of the project and focus on the initial 12 POPs subject of the Convention.

*“Given that an implementation plan will be a legal requirement under the treaty, it is not clear whether these NIPs are expected to fit that requirement.”*

We have made explicit UNEP’s intention that the National Implementation Plans which will be developed by the twelve participating countries will meet the initial reporting obligations of these countries towards the POPs Convention (summary; para. 10).

*“In our view, these [guidelines] should also require the endorsement of the Parties.”*

UNEP agrees. This is now explicit in paragraph 25.

*“We assume that the proposed guidelines that are mentioned are for GEF eligible countries only and not for donor countries.”*

UNEP’s intention is that the guidelines will be applicable to the widest possible range of developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

*“Although these NIPs will provide some information for development of guidelines, it should not delay the development of NIPs for other countries.”*

UNEP agrees. This was taken into account in project design: paragraphs 12 and 25 describe how lessons are derived for the benefit of all as the project progresses, and not just at the end.

## UNDP

The UNDP, in its review, raises a number of points as follows:

*“The proposal should state explicitly that countries to receive funding must have signed the Stockholm Convention by the time of CEO endorsement of the Project Document.”*

UNEP disagrees. The present project proposal is an International Waters project funded under Operational Programme No 10. The eligibility criteria that must apply are those that apply to the International Waters focal area: under article 9b of the Instrument for the establishment of the restructured GEF, a country is “an eligible recipient of GEF grants if it is eligible to borrow from the World Bank [...] or if it is an eligible recipient of UNDP technical assistance [...]”.

There are a number of reasons why UNEP does not believe it wise to stray away from this principle. Firstly one does not know what eligibility criteria the GEF Council may want to apply to POPs activities, in the absence of guidance from the COP of the future POPs Convention. Secondly, this project will be submitted to the GEF Council before the POPs Convention is even opened for signature. It would not be appropriate, and indeed would be of dubious legality, to condition the participation of a country to this project to a process that will follow the project approval process. Thirdly, the interim period before a Convention enters into force is one where assistance should be provided to countries such that they understand the implications of signing and ratifying the Convention.

*“The proposed project appears to be trying to achieve too much and may be spread too thinly, e.g. activities such as “small financial allowances to other GEF eligible countries to overview their POPs problems”, small grants programmes in pilot countries, sub-regional consultations, etc.”*

UNEP disagrees. Supporting some limited activities in the neighbouring countries, and offering small grants to support civil society participation in the twelve pilot countries, as noted by the STAP reviewer, are some of the more innovative aspects of the proposal. UNEP believes that during the interim period before the Convention enters into force, it is of critical importance that the international community assist countries to understand the national implications of signature and ratification of the Convention. This responsibility is incumbent particularly on UNEP as interim Secretariat to the Convention and on the GEF as interim financial mechanism. The proposed activities will contribute to the removal of barriers to information exchange. Moreover, the project as designed offers some answers to the often-lamented lack of capacity of civil society to intervene on chemicals management issues at the national level.

*“Encouraging countries to sign and ratify the convention is a political activity that should be handled within the existing political structures, e.g. COP and the clearinghouse mechanism, not through an Enabling Activity project targeting countries party to the Convention.”*

Whilst UNEP agrees that the decision to sign and ratify the Convention is a political matter that lies wholly within the competence of the appropriate national authority. Such a decision must, as

noted above, be based upon a full understanding of the benefits and obligations that result from a State becoming a party to the Convention. UNEP's role and mandate involves ensuring through the interim Secretariat of the Convention that such understanding is fostered "with a view to facilitating capacity-building, early entry into force and financing<sup>3</sup>". The wording of paragraph 29 has been amended to reflect more accurately this position.

*"The document provides for involvement of civil society in the project, and includes a provision stating "in order to strengthen the capacity of civil society to intervene, small grants will be offered to grassroots organizations in each pilot country for on-the-ground activities (eg. education, awareness-raising)." [...] This is a key element in the Small Grant Programmes' mandate, [...] we consider that this activity would most appropriately be carried out by SGP on behalf of UNEP. We are prepared to do this in those pilot countries listed by UNEP where we have an operation: Barbados, Chile, Ecuador, Lebanon, Mali, Malaysia and Papua New Guinea."*

UNEP welcomes this offer and will be liaising with UNDP to assess its feasibility during the appraisal phase.

## **STAP roster**

The review is overall supportive: "well conceived, thoughtfully prepared". The review raises a number of points as follows:

*"While Annex F provides the basis on which the selection of countries was made, it unfortunately does not document the specific nature of the selection process that resulted in the identification of the 12 participating countries."*

Annex F has been expanded to detail the selection of countries, in order that the selection process is made clear and transparent.

*"It is not wholly clear what guarantees are provided regarding the compilation of a manual of existing methodologies from specialised national, non-governmental and international organizations for provision to the participating countries at the beginning of the project. [...] This also extends to some of the responsibilities covered under Paragraph 26 of the proposal."*

We have made explicit that UNEP Chemicals, the executing agency for the PDF-B and proposed executing agency for the project, is responsible for compiling existing methodologies before commencement of the project (para. 23), and for further development and finalising of the guidelines (para. 27).

*"The timing of the Second Steering Group Meeting (January 2003) does not permit either the priority-setting exercise or the second stage of the global guidance consolidation to have been completed beforehand. Consideration should be given to adjusting the timetable by delaying the*

---

\* UNEP Governing Council decision GC 21/4

*Second Steering Group Meeting to allow these elements to be completed and considered during the meeting.”*

On consideration of this suggestion, UNEP prefers to leave the proposed Steering Group meeting date earlier so that it might be still possible to take corrective actions, should the need arise.

*“Issues of accountability and authority do not appear to have been considered in the proposal as a whole. Some consideration should be given to such issues in the context of problem resolution within the project brief.”*

Issues of accountability and authority have been strengthened in the present document (para. 23, 27, 37).

## ANNEX D –FRAMEWORK FOR DEVELOPING NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Step 1	Determining Co-ordinating Mechanism and Organizing Process		
Key Activities/ Issues	Output/Results	Possible Assistance Needs	Indicative Timeframe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and strengthening of national institution/unit to serve as Focal Point;</li> <li>• Identification and sensitisation of main stakeholders;</li> <li>• Strengthening government commitment;</li> <li>• Determination of multi-stakeholder national co-ordinating committee;</li> <li>• Identifying and assigning responsibilities amongst government departments and other stakeholders for the various aspects of POPs management;</li> <li>• Obtaining commitment of national stakeholders (for example by means of Memorandum of Understanding);</li> <li>• Assessment of needs of Focal Point to oversee overall execution (technical, human resources, etc.);</li> <li>• Drawing-up overall workplan;</li> <li>• Organisation of inception workshop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal Point to oversee overall execution;</li> <li>• National co-ordinating mechanism amongst stakeholders is identified / established;</li> <li>• Agreement, including mission statement, amongst national stakeholders is developed;</li> <li>• Agreed Focal Point needs and budget;</li> <li>• Overall workplan and timeframe for country activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation manual and/or guidance for overall implementation, including expected country deliverables/ output.</li> </ul>	<p>2 to 3 months Average 2.5 months</p>
<p><b>Comments</b> <b>Step 1</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wherever possible, use should be made of existing committees/structures for overseeing NIP development; the creation of new coordinating structures should be avoided.</li> <li>• External consultants may be recruited to provide technical assistance, if needed. Priority should be given to local and regional consultants.</li> <li>• Awareness raising activities and effective communication at the country level, whether directed to decision-makers or the public at large, should be on-going activities which are important for steps 1 through 5 and further .</li> </ul>		

Step 2	Establishing a POPs Inventory and Assessing National Infrastructure and Capacity		
Key Activities/ Issues	Output/Results	Possible Assistance Needs	Indicative Timeframe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of National Profile (or core sections thereof as they relate more specifically to POPs);</li> <li>• Constitution of task teams responsible for inventories;</li> <li>• Training on inventory procedures;</li> <li>• Preliminary inventory of production, distribution, use, import and export;</li> <li>• Preliminary inventory of stocks and contaminated sites; assessment of opportunities for disposal of obsolete stocks;</li> <li>• Preliminary inventory of releases to the environment;</li> <li>• External independent review of initial national POPs inventories;</li> <li>• Assessment of infrastructure capacity and institutions to manage POPs, including regulatory controls; needs and options for strengthening them;</li> <li>• Assessment of enforcement capacity to ensure compliance;</li> <li>• Assessment of social and economic implications of POPs use and reduction; including the need for the enhancement of local commercial infrastructure for distributing benign alternative technologies/products;</li> <li>• Assessment of monitoring and R&amp;D capacity;</li> <li>• Identification of POPs related human health and environmental issues of concern, including their transboundary nature;</li> <li>• Basic risk assessment as a basis for prioritisation of further action taking into account, <i>inter alia</i>, potential releases to the environment and size of exposed population.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National profile (or core sections thereof);</li> <li>• Initial national POPs inventory;</li> <li>• Report on human health and environmental concerns related to POPs;</li> <li>• Assessment report of national POPs management infrastructure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance for preparation of National Profile;</li> <li>• Guidance for development of initial national POPs inventory. Specific guidance needed for each category of POPs including as a minimum detailed guidance on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reporting format</li> <li>- identifying POPs sources</li> <li>- estimation techniques</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Technical assistance;</li> <li>• Provision of computer equipment, software etc;</li> <li>• Experts to carry out review of inventory;</li> <li>• Training.</li> </ul>	<p>5 to 10 months Average 7.5 months</p>

<b>Comments Step 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countries which have not prepared a National Profile are encouraged to do so (using UNITAR/IOMC guidance). Focus should be on those sections of National Profile which are of particular relevance to POPs.</li> <li>• An inventory is an iterative process: the inventory should be a “living document”. In this initial capacity building stage, the inventory should be detailed enough to allow further prioritisation. The task of developing a detailed inventory would be part of an implementation plan for a particular POP or family of POPs that warrants it.</li> <li>• For the development of the POPs inventory, use should be made of existing materials, e.g. dioxin toolkit (UNEP), guidance on PCB and PCT containing materials (SBC), PRTR documents on estimating point and non-point emissions (UNITAR), obsolete pesticides (FAO, GTZ), OECD, material available from countries (e.g. Argentina, Slovenia). Guidance on what can be used, and how, will be developed by UNEP at the beginning of the project.</li> <li>• Results of the UNEP/GEF Regionally-based Assessment of persistent toxic substances project should be taken into account.</li> <li>• The Table of Contents of a POPs Inventory could follow, with some adjustments, the structure set out in the UNEP Chemicals document titled “Dioxin and Furan Inventories – National and Regional Emissions of PCDD/PCDF”.</li> </ul>
------------------------	--

Step 3	Priority Setting and Determining Objectives		
Key Activities/ Issues	Output/Results	Possible Assistance Needs	Indicative Timeframe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of criteria for prioritisation, taking into account health, environmental and socio-economic impact and the availability of alternative solutions;</li> <li>• Determination of national objectives in relation to priority POPs or issues (could be general and/or specific objectives);</li> <li>• Organization of national priority validation workshop.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of prioritisation criteria;</li> <li>• Objectives with regard to priority POPs management.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance on priority setting methodologies.</li> </ul>	<p>4 to 6 months Average 5 months</p>
<b>Comments Step 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review relevance of UNITAR document on risk reduction strategies.</li> <li>• Review priority setting documents developed in other countries, e.g. by Environment Canada.</li> <li>• Priority setting amongst POPs/issues could include the consideration of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- priorities defined in national environmental action plans;</li> <li>- findings of the National Profile;</li> <li>- known amounts of stockpiles;</li> <li>- wastes/residues at sites that were not well-managed;</li> <li>- areas of special environmental interest that may be affected by POPs;</li> <li>- economically feasible management options.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Step 4	Formulating a National Implementation Plan and specific Action Plans on POPs		
Key Activities/ Issues	Output/Results	Possible Assistance Needs	Indicative Timeframe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assigning mandates to task teams to develop proposals for addressing priorities;</li> <li>• Identification of management options, including phasing out and risk reduction options;</li> <li>• Need for introduction of technologies, including technology transfer; possibilities of developing indigenous alternatives;</li> <li>• Assessment of the costs and benefits of management options;</li> <li>• Defining expected results and targets;</li> <li>• Development of a detailed implementation plan, including an action plan for un-intentional by-products, PCBs and, where appropriate, for DDT and other POPs as prioritised;</li> <li>• Review of Implementation Plan by external experts;</li> <li>• Preparation of initial funding request package for implementation, including cost estimates and incremental costs;</li> <li>• Development of a national strategy for information exchange, education, communication and awareness raising, taking into account risk perception of POPs by the public, particularly the least educated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Report on management options;</li> <li>• Detailed implementation plan;</li> <li>• Cost estimates of implementation;</li> <li>• Preliminary funding request package.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information on management options (from UNEP, UNITAR and others);</li> <li>• Information on alternative methods and technologies;</li> <li>• Methodological guidance and training on planning methodologies (e.g. ZOPP) to facilitate the development of effective implementation plans.</li> </ul>	<p>5 to 9 months Average 7 months</p>

<b>Comments Step 4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wherever possible, use should be made of existing committees/groups for formulating detailed action plans.</li> <li>• In order to be in a position to successfully develop the NIP, the following are considered key elements/conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Availability of quality data to make informed decisions;</li> <li>- Commitment and political will to address the issue;</li> <li>- Commitment and meaningful participation of stakeholders, in particular industry at the national and international level;</li> <li>- A good understanding of technological options available and resources necessary to make use of these;</li> <li>- Human resources and financial means to effectively implement and enforce the NIP.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Responsibilities for developing POPs specific action plans should be shared amongst main concerned national parties, including government agencies, industry, research institutions, etc.</li> <li>• The following elements may be critical to the success of a POPs specific action plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensuring participation of local authorities in enforcement measures;</li> <li>- Awareness raising of the general public in particular in relation to the role they could play in addressing POPs problems.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NIP implementation may include some of the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Development of a more detailed POPs inventory;</li> <li>- Drafting of new legislation/regulation;</li> <li>- Strengthening of compliance and enforcement of existing regulation;</li> <li>- Identification of specific eco-systems or populations at risk;</li> <li>- Evaluation and introduction of POPs alternatives;</li> <li>- Implementation of awareness-raising and education activities and establishment of mechanisms to involve local populations in the implementation of the plans;</li> <li>- Training and capacity building activities on various issues such as sound management practices of POPs, POPs alternatives, conducting environmental impact assessment, effective legislation and regulation, good storage and management practices, risk assessment and risk management, etc;</li> <li>- Technology transfer activities;</li> <li>- Development of a national waste management strategy;</li> <li>- Monitoring, site auditing and other activities to ensure compliance and enforcement of regulations;</li> <li>- Development of safe disposal plans for existing stocks of POPs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Some issues, e.g. illegal POPs trade would require coordinated action amongst several neighbouring countries.</li> </ul>
------------------------	---

<b>Step 5</b>	<b>Endorsement of NIP by Stakeholders</b>		
<b>Key Activities/ Issues</b>	<b>Output/Results</b>	<b>Possible Assistance Needs</b>	<b>Indicative Timeframe</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare an information document/report to be submitted to stakeholders for comments;</li> <li>• Lobbying high Government officials;</li> <li>• Organise workshops and circulate information to obtain commitment of stakeholders and decision-makers, including resources commitment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endorsement by national stakeholders at highest possible level;</li> <li>• Commitment in terms of active participation;</li> <li>• Commitment in terms of allocation of resources (staff, material, funds etc.).</li> </ul>	- none foreseen-	<p>2 months</p> <p>All activities should be completed within 24 months</p>

## **ANNEX E: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PROJECT MANAGER AND THE NATIONAL COORDINATORS**

### **PROJECT MANAGER**

Under the overall supervision of the Director of UNEP Chemicals and the Executive Coordinator of the GEF Coordination Office, the project manager will be responsible for the timely delivery of all products of the “Development of National Implementation Plans for POPs” pilot project, and for providing technical assistance to the pilot countries. More specifically, the project manager will discharge the following functions:

- 1. Providing overall direction and supervision of the implementation of the project by:**
  - (a) preparation of contracts and agreements with appropriate institutions, organizations, and individuals, including the National Coordinators and experts as appropriate;
  - (b) acting as secretary to the project Steering Group;
  - (c) convening meetings of the National Coordinators, as necessary;
  - (d) organizing the work and monitoring the progress of the experts as appropriate;
  - (e) monitoring the progress of project execution in the pilot countries;
  - (f) preparing quarterly and half-yearly progress reports to UNEP; and
  - (g) preparing financial reports to UNEP and other co-financing organisations.
  
- 2. Providing assistance and expertise to the pilot countries through:**
  - (a) identification of appropriate experts and sources of information/expertise;
  - (b) providing guidance to the work of the National Co-ordinating Committees as appropriate;
  - (c) participating in national meetings if necessary; and
  - (d) ensuring the transfer and sharing of experience and information between the pilot countries.
  
- 3. Preparing the generic and technical guidelines, with expert assistance as appropriate by:**
  - (a) organizing the compilation of existing methodologies and guidelines;
  - (b) integrating the lessons learned and experience gained in the pilot projects in the guidelines;
  - (c) convening experts meetings to review guidelines as necessary; and
  - (d) organizing the publication and dissemination of the guidelines.
  
- 4. Managing interactions with external entities through:**
  - (a) identification of, and liaison with potential organizations, institutions and individuals that could execute parts of the project at the national level;
  - (b) identification of, and liaison with donors, partner agencies and contributors interested in participating in, or financing the work of the pilot countries;
  - (c) actively promoting the GEF project to additional potential donors;
  - (d) developing and implementing a communication strategy; and
  - (e) supervising the maintenance of the project web-site.

## NATIONAL COORDINATORS

The National Coordinator will report to the National Coordinating Committee and oversee overall project execution at the country level. More specifically, the national coordinator will discharge the following functions:

- 1. Providing secretariat functions to the NCC by:**
  - (a) organizing and facilitating the meetings of the NCC and other meetings
  - (b) organizing training as required under the project;
  - (c) preparing contracts and agreements with appropriate national institutions, organizations, and individuals;
  - (d) assessing the work done by different national agencies, and integrating the results; and;
  - (e) formulating the NIP.
  
- 2. Providing a linkage to UNEP through:**
  - (a) monitoring the progress of project execution in the country;
  - (b) preparing quarterly and half-yearly progress reports to UNEP; and
  - (c) preparing financial reports to UNEP and other co-financing organisations.
  
- 3. Providing input in the development of the global guidelines through:**
  - (a) documenting and assessing lessons learned and experience gained at each step of NIP development;
  - (b) participating in peer-review of other pilot countries' NIPs; and
  - (c) participating in experts meetings to review and amalgamate guidelines and methodologies.
  
- 4. Managing interactions with external entities through:**
  - (a) participating in sub-regional consultations;
  - (b) exchanging information and lessons learned with other pilot countries as project execution progresses;
  - (c) liaising with international organisations in matters relevant to the project; and
  - (d) identifying and building working relationships with relevant regional centres.

## **ANNEX F: SELECTION OF PILOT COUNTRY**

### **Need for a reasoned selection**

The selection of countries that were to participate to this pilot project was first discussed at the time of PDF-B preparation and approval. These discussions involved UNEP as Implementing Agency, the Executing Agency UNEP Chemicals, the GEF Secretariat, and those agencies that were invited to comment on the draft PDF-B proposal (UNITAR, and WHO). Two main items as regards country selection emerged from these discussions and are reflected in the PDF-B that was finally adopted in October 1999: i) the pilot countries must be representative of a wide range of national circumstances, such that lessons learned and experience can be used to develop widely applicable guidelines: thus there is a need to introduce reason in the selection of countries; and ii) the countries should be selected at the end of the PDF-B phase such that a greater number of countries might have an incentive to participate in the development of the project.

Therefore, alongside the main activities of the PDF-B which were devoted to developing a framework action plan for POPs management and discussing it at the regional level, a process was initiated which culminated with the selection of the 12 participating countries by the last meeting of the Steering Group for the PDF-B in November 2000. This process and the criteria that were used are described in this annex.

### **Description of the Process**

The steering group for the PDF-B, comprised of representatives from intergovernmental organisations (World Bank, UNDP, FAO, UNIDO, Secretariat to Basel Convention, UN-ECE), bilateral aid agencies (GTZ), industry and environmental NGOs, held its first meeting in Geneva 18-20 January 2000. The steering group developed a first set of criteria to guide in country selection, as well as a draft survey form to be sent to all GEF eligible countries. The survey form which was also the means for countries to express their interest in participating to the project was designed in order to obtain from countries that information necessary to inform the selection process.

The first group of experts to meet in the framework of the PDF-B (Geneva 6-10 March 2000) was comprised of environmental policy and chemicals management experts. From a total of 36 participants, 28 participants came from GEF eligible countries, 2 from developed countries, 1 represented industry, 2 represented environmental NGOs, and 3 represented intergovernmental organisations (in addition to UNEP). This group endorsed the proposed selection process, and amended the set of criteria to be applied.

The Steering Group met for the 2<sup>nd</sup> time in Geneva 8-9 May 2000. The group reviewed and finalised the criteria for selection, and discussed “guiding principles” that were to be adhered to when selecting the participating countries. This text is appended to this annex as attachment 1, and was prepared in the realisation that a description of the principles that were to be followed

when applying the criteria was as much, or more, important than the criteria themselves. The steering group also made its final comments on the survey form.

Following this meeting, the survey forms were finalised and sent out, in English or in French, to the GEF operational focal points and POPs focal points of all GEF eligible countries. Countries wishing to participate as a pilot were requested to provide the desired information by August 31 2000. This deadline was later extended to October 15 2000.

Four meetings of national experts were held from July to October 2000. Participants at these meetings were each time reminded of the importance of filling and sending back the survey forms within deadline. (The meeting for Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia was held in Varna, Bulgaria, July 18-21; the meeting for Asia and the Pacific, including Pacific SIDS and middle East, was held in Bangkok, July 24-28; the meeting for Africa was held in Nairobi, Kenya, July 31 to August 3; the meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean was held in La Havana, Cuba, October 2-6.)

The steering group met for the third and last time November 20-22 2000 in Geneva to select the participating countries and review the draft project brief. This group was comprised, in addition to UNEP, of FAO, World Bank, UNIDO, UNITAR, Secretariat to the Basel Convention, and WWF. The Steering Group, for its deliberations, had in front of it the responses to the survey forms from 35 countries which had responded within deadline, as well as a set of short summaries for each country (1-2 pages each) and tables showing an overview of information which it had asked the PDF-B Executing Agency, UNEP Chemicals, to produce in advance to the meeting. (Table 1 contained for each country information related to the number of endorsements and the quality of the survey response. Table 2 contained information as whether a country was least developed, with an economy in transition, industrialised/ing, with intensive agriculture, had a co-ordination committee for POPs already in place, the state of its infrastructure, existence of specific legislation, experience in sub-regional collaboration, presence of transboundary water bodies etc. Table 3 was an indication of POPs/PTS issues for each country: indication of manufacture, use, import and export of pesticides and industrial chemicals; report of illegal traffic, presence of obsolete stockpiles, need for vector control etc.)

### **Selection of participating countries by the PDF-B Steering Group**

During discussions in the first two steering group meetings, and at the first expert group meeting for the PDF-B, the consensus emerged that the commitment of the participating countries was critical to the success of the pilot project. Therefore, particular emphasis was placed on the demonstration of country drivenness through the requirement that the responses to the survey forms be endorsed by at least 3 national stakeholders. The quality of responses to the survey forms, and the care that had been put into filling them, was also felt to be an indication of a country's commitment.

The steering group reviewed the summary country submissions and requested more information (from the full dossiers) where needed. The meeting then ranked the countries by region, number of endorsement and signatures obtained from different Ministries and quality of the survey.

Three steps were followed in order to select twelve countries from the 35 submissions. (The 35 countries were Africa: Algeria, Congo, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Madagascar, Mali, Nigeria, Togo, Zambia; Asia/Pacific, including middle East: Indonesia, Jordan, Lebanon, Malaysia; Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia: Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Estonia, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Moldova, Slovenia, Ukraine; Latin America: Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Peru; SIDS: Barbados, Fiji, Mauritius, Micronesia, PNG. It had been decided at time of PDF-B preparation to include SIDS as a separate category to take into account their specific needs.)

### Step 1

The first screening was to eliminate countries that did not have at least three signatures or endorsements for their survey form. 22 countries were retained, 8 from Africa, 2 from Asia//Pacific, 5 from Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia, 2 from Latin America and 5 from SIDS (Algeria, Congo, Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Nigeria, Togo, Zambia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Ukraine, Chile, Ecuador, Barbados, Fiji, Mauritius, Micronesia, PNG).

### Step 2

The second screening was based on the quality of the submissions (which had been ranked as good, medium or poor). 18 countries were retained that had returned “good” or medium” survey forms. An exception was made for Malaysia in light of the need to have representation for South East Asia and of the small number of responses from Asia/Pacific generally. (Congo, Gambia, Guinea, Mali, Nigeria Togo, Zambia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Ukraine, Chile, Ecuador, Barbados, Fiji, Micronesia, PNG).

### Step 3

Thereafter the meeting considered each region separately, and took account of the possibility for each of the pilot countries to act as a “model”, taking into account *inter alia* good sub-regional coverage, priority sectors affected by POPs indicated in the country submissions, level of economic development, available chemical management capacities.

There were only two countries at this stage for Latin America: Chile and Ecuador were therefore both retained. Similarly, for Asia and the Pacific including the Middle East, Jordan and Malaysia were retained. For Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia, considerations of the quality of the survey response, as well as the desire to have a model for those countries that are to join the EU soon, guided the choice of Bulgaria and Slovenia. In the case of SIDS, Barbados was kept as only example of the Caribbean SIDS, and Micronesia because of the interest of working with a federated State. Choosing PNG, it was felt, would compensate partly the small number of positive responses from Asia and the Pacific.

The greatest difficulties were with the selection of African countries, region which had the greatest number of submissions, most of high standard (6 “good” and one “medium”). Zambia was kept as a representative of the Southern part of the continent. For West Africa, it was felt that a francophone country would serve better as a model country, which eliminated the Gambia and Nigeria. Mali was seen as an example of a Sahel country, with a growing and intensifying

agriculture. Finally, it was felt that a country with important mining activities should be chosen, which led to prefer Guinea or Congo to Togo. The former was preferred because it had a better quality survey form.

Overall, the meeting felt that the twelve countries chosen allowed sufficient coverage of the wide variety of existing national circumstances, such that the objective of the project to derive guidelines could be achieved. It was noted that the list did not include any very large country, but that the World Bank would be developing action plans for POPs in a number of countries, including China. Outcomes of the WB country lead activities will be integrated with experiences derived from the GEF pilot countries in producing the guidelines for wider application.

The following table summarises how the selected countries are representative of a variety of national circumstances.

CIRCUMSTANCE	Barba.	Bulgar	Chile	Ecuad.	Guin.	Leban.	Mali	Malay.	Micro.	PNG	Sloven	Zamb.
Africa					X		X					X
Asia/Pacific Incl. M. East						X		X	X	X		
Centr. East Europe Centr. Asia		X									X	
Latin America And Caribbean	X		X	X								
SIDS	X								X	X		
Size > 100,000 km <sup>2</sup>		X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X
Population > 7M		X	X	X	X		X	X				X
Least developed					X		X			X		X
Industrialised/ing		X	X	X		X		X			X	
Intensive pesticide Use agriculture	X		X	X			X			X		
Mining (incl. oil)			X	X	X					X		X
Economies in Transition		X									X	
National Profile		X	X	In prep	X		X	In prep		X	X	X
Existence of coordination com.		X		X		X					X	
Level of infrastructure	X	XXX	XXX	XX		XX		XXX		X	XXX	X
Legislation/policy	XX	XXX	XXX	XX	XX	XX	X	XX	X	XX	XXX	X
Sub-regional collaboration	X	X	XX	XX	XX	X	X	XX	XX	XX	XXX	XXX
Vector Control problem		X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X
Stockpiles	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Concern with by- products		X	X		X			X			X	
Concern with industrial POPs	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X
Concern with pesticides	X		X				X		X	X		
Rich biodiversity			X	X				X		X		

## **Attachment 1 - Guiding principles for country selection**

In the process of selecting countries for the pilot project on assessing national management needs of PTS, a minimum number of requirements need to be fulfilled. In the first instance certain conditions need to be met. In order to be considered for selection a country must show government commitment, including the support and involvement of national agencies, and existence of a willingness to promote multi-stakeholder co-ordination that would include non-governmental organisations and the private sector. Government commitment will be demonstrated by an indication of inter-agency and inter-ministerial co-operation as well as by the provision of in-kind contribution. The willingness to promote multi-stakeholder co-operation may be detailed in an attachment to the submission and would include endorsement of the project from various stakeholders.

At the outset as broad a regional representativeness as possible should be aimed at. To this end the regions as developed for the PDF-B will be used. These are Africa, Latin America, Asia and the Pacific including the Middle East, Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia, and Small Island Developing States. The next element of priority setting in the selection process are economic conditions. Four broad categories may be identified in this context: least developed countries, industrialising countries, intensive pesticide use agricultural economies and countries with economies in transition. Also of high priority for the selection of pilot countries is the extent of PTS use and emission problems in the country. In analysing this category, emphasis will be placed on PTS related issues such as the types of industries, PTS manufacturers, PTS in use, and PTS imported and exported. For agricultural activities, the extent of PTS used and technologies involved as well as the level and type of the agricultural sector may be considered.

In this connection a general evaluation of the chemical management structure already in place in the country will need to be made. Various levels of chemical management capacity should be represented and countries will be identified accordingly. For this purpose the following elements may be included: availability of expertise, degree of dependency in outside assistance to solve problems, existence of a national policy on PTS, existence of legislation on pesticides/chemicals, state of infrastructure (laboratories, information systems, etc.), existence of public awareness, awareness of illegal traffic, alternatives, and on-going related projects. The existence of a national profile would provide extensive information for many of the above elements.

General POPs related issues that will also be taken into consideration are as follows: the nature of transboundary issues, such as the presence of major water bodies and the location of industrial/agricultural areas near water bodies; the commonality of the problem, including vector control needs and known or suspected sources of by-products; fisheries based economies; extent of biodiversity/health problems caused by PTS; and vulnerability of the population and ecosystems. To supplement this latter element, the country size, demographic situation, urban and rural settlement patterns and climatic condition may be provided.

It is clear that the possibility and ease of extending lessons learned from one of the pilot countries to benefit other countries is a factor that would influence the choice for selection. In this context, broad representation of priority substances and economic and geographical coverage will be addressed during the country selection process. Experience with sub-regional co-

operation should also be an element on which information should be provided by the countries wishing to participate to the pilot project.

## **Annex G - LIST OF PUBLICATIONS PREPARED UNDER THE PDF BLOCK-B GRANT**

1. Report of the First Steering Group Meeting 18-20 January, Geneva, Switzerland
2. Report of the First Expert Group Meeting: Preliminary Assessment of National Needs 6-10 March 2000, Geneva Switzerland
3. Report of the Second Expert Group Meeting: Framework for a National Action Plan for PTS Management 1-5 May 2000, Geneva, Switzerland
4. Report of the Second Steering Group Meeting 8-9 May 2000, Geneva, Switzerland
5. Report of the Regional Workshop of National Experts for the Central and Eastern European Region, 18-21 July 2000, Varna, Bugaria
6. Report of the Regional Workshop of National Experts for the Asia and Pacific Region, 24-28 July 2000, Bangkok, Thailand
7. Report of the Regional Workshop of National Experts for the African Region, 31 July – 3 August, Nairobi, Kenya
8. Report of the Regional Workshop of National Experts for the Latin America and Caribbean Region, 2-6 October 2000, Havana, Cuba
9. Report of the Third Meeting of the Steering Group, 20-22 November 2000, Geneva, Switzerland

**ANNEX H**

**LETTERS OF SUPPORT AND ENDORSEMENTS OF PDF-B SURVEY FORM FROM PARTICIPATING  
COUNTRIES LINE MINISTRIES AND OTHER STAKEHOLDERS**



## ANNEX I

### BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF POPs ISSUES IN THE TWELVE PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES

#### **BARBADOS** (SIDS / Caribbean)

##### Geography

Island of 431 km<sup>2</sup>; flat in the Southeast, hilly towards the West. The climate is tropical/semi-arid (average temperature: 27 - 28°C, rain: 1,460 mm). The total population is 267,000 of which 54 % live in urban conditions and 29 % are below 18; literacy is 98%. Barbados is bordered by the Atlantic Ocean on its East Coast and the Caribbean Sea on its West Coast. Its closest neighbours are Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines.

##### Economy

Industry represents 30.3 % of total GDP and includes small scale industries including textiles, leather, electrical components manufacturing, cement, asphalt mixing, paint, car battery and secondary scrap metal processing. Agriculture involves 2 % of the population on mostly small farms (2/3 of farms below 0.5 ha), and includes sugarcane, cotton, root and tuber crops and vegetables. Heavy use of agrochemicals is reported.

##### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

The Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs and PTS management are Ministries of Environment, Labour, Health and Agriculture, and Customs and Excise. Other stakeholders include the University of the West Indies. Barbados has made a request for funding of a National Profile. There is no co-ordination mechanism on POPs/PTS, but legislation on pesticides is in place. Legislation on hazardous chemicals is in preparation. Government analytical services lack equipment and personnel, and infrastructure is generally rudimentary. No POPs monitoring activities take place.

##### Some POPs/PTS issues

The industrial sectors described above such as electrical components manufacturing and car battery and secondary scrap metal processing industries are likely to be the source of industrial chemicals or by-products releases to the environment, as well as solid waste incineration. Some reported issues of concern are the existence of obsolete stocks of unknown chemicals and pesticides, burning of cables in secondary scrap metal processing, indiscriminate dumping of chemicals. Barbados is an active player in AOSIS, and has actively participated to the POPs negotiations.

#### **BULGARIA** (Europe)

##### Geography

Coastal (Black Sea) and mountainous country of 111,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The climate is temperate (average temperature 10-13°C, rain 450-1,250 mm). The total population is 8.2 million including 68 % urban (Sofia: 1.1 million) and 22.8 % below 18. Approximately 100 % has access to health

services. Bulgaria shares a number of transboundary water bodies: Black Sea (Turkey, Rumania etc.), Danube River (Rumania etc.), Timok River (Yugoslavia), Mesta, Stroma and Maritza Rivers (Greece), Strumestnitza River (Macedonia). Danube River ecosystems are globally important and about 9 % of the 3500 plant species are endemic to Bulgaria.

### Economy

Industry represents 23.4 % of total GDP, including 14.5 % of MVA (Manufactured Value Added). The industrial sector includes machinery, chemical (including oil and plastics), coal, food, textile, leather, paper, wood, and mining. Agriculture accounts for 13.9 % of GDP and includes wheat, silage, potato, alfalfa, sunflower, and tomato. 25.7 % of population is involved in agricultural activities.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

The Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs and PTS management are Ministries of Environment & Water, Health, Agriculture, Labour & Social Care, Economy and Customs. Other stakeholders include industrial organisations, chambers of commerce and companies, universities, research and training institutions, and NGOs. There is no co-ordination mechanism on POPs as such, but a number of committees exist which can be built on (Higher Council of Experts in Ecology for example). A comprehensive legislation on chemicals including pesticides and hazardous wastes is in place, and Bulgaria has conducted an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile on Chemicals Management. All POPs pesticides were banned years ago in the COMECON countries. Bulgaria has accredited laboratories with analytical chemistry capacities working according to ISO 9000 and GLP standards, and a number of monitoring activities of water, air and soil are ongoing. Bulgaria collaborates in the PHARE Danube Regional Pesticide Study.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

Bulgaria is a producer, importer, and exporter of chemicals. A number of processes are reported that may lead to the release to the environment of by-products and manufactured chemicals: chlorinated organic chemicals industry, oil refining, catalyst regeneration, pulp and paper, textile/wool/leather, industrial bleaching, iron sintering, primary copper smelting, scrap metal processing, coke, asphalt mixing, metal and other recycling processes, solvent use, waste oil recovery, coal and oil combustion, landfill gas, biomass burning, landfill fires.

Reported environmental hazards include the presence and use of stockpiles of obsolete pesticides (3500t) and subsequent soil and water contamination; contaminated sites (DDT, lead, arsenic, industrial wastes); drinking water pollution by obsolete pesticides, lead and arsenic, etc. Reported health hazards include increased POPs content in human body tissues; high human morbidity in towns with intensive pollution from chemical and non-ferrous metallurgical plants including chronic respiratory and brain vascular diseases; pathological prenatal development; premature birth; spontaneous abortions etc.

Bulgaria is a good example of a country in transition. Some legislation is inherited from the old regime; some is recent and driven by EU integration. The different aspects of POPs management need to be rationalised. There is some specificity to economies in transition. For example market forces ensure that pesticides are applied more moderately, but the breakdown of the old

structures may mean less control on the quality of what is applied, and more poisoning accidents of untrained workers.

## **CHILE** (Latin America)

### Geography

Chile extends over a length of about 4,000 km and an average width of 200 km along the Pacific Coast of South America with a continental surface area of 757,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The landscape varies widely from coastal deserts to the high mountain range of the Andes. The climate varies widely (desert, Mediterranean, alpine, sub-polar) with a wide range of average temperatures (from average of less than 6°C to 18°C) and annual rains from under 100 to 2,000 mm. The total population is 13.3 million, including 85.2 % urban and 37 % below 18; literacy is 95 %. Central Chile has a high number of animal and plant species. Countrywide, 2,700 higher plant species are endemic.

### Economy

Industry represents 14.7 % of total GDP and includes copper mining, petrochemical, chemicals including plastics, pulp and paper. Agriculture which involves 20% of the population in farms of 0.5 - 20 ha includes cereals, sweet potato, and cash crops such as fruits.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

The Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs and PTS management are CONAMA (Environmental Commission), Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Mining, Economy, Transport & Telecommunication, Interior, Finance, Labour & Social Security and Foreign Affairs. There exist a number of inter-ministerial groups and commissions, and in particular for the implementation of the Basel, PIC, and POPs Conventions. A number of industry and environmental NGOs that have a stake in POPs issues have been identified. Chile has conducted an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile on Chemicals Management and a comprehensive legislation on chemicals is in place. POPs pesticides have been banned, but compounds such as endosulfan are still used. The infrastructure includes a number of accredited laboratories, inspections, information systems and poison control centres. Monitoring programmes related to water contamination are carried out. On-going activities of direct relevance include a PCB inventory and a CIDA funded project on safe use and management of pesticides. The University of Concepcion is the lead institution for South America for the Regionally-based Assessment of PTS UNEP-GEF project.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

PTS pesticides used recently or currently include lindane, endosulfan, pentachlorophenol (wood treatment). Various sources of dioxins/furans are suspected, but no inventory has been conducted. Environmental hazards related to the existence of PCBs stockpiles in unsafe conditions are reported. Anecdotal evidence suggests the existence of sites contaminated with PCP and PCDDs. Studies on health problems related to pesticides, arsenic and lead have been conducted. Chile is a rapidly industrialising country with good infrastructure. The pilot study will make use of existing expertise in NGOs, public and private institutions and universities.

## **ECUADOR (Latin America)**

### Geography

Ecuador consists of a coastal lowland, the Andes Mountains, and the eastern lowlands of the Amazon valley plus the Galapagos Islands (256,000 km<sup>2</sup>). Its climate is tropical, highly variable according to the major regions (coast: rain 250 mm (south) – 4,000 mm (north), average temperature 24°C; highland: rain 500 mm (some interior valleys) – 2,000 mm, average temperature 15°C; Amazon region: rain up to 6,000+ mm (in the north), average temperature 21°C). The total population is 12 million including 59 % urban, 60 % below 18 years; literacy is 90.5 %. Transboundary water bodies include the Amazon Basin (Peru) and Carchi Guaytara Basin (Colombia). Ecuador is one of the 10 most important biodiversity hotspots with a high diversity of higher plants (19,000+ species, 4,000 of them endemic).

### Economy

Industry represents 15 % of total GDP, including 5.5 % of MVA (Manufactured Value Added), petroleum, agro-industry, and manufacture. Agriculture, which involves 31 % of the total population, includes rice, potato, maize, and cash crops such as banana, coffee and cocoa.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs management are Ministries of environment, Industry & Trade, Public Health and Agriculture. Other non-governmental stakeholders include Nature Foundation, Ecological Action and the Toxicological Society. Two co-ordination mechanisms are in place the National Committee for the Management of Dangerous Chemical Products and the National Committee on Pesticides and Products of Veterinarian Use. Ecuador has an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile for Chemicals Management in preparation. There is legislation on chemicals including pesticides and hazardous wastes. Most, but not all, organochlorine pesticides have been banned for agricultural purposes. DDT is used for disease vector control. Illegal traffic of aldrin and heptachlor is reported. Infrastructure is relatively developed with capacity for pesticides analysis in the Service of Agricultural Sanitation and universities. The Ministry of Public Health is co-ordinating the development of a national poison control centre. Sub-regional collaboration is taking place in the Andin Pact countries on the harmonisation of pesticides registration.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

There are a number of sources of POPs/PTS to the environment in Ecuador. Agriculture is a source of pesticides. For example endosulfan is used in cut flower industry near water bodies and heptachlor is applied in the wood industry. The petroleum industry is a source of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and dioxins/furans near the Amazon Basin.

Environmental hazards include reports of quantities of stocks of POPs in unsafe conditions, the dumping of oil contaminated with PCBs, and the risk to wildlife of water, air and soil contamination by PAHs. Reported health hazards include elevated levels of POPs residue in foodstuff and up the foodchain.

## **GUINEA Conakry (Africa)**

### Geography

Guinea is a coastal and mountainous country of 246,000 km<sup>2</sup> in West Africa. Its climate is tropical with average temperatures of 12 - 15°C. Total population is 7 million with 45 % below 18; literacy is 74 %. Guinea shares a number of transboundary rivers with its neighbours: the Niger and Senegal (to Mali), but also smaller rivers to Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone and Liberia). The forests of Guinea have been reported to be the richest in West Africa.

### Economy

Industry represents 32 % of total GDP and includes mining of aluminium, bauxite, gold and diamonds, agro-industry and plastics. Agriculture, which involves 53 % of the population, includes cassava, rice and other cereals, groundnut, and cash crops such as banana, coffee, cocoa, cotton and palm oil.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management are Ministries of Environment, Industry, Labour, Health and Agriculture. A large number of stakeholders exist in Guinea and include mining and other industrial companies, pesticides importers, research centres and universities, and environmental NGOs. Guinea has completed a National Profile, and a number of legislative texts exist which contain regulations on chemicals, pesticides and hazardous wastes. This legislation, however, is piecemeal, and there is no inter-ministerial co-ordinating mechanism. Sub-regional collaboration efforts are on going with the inter-African phytosanitary homologation which aims at harmonisation of regulatory texts on agro-chemicals.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

Releases of dioxin/furans are predicted in bauxite industry, hospital waste incineration and plastic recycling. POPs pesticides are now banned, but illegal importation and use of DDT and lindane is reported. Environmental hazards include handling of PCB stocks and mining wastes disposal. Reported health hazards include pesticide intoxication in farming population and occupational health hazards in industry from PCBs.

Guinea is a least developed country, but it is relatively industrialised and has some level, albeit limited, of infrastructure which can be build upon.

## **LEBANON (Middle East)**

### Geography

Lebanon is a coastal to mountainous Mediterranean country of 10,000 km<sup>2</sup>. Its climate is Mediterranean with an average temperature of 32°C in summer and 20°C in winter, and average rainfall of 600 mm. The total population is 4 million including 74 % urban and 41 % below 18; literacy is 15 %. Lebanon transboundary waterbodies include the Mediterranean Sea and rivers shared with Syria and with the Palestinian Authority.

### Economy

Industry represents 17 % of total GDP which includes 10.5 % of MVA (Manufactured Value Added), cement, fertilisers, tanneries, power stations, pesticides, food and beverages, paper, soap and detergents. Agriculture, which involves 14.5 % of population, includes fruits, olives, potatoes, vegetables and animal feed.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

Ministries and government institutions involved include Ministries of Environment, Labour, Health, Agriculture and Trade and the Lebanese Institute for Norms and Measures. Other stakeholders include environmental NGOs. There is no inter-ministerial co-ordination mechanism as such, and Lebanon has not done a National Profile. Legislation exists on pesticides and hazardous wastes, but not on chemicals generally. The level of infrastructure is relatively good, with laboratories capable of pesticides analysis (but not dioxins/furans). A case study on dioxins levels in soils is underway with UNEP.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

Some of the issues of concern are related to the use of DDT in malaria vector control, dioxins/furans emissions from incineration and from PCB containing material, unsafe storage and handling of obsolete stocks of PCBs, illegal hazardous waste importation. Reported environmental hazards stem from industry effluents discharge in water bodies. Occupational health hazards with regard to PCBs are also reported.

## **MALAYSIA (Southeast Asia)**

### Geography

Malaysia consists of the Malaysian peninsula, the northern part of Borneo (with the exception of Brunei) and a number of small islands with a surface area of 330,000 km<sup>2</sup>. It has high mountains in major parts. The climate is humid-tropical with average temperatures of 28°C (Kuala Lumpur) and rainfall of 4,000 – 6,000 mm. The total population is 22 million with a literacy of 78 %. Malaysia shares the Southern China Sea and Malacca Straits with Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, Indonesia and Brunei. It has a rich flora and fauna (more than 15,000 plant species with nearly a quarter of them endemic and almost 1,900 vertebrates) especially in the part belonging to Borneo, one of the 10 countries with highest biodiversity.

### Economy

Malaysia is a rapidly industrialising country. Industry represents 42 % of total GDP and includes petrochemical, mining and electronics. Agriculture includes rice and cash crops such as rubber.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

The Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management are Ministries of Environment, Health, and Agriculture. Malaysia is in the process of preparing an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile for Chemicals Management. Legislation includes a Pesticides Act and an Occupational Health and Safety Act. Industry operates a pesticide stewardship programme and a responsible care programme.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

POPs pesticides have all been banned. Lindane is still used, although prohibited on rice. DDT has been recently also banned for disease vector control and replaced by synthetic pyrethroids. Malaysia is one of the most industrialised countries amongst the 12 proposed pilots and issues of industrial manufactured POPs and by-products are expected to be important.

## **MALI (Africa)**

### Geography

Landlocked Sahel country of 1,240,000 km<sup>2</sup>; its northern part belongs to the Sahara desert. The climate is semi-arid to arid with average temperatures ranging from 18 - 26°C and rain from negligible in the north to 1,000 – 1,500 mm in the south. The total population of 8.7 million is almost 50% below 15; literacy is 69 %. Mali shares two major transboundary water bodies the Niger River and the Senegal River. The inner delta of the Niger River between Djenné and Timbuktu hosts about 350 bird species including 100 migrating ones for which it is a resting site of crucial importance after their journey across the Sahara from Europe.

### Economy

Industry represents 15 % of total GDP and includes food, textiles, paper, machinery and equipment, pharmaceutical, power generation and gold mining. Agriculture includes cereals and cash crops such as cotton and groundnuts; livestock is predominant in the Sahel region.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

The main Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management are Ministries of Environment, Health, Industry, Customs, Agriculture, and Rural Development. Other stakeholders include Research Centres and NGOs, including consumer associations. 5 inter-ministerial commissions are relevant to environmental issues, particularly the national committee on pesticides management. Mali has recently completed an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile on Chemicals Management. A number of legislative texts exist that set-up to regulate toxic substances, but in practice the capacity to enforce them has often been missing. The infrastructure is weak and there is no monitoring of POPs in Mali. A FAO project on pesticides stockpiles management and elimination is underway. Regional collaboration takes place on pesticide homologation under the aegis of CILSS (International Commission for Drought Control in the Sahel).

### Some POPs/PTS issues

A number of POPs/PTS pesticides use is reported (DDT, dieldrin, HCH, mirex, endrin) in agriculture and vector control. In addition some are imported and sold illegally and used in the informal sector (DDT, dieldrin, and lindane). Intensive agriculture is a heavy user of pesticides. Uncontrolled waste incineration is a potential source of by-products.

Reported environmental hazards include old PCBs containing transformers stored unprotected in the open air, uncontrolled dumping of chemicals, obsolete pesticide stocks with soil and water contamination hazards. Most of the country's industry and agriculture is located along the Niger

River and contributes to its contamination. Occupational health hazards associated with PCBs are reported.

Mali is one of the least developed countries, however the intensification of agriculture for cash crop is leading to heavy, and somewhat uncontrolled use of toxic pesticides. It is exemplary in having some elements of legislation, but no capacity to implement and enforce this legislation.

## **MICRONESIA (SIDS / Pacific)**

### Geography

The Federated State of Micronesia is made up of four highly autonomous states composed of a group of small islands in the Pacific of 700 km<sup>2</sup> total surface area. Its climate is tropical-humid with average temperature of 27°C and rainfall of 4,800 mm. The total population is 105,500 including 25% urban and 55 % below 18; literacy is 94%. Micronesia has particularly high biodiversity with 18 bird species and 293 higher plant species that are endemic.

### Economy

Industry represents 17 % of total GDP. Fisheries is important and tourism is developing. Agriculture includes yams, taro, bread fruit, banana and cash crops, mainly vegetables. 76 % of the population is involved in agricultural activities on farms of less than 4 ha.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

The Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management include the State Environmental Protection Agency, the State Department of Health Services and the State Department of Resources & Development (agriculture). At the national level, they include the Department of Health Education and Social Affairs, and Department of Economic Affairs and Health. There are few linkages between departments, and no national co-ordinating committee for POPs/PTS issues. Micronesia is about to start an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile on Chemicals Management. SPREP has conducted recently a study funded by AusAID on the management of POPs in Pacific Island Countries, including FSM, which focuses on the assessment of stockpiles of obsolete chemicals.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

Few industrial sources of industrial POPs/PTS are present. There exist, however, power supply and bitumen production, medical and municipal waste incineration and uncontrolled combustion of waste. The use of DDT and chlordane in agriculture is reported. Environmental hazards include soils contaminated with hydrocarbon wastes and PCBs, and unsafe stocks of pesticides and PCBs. Health hazards include documented lead poisoning of children.

## **PAPUA NEW GUINEA (SIDS / Pacific)**

### Geography

PNG is a group of some 600 islands including the eastern half of New Guinea, and totals 463,000 km<sup>2</sup>. Its climate is tropical-humid with much variation: average temperatures range from 20 to 32°C and rainfall from 1,500 to 8,000 mm. The total population is 4.8 million including 20% urban and 50 % below 18; literacy is reported between 76 % and 45 %. 75 % of the population has access to health services. PNG shares a number of transboundary water bodies with its neighbours: the Gulf of Papua/Coral Sea (Australia), Solomon Sea (Solomon Islands), Bismarck Sea (Indonesia), Arafura Sea (Indonesia, Australia). A large number of rivers are shared with Indonesia (Irianjaya) including the Yapsiei, Ok Tedi/Fly, Hausei, Bewai, Denam and Merauke. PNG is one of the 10 most important biodiversity hotspots with a particular diversity of higher plants (20,000 species).

### Economy

Industry represents 36 % of total GDP and includes mining, petroleum, manufacturing and forestry. Agriculture, which involves 80 % of the population, includes coconut, banana, sweet potato, yams (subsistence crops) and plantations (oil palms, coffee etc.).

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management are Ministries of Environment, Health, Industry and Trade, Agriculture, Labour, Mining and Finance. Other stakeholders include mining, petroleum and manufacturing companies, agricultural enterprises (plantations) and forestry industries and chemical importers. PNG has completed an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile for Chemicals Management, and has legislation on chemicals management and a pesticide registration system in place. There is no inter-ministerial co-ordinating mechanism as such (Pesticide Working Group is defunct). Infrastructure is limited, with no capacity for pesticides analysis and no poison centre.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

Heptachlor is used for pest control against termites and DDT for disease vector control. Lindane is also used for pest control in agriculture. Illegal use of stocked DDT for agriculture is reported. Suspected sources of dioxins and furans include plastic manufacturing including PVC pipes, incineration of hospital wastes in old and rundown incinerators, and uncontrolled landfill and backyard burning of waste. Environmental hazards include DDT and PCBs stockpiles in poor condition and misuse of pesticides for fishing.

## **SLOVENIA (Europe)**

### Geography

Slovenia is a mountainous Mediterranean country of 20.000 km<sup>2</sup>. Its climate is sub-Mediterranean to alpine with average temperatures of 22°C in summer and -2°C in winter. The total population is 2 million including 50% urban and 23 % below 18; literacy is 99.6%. Access to health services is good. Slovenia shares a number of transboundary water bodies such as the rivers Sava (Croatia), Drava (from Austria to Croatia), Soča (near Italy, Adriatic Sea), Kolpa

(Croatia), Mura (from Austria to Croatia and Hungary) and Krupa (Croatia). Subterranean drinking water resources are connected with Austria, Italy and Croatia (4/10 of Slovenia is karstic).

### Economy

Industry is highly diversified and includes 31.8 % of MVA (Manufactured Value Added). It includes metal, chemicals, food, electrical and optical equipment, machinery, paper and textiles. Agriculture, which involves 1.5% of the population and accounts for 3.9% of the GDP, includes maize, potato and wheat.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management include Ministries of Environment, Health (National Chemicals Bureau), Labour, Agriculture, Trade, Interior, Foreign Affairs, Transport & Communication, Defence, Science & Technology, and Institutes for Hydrometeorology, Public Health, and Agriculture. Slovenia has completed an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile for Chemicals Management and has legislation in place on pesticides, hazardous waste and chemicals. There are two inter-ministerial co-ordination mechanisms the Commission for the preparation of expert opinions about POPs and the Intersectoral Committee on the Management of Dangerous Chemicals. The Infrastructure is good with well-equipped laboratories including the capacity for analysis of dioxins/furans and PCBs in environmental samples. There is a national poison centre. Monitoring programmes are underway on ground and surface water, air and food. Efforts have been galvanised by the UN-ECE protocol and Slovenia has conducted a PCB and dioxins/furans inventory. A number of collaborative sub-regional activities are taking place such as the PHARE projects on chemical safety and monitoring of pollution.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

POPs/PTS problems are more likely to stem from industrial manufactured chemicals than pesticides. Endosulfan, however, is used in orchards and vineyards. Environmental hazards from emissions from sub-standard small incinerators for hospital waste are reported. Other sources of by-products include recycling plants, aluminium melting and ironworks, and pulp mill using chlorine bleaching. Increased pesticides levels in water and PCBs leaching in river are reported. Many chemical industries are located close to water bodies. Moreover, the karstic nature of groundwater makes it particularly prone to contamination.

## **ZAMBIA (Africa)**

### Geography

Zambia is a 753,000 km<sup>2</sup> landlocked country consisting mostly of highlands. Its climate is tropical with average temperatures in the highlands of 20 to 23°C and rainfall ranging from 600 mm in the south to 1,200 mm in the north. The total population is 9.3 million including 40% urban and 51,4 % below 18. Literacy is 79%. Zambia shares a number of Lakes with its neighbours: Lake Kariba (shared with Zimbabwe), Lake Mweru (DRC), Lake Tanganyika (Tanzania, Zambia, Burundi, Rwanda and the DRC); as well as a number of rivers: Luapula River (DRC and Zambia), Zambezi River including the Victoria Falls (Angola, Zambia, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique). The Zambezi River and the country's lakes are important ecosystems. Lake Tanganyika is the oldest of the east African lakes and has the richest radiation of species of all these lakes (33 genera of cichlid fish are endemic to this lake as compared to 4 in Lake Victoria, for example).

### Economy

Industry represents 32.2 % of total GDP and includes power generation, mining and tannery. Agriculture includes maize, sorghum, sunflower, paddy and millet.

### POPs/PTS management and related infrastructure

Ministries and government institutions involved in POPs/PTS management include Ministries of Environment & Natural Resources, Health, Agriculture, Forest & Fisheries, Labour & Social Security, Commerce, Trade and Industry, and Mines and Minerals Development. Other stakeholders include university and other research institutions, copper mines and association of manufacturers. Zambia has completed an IOMC/UNITAR National Profile for Chemicals Management and has legislation in place on chemicals that encompasses POPs/PTS. A number of activities are taking place at the sub-regional level under the aegis of SADC: elaboration of a protocol and code of practice in occupational safety, protocol on POPs, harmonisation of pesticide registration requirements.

### Some POPs/PTS issues

Illegal traffic of chlordane and dieldrin is reported. Chlordane is used in termite control; DDT in malaria vector control; toxaphene against ticks in livestock. Power supply industry and mining are sources of PCBs. Reported environmental hazards include PCB stocks, sites contaminated with pesticides, and Kafue River contamination with industrial chemicals.