



**12 Pilot Countries' Global Project
for the Development of
National Implementation Plans
for the Management of
Persistent Organic Pollutants**



**First Steering Group Meeting
June 26-27, 2003**

Conclusion Remarks and Recommendations

- The Steering Group Meeting was opened, chaired, and closed by Mr. John Whitelaw, Deputy Director of UNEP Chemicals. The Agenda (Annex 1.) and List of Participants (Annex 2.) is attached to this document;
- The Steering Group (SG) noted the good progress that has been achieved so far in the Project especially considering the initial delays with the Sub-project signatures and effectiveness. The SG also noted that the Project Manager has done an outstanding job to achieve this progress; the reports, hand-out documents and presentations as well as the organization of the whole Steering Group Meeting was very target oriented, informative and comprehensive;
- The SG accepted all the small changes proposed by the Project Manager for the Project Document, the Umbrella and Sub-project Budgets, and the small corrections to the original design. Regarding possible use of FAO for in country delivery of funds, UNEP cautioned that the overhead fee needs to be taken into account;
- The Project Work Plan was accepted by the SG. In connection with the Work Plan, it was agreed that the next Steering Group Meeting (SGM) will be held when numerous draft National Implementation Plans (NIPs) will have been submitted so that the SG can review results and make recommendations to improve the NIPs, and can contribute to the development of the "lessons learned and good practice";
- The SG noted that an extension of at least 12 months would likely be required for the Project. The SG recommended that a minimum of a one-year extension (until 30 April 2005) should be granted so that all the Project objectives can successfully be achieved. It was acknowledged that the mid-term review would provide further clarity regarding the exact extension needed;
- The SG took note of the revised Guidance Document prepared by the Secretariat, and agreed that it was a considerable improvement on the previous version. The changes were in line with the suggestions of the expert group. The revised version kept the content, modified the structure, and made it shorter and handier. As a result, the new Guidance Document is much more user friendly. The Steering Group made a few suggestions to improve the content of the Document – these will be reflected in the Document. UNEP suggested that the NIP guidelines should also include performance monitoring. The SG noted that the Document would be a "living" one and can be changed to the actual needs of the countries to meet the requirements of NIPs and based on the countries' feedback. The 12 pilot countries are expected to be among the first ones to use the document and thus provide comments, feedback. The SG the role of NGOs in the process should be assessed welcomed advice that the new Guidance Document will be available in all the main languages in CD-ROM, and, submitted to the INC7. It was agreed that the civil society

reference in the guidelines should be changed to "...environment, health and other groups concerned with POPs...";

- The PM will reinforce with countries the need for involving civil society;
- The Steering Group observed that capacity building is an objective for the project, and the extent to which it has been successful in this regard will be reviewed as part of the performance evaluation;
- The SG welcomed advice that UNEP Chemicals will soon launch an Internet Discussion Forum open for exchange of information globally for all countries regarding the NIPs and POPs issues. The SG asked UNEP Chemicals to consider facilitating a discussion group on the guidance as part of its proposed NIP Web discussion forum;
- The Steering Group considered the Communication Strategy that had been drafted by the Project Manager. The Group recalled that the mandate for the strategy is Paragraph 33 of the project document. The SG recognized that various elements of such a strategy could include: global (relating mainly to the need to communicate lessons learned and good practices) and national (both during the development of the NIP and as part of its implementation). In the latter, the SG considered that countries would benefit from guidance. The PM is to circulate to SG members within a week an outline for their comment;
- The possible lessons learnt and good practices for replication, which have been identified so far in the course of Project implementation and as presented by the Project Manager to the SG were intensively discussed and the agreement reached is shown in the redrafted List of Lessons Learnt and Good Practices for Replication as attached to this document (Annex 3.);
- It was agreed that the training in action plans would be provided to the countries based on their specific needs and request. UNITAR's involvement in such trainings will be considered on a case by case, i.e. country by country basis;
- The SG accepted the recommendation that a second global meeting with the involvement of all the 12 countries would be useful early 2004 to exchange experience, information, review progress made and work plans jointly and harmonize timing and quality requirements. The meeting can also take up on its agenda the discussion and integration of the findings and recommendations made in the course of the mid-term review of the Project due in November 2003;
- The SG was advised that some countries of the 12 would require further grant funds from GEF to be able to successfully complete their sub-projects. In that context, the SG noted that the Project lacks the US\$ 131,000 co-financing foreshadowed in the original project proposal. The countries, most likely Guinea Conakry, Mali, PNG and Zambia, would submit a request for additional funds toward October 2003. The request will include detailed budget tables, explanations, and justification for the needs of the further funds. Funds that each country will have received additionally from the Umbrella budget will be taken into consideration when the requests for further additional grants are made. The Steering Group noted that: today countries applying for grant funds from GEF for their NIPs development receive almost the ceiling amount of US\$ 500,000. The 12 pilot countries received only an average of US\$ 340,750 to undertake comparable tasks. The SG approved the approach to be taken for the request of further funds and the fact that specific countries will need to get further funds to be able to successfully achieve the objectives and complete their sub-projects. It pointed out that in fund raising, we need to emphasize the value-added of the project that differentiates it from other NIP projects;
- The SG observed that there are advantages in including donors in the planning workshops at an early stage to secure "buy in";

- Knowledge, database management, exchange of information among the SG members:
 - Agreement was made that IPEN and ICCA would send UNEP Chemicals their main relevant contacts and representatives in the pilot countries,
 - UNEP Chemicals will share the list of NIP coordinators, stakeholders and NGOs participating in the sub-project events, as well as send information on relevant local and regional workshops well before also to the donor representatives to assure broad participation in these events by NGOs, industry and donors.

June 30, 2003.

Krisztina Kiss, Project Manager

Annex 1: Agenda of the Steering Group Meeting
Annex 2: List of Participants
Annex 3: List of Lessons Learnt and Good Practices for Replication as identified so far
Annex 4: Global Project Work Plan

FIRST STEERING GROUP MEETING
UNEP Chemicals, 2nd Floor Meeting Room
Geneva, Switzerland June 26-27, 2003

AGENDA

Thursday, June 26

- Chairperson:** Mr. John Whitelaw, Deputy Director, UNEP Chemicals
- 09:00 – 09:15 Opening – Mr. John Whitelaw, Deputy Director, UNEP Chemicals
- 09:15 – 10:00 Progress Report on the Project, changes needed
– Dr. Krisztina Kiss, Project Manager
- 10:00 – 10:15 Coffee break
- 10:15 – 12:30 Discussion on Progress Report
- 12:30 – 13:30 Lunch
- 13:30 – 15:30 The draft Guidance Document for the Development of NIPs – Ms.
Fatoumata Ouane
- 15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break
- 15:45 – 17:30 The draft Communication Strategy under the Project – Dr.
Krisztina Kiss

Friday, June 27

- Chairperson:** Mr. John Whitelaw, Deputy Director, UNEP Chemicals
- 09:00 – 10:00 Review of the Work Plan for future until completion – Dr. Krisztina
Kiss
- 10:00 – 10:15 Coffee break
- 10:15 – 12:30 Discussion on Work Plan
- 12:30 – 13:30 Lunch
- 13:30 – 15:30 Knowledge Management: issues, lessons, good practices,
regional meetings, etc. -- Dr. Krisztina Kiss
- 15:30 – 15:45 Coffee break
- 15:45 – 17:00 Final discussions, conclusion remarks, recommendations
- 17:00 Adjournment

GEF / UNEP -- 12 PILOT COUNTRIES PROJECT

FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION PLANS (NIPs) FOR
THE MANAGEMENT OF PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS (POPs)

FIRST STEERING GROUP MEETING

June 26-27, 2003

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Ms. Catalina Marulanda

Environmentally & Socially Sustainable
Development
Latin America & Caribbean Region
The World Bank
3113 45th St., NW
Washington, DC 20433
Tel.: + 1-202 473 - 8616
Fax.: + 1-202 522 - 3132
Email: cmarulanda@worldbank.org

Ms. Bahar Zorofi

UNEP, Division of GEF Coordination
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: + 254 2 623765
Fax: + 254 2 624042
Email: bahar.zorofi@unep.org

Mr. Jack Weinberg

IPEN's Northern Co-Chair
Environmental Health Fund
407 South Dearborn, Suite 1775
Chicago, IL 60605
United States of America
Tel: + 1-312 566 9314
Fax: + 1-312-408-0682
Email: jackwein@uic.edu

Mr. Craig Boljkovac

Acting Programme Coordinator
Chemicals and Waste Management
UNITAR
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel : 41 22 917 8471
Fax : 41 22 917 8047
E-mail : craig.boljkovac@unitar.org

Mr. John Haines

UNITAR
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
1219 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 791 3573
Fax: +41 22 791 4848
E-mail: hainesj@eurospan.com or
john.haines@unitar.org

Mr. Robert J. Simon

Senior Director, International Council
Chlorine Chemistry Council
1300 Wilson Blvd.,
Arlington, VA 22209
United States of America
Tel: +1-703 741 5866
Fax: +1-702 741 6084
Email: robert_simon@americanchemistry.com

Mr. Gero Vaagt

**Senior Officer, Pesticides
Management**

Plant Production & Protection Division
Agriculture Department (FAO)
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
0100 Rome
Italy
Tel.: +39 06 5705/1
Fax: +39 06 5745084
E-mail: fao-hq@fao.org

Dr. Grace Ohayo-Mitoko

Programme Manager / POPs (Africa)
United Nations Industrial Development
Organization (UNIDO)
P.O. Box 300
1400 Vienna
Austria
Tel: + 43-1 26026 3493
Fax: + 43-1 26026 6819
Email: g-ohayo-mitoko@unido.org

Mr. Peter Müller

Chemical Expert
Substances, Soil and Biotechnology Division
Swiss Agency for the Environment, Forests
and Landscape
3003 Berne
Switzerland
Tel.: + 41-31 322 9349
Fax: + 41-31 322 7978
Email: dr.p.m.Mueller@swissonline.ch

Dr. Matthias Kern

Chemical Safety Project
GTZ
Tupenfeld 2
53113 Bonn
Germany
Tel.: + 49 228 985 7014
Fax: + 49 228 985 7018
Email: gtzkern@aol.com

UNEP Chemicals Participants

Mr. John Whitelaw

Deputy Director
UNEP Chemicals
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
219 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+4122) 917 8360
Fax: (+4122) 797 34 60
Email: jwhitelaw@unep.ch

Ms. Fatoumata Ouane

Lead Specialist
UNEP Chemicals
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
219 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+4122) 917 8161
Fax: (+4122) 797 34 60
Email: fouane@unep.ch

Krisztina Kiss

Project Manager
UNEP Chemicals
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
CH-1219 Châtelaine Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+4122) 917 8518
Fax: (+4122) 797 34 60
Email: kkiss@chemicals.unep.ch

Mr. Andreas Arlt

(as observer)
UNEP Chemicals
11-13 Chemin des Anémones
219 Geneva
Switzerland
Tel: (+4122) 917 8174
Fax: (+4122) 797 34 60
Email: arlt@chemicals.unep.ch

List of possible notes on lessons and good practices as discussed during the SGM in June 2003

The lesson, problem, issue identified, and suggestion on how to overcome:

1. Initial delays in signatures and fund transfer arrangements

- A Project Management Manual (now being produced by UNEP) specifically for the countries accompanied with the Project Document already at endorsement can help to reduce initial delays in sub-project signatures and fund transfer arrangements;
- This Manual will also help clarify reporting, fund use requirements;
- The Project Manager should respond to/clarify specific questions during missions and work with the national coordinators country by country; share responses of interest with all the other countries through email and in writing;
- An overall training at the start specifically for the National Coordinators and reporting staff (as it was done in this project) for all the countries involved is useful.

2. Political support is needed for having local commitment and ownership of the project in place and for rapid appointment of the National Coordinator

- Political support is extremely important for the success of the project. If it drops, the project progress can be at risk;
- An almost continuous communication between the project manager and the national authorities can be helpful to maintain the political engagement.

3. Hiring the project manager in time to be in place for endorsement

- Difficult to overcome, since advertising the position cannot be done before project endorsement; good coordination and keeping tight schedules can be helpful.

4. Delays and additional difficulties in implementation in case of countries, which chose UNDP for the financial management of their projects. The reason for the delay is the additional layer of subsidiary agreements to be made between the UNDP local office and the Government in concern. The additional difficulty is that UNDP's reporting requirements are different from UNEP, therefore the countries need to submit two types of reports.

- Certain countries cannot avoid such arrangements; the issue can be identified already during preparation country by country and tight schedules can be set up at national level with the local UNDP office in concern to accelerate the necessary contracting and fund transfer arrangements; either UNEP or UNDP can give a waiver of their reporting requirements to avoid duplications – in case of this Project, UNEP gave a waiver;

5. The completion of the POPs inventories on time and in good quality is the most crucial step for the preparation of NIPs;

- The issue varies country by country. In general, countries should not spend too much time on perfecting their inventories during this NIPs development, but rather identify the gaps and prepare action plans how the missing information should be gained and managed; -- especially difficult to establish POPs inventories in countries with large informal economies, best estimates can be made in such cases and specific action plans on how to internalize data of the informal sectors.

6. Sub-project management and coordination challenges in smaller countries that lack own media and effective communication networks;

- Taking a regional approach in such cases can be helpful, bringing in key representatives of relevant regional centers like SPREP;
- National workshop and training with all stakeholder involvement and international facilitators can help set the national framework of communication and coordination;
- The Communication Strategy (under preparation), which will guide countries on how to prepare their own communication strategies for the Project and related to the requirements of the Stockholm Convention will also be helpful to overcome this problem.

7. Competitive bidding procedures with thorough preparation lower costs and assure quality output;

- Can be applied in this project to a limited extent, since very few equipment are procured;
- In case of hiring consultants the quality (though good TORs and transparent selection process) is determining.

8. Issues frequently subject of discussion: erection and operation of incinerators, whether environmental legislation, emissions monitoring, control and enforcement are in place

- These issues should be addressed within the project at an early state at project launch workshops and/or when the countries are developing/updating their National Profiles, stakeholder meetings can be organized to address such important issues and accelerate the necessary legislation, enforcement process, and awareness raising.

9. General

- Towards the end of the project, lessons learnt should also include lessons learnt in terms of the overall implementation of NIPs. The key lessons learnt within the project should reflect issues for the implementation of the NIPs and should be broken down to the different categories as addressed by the Stockholm Convention;
- At the end, a review whether the right stakeholders were involved and what role the NGOs took in the process will also be very useful for future projects.

Good practices, examples:

- 1. Slovenia's POPs related health monitoring system can serve as a good example for some countries**
 - POPs monitoring will need to be done by each party, based on Article 19 of the Convention; to set up POPs related health monitoring plans are not part of the NIPs process though; the example might be useful to avoid duplication of efforts in the field of monitoring in general or specifically for health projects.
- 2. Success in and pioneering the project ahead of other countries create good opportunities for the countries to get international exposure and enhance their image**
 - An important and effective incentive for good performance; countries can pilot their regions; their good results are noticed by their neighboring countries, regions, which can enhance better regional performance.
- 3. National monitoring and research plans maybe included in the NIPs, which should include monitoring of fish POPs intakes – the Slovenia and Bulgaria wild bear population POPs levels in comparison with other regions' bears or the arctic polar bears can be an interesting exercise**
 - Such can also help to foster the awareness raising process in the country and to identify data that are useful for local health monitoring.
- 4. The role of women in awareness raising, environmental and health protection; -- the good example in Mali to involve the Association of Women Groups for nationwide awareness raising activities**
 - Important, the Convention highlights the role of women in three of its parts.

Annex 4. Umbrella Project Work Plan		Project Months																																				
		2002						2003						2004						2005																		
ACTIVITIES		1*	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	
I.	Coordination of Sub-project initiation and launch activities																																					
I.1.	Completion of signatures of the 12 sub-project documents																																					
I.2.	Completion of transfer of initial funds for the 12 sub-projects																																					
I.3.	Completion of 11 sub-project launch workshops																																					
I.4.	The Lebanon Sub-project launch workshop as the last one																																					
I.5.	Completion of the activities under the MOU with UNITAR for the assistance in the preparation/update of National Profiles for all the countries except for Chile, Lebanon and Slovenia (in Step 2 of the NIPs)																																					
I.6.	Guidance Document for the NIPs																																					
I.7.	Communication Strategy																																					
II.	Steering Group Meeting																																					
II.1.	First Steering Group Meeting																																					
II.2.	Second Steering Group Meeting																																					
III.	Mid-term review of the Project																																					
III.1.	Prepare documentation for the MTR – Project Manager																																					
III.2.	Review – UNEP GEF Division																																					
III.3.	Report on the findings and recommendations of the MTR–UNEP GEF Division																																					
IV.	National Profiles																																					
IV.1.	Submittal of the 12 draft National Profile																																					
IV.2.	Review of and provide comments to the NPs – UNITAR																																					
IV.3.	Submittal of the final endorsed NPs by the countries																																					
V.	POPs Inventories																																					
V.1.	Submittal of the 12 draft POPs Inventories																																					
V.2.	Independent Review of the draft Inventories and provision of comments – UNEP																																					
V.3.	Submittal of the final endorsed Inventories by the Countries																																					
V.4.	Development of and Training in Action Plans in DDT, Pesticides, PCBs and D/F																																					
VI.	NIPs with costing, backed up by Action Plans																																					
VI.1.	Submittal of the 12 draft prioritized NIPs with costing backed up by Action Plans																																					
VI.2.	Independent Review of the draft NIPs and provision of comments -- UNEP																																					
VI.3.	Submittal of the final endorsed NIPs by the Countries																																					
VII.	Request and Provision of Further Funds																																					
VII.1.	Request of further funds by the countries																																					
VII.2.	Proposal to GEFSEC by PM and UNEP GEF Division																																					
VII.3.	Provision of funds as needed																																					
VIII.	Sub-project Completion Reports																																					
VIII.1.	Submittal of 12 draft Sub-project Completion Reports by the countries																																					
VIII.2.	Review of and comments to the Reports – PM																																					
VIII.3.	Submittal of the final Reports by the countries																																					
IX.	Global Pilot Project Completion Report																																					
IX.1.	Submit draft Report to UNEP management – Project Manager																																					
IX.2.	Review of and comments to the Completion Report – UNEP Management																																					
IX.3.	Submit the final Report to GEFSEC and SGM members																																					
X.	Audit of the Project (after this 36 months time-frame)																																					
X.1.	Carry out an independent Audit of the Project/Sub-projects – arranged for by UNEP GEF Division																																					
X.2.	Submit Audit Report																																					
XI.	Evaluation of Project (after this 36 months time-frame)																																					
XI.1.	Carry out an independent evaluation of the Project – as requested and arranged for by GEFSEC																																					
XI.2.	Submit Project Evaluation Report																																					

• First Month: May 2002 – Last Month: April 2005

X – Tied to the submittal of numerous draft NIPs by the countries