



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
13 February 2006

Original: English

**Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm
Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants
Second meeting**

Geneva, 1–5 May 2006

Item 5 (h) of the provisional agenda*

**Matters for consideration or action by the Conference of the Parties:
Financial resources**

**Report of the Global Environment Facility on its activities in support
of the implementation of the Stockholm Convention****

Note by the Secretariat

1. At its first meeting, the Conference of the Parties, in its decision SC-1/11, adopted the memorandum of understanding between the Conference of the Parties and the Council of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), as reproduced in the annex to decision SC-1/11.
2. The Council of the Global Environment Facility approved the memorandum of understanding at its twenty-seventh meeting, held from 8 to 10 November 2005 in Washington D.C. With that approval, the memorandum of understanding came into effect.
3. Paragraph 7 of the memorandum of understanding states contains the provision that "... the [GEF] Council will prepare and submit regular reports to the Conference of the Parties at each ordinary meeting." Paragraphs 8 to 12 of the memorandum specify what is to be included in that report.
4. Pursuant to paragraphs 7 to 12 of the memorandum of understanding, the Council of the Global Environment Facility has submitted its report to the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention at its second meeting. The report is reproduced in the annex to the present note.
5. Paragraph 13 of the memorandum of understanding contains the provision that "[t]he Conference of the Parties may raise with the Council any matter arising from the report received."

* UNEP/POPS/COP.2/1.

** Stockholm Convention, Articles 13 and 14; report of the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants on the work of its first meeting (UNEP/POPS/COP.1/31), annex I, decision SC-1/11.

Possible action by the Conference of the Parties

The Conference may wish:

- (a) To welcome the report of the Global Environment Facility to the Conference of the Parties of the Stockholm Convention at its second meeting;
- (b) To raise with the Council of the Global Environment Facility any matter arising from that report.



Global Environment Facility

February 3, 2006

REPORT OF THE GEF TO THE SECOND SESSION OF THE
CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON
PERSISTENT ORGANIC POLLUTANTS

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Development of the POPs Focal Area	1
III.	Project Activities in the POPs Focal Area	2
IV.	Highlights of Other Relevant Activities	5
V.	GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Activities	6
VI.	Fourth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund	7
VII.	Outlook	8
	Annex A: Synthesis of Projects Approved during the Reporting Period.....	9
	Annex B: List of Countries for Which POPs Enabling Activities Have Been Approved, as of December 15, 2005	11
	Annex C: List of Projects (Excluding NIPs) Approved Since Adoption of the Stockholm Convention, May 2001, as of December 15, 2005	12
	Annex D: Reports Previously Submitted by the GEF to the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention	14

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This report has been prepared for the second session of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Stockholm Convention on POPs. It covers the period from January, 15, 2005, to December, 15, 2005, and describes major GEF activities in the area covered by the Convention. The report complements the report of the GEF to the first session of the Conference of the Parties that covered activities from adoption of the Stockholm Convention in May 2001 to January 15, 2005.

2. The Parties' attention is also drawn to the following GEF publications and documents which the GEF will make available to the second session of the Conference of the Parties. They are also available on the GEF website (www.thegef.org) :

GEF Annual Report 2004 (available in English, French, and Spanish)

Achieving the Millennium Development Goals – A GEF progress report (September 2005)

Third Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility (August 2005)

II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE POPs FOCAL AREA

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Between the COP and the GEF Council

3. Following adoption of the MOU by the COP at its first session, the Council of the GEF approved the MOU without amendment at its November 2005 meeting, thereby bringing the MOU into force. The coming into effect of the MOU codifies the relationship between the GEF and the Stockholm Convention that has developed over the past four years since adoption of the Convention.

Consultation with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention

4. Pursuant to the MOU, the cooperation with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention that was taking place since adoption of the Convention has continued. The Stockholm Convention Secretariat addressed the GEF Council at its June 2005 and November 2005 meetings. The Secretariat has also advised the GEF on eligibility criteria following COP-1 decision on guidance to the financial mechanism. Finally, the Secretariat is regularly invited to comment on all concept or project proposals before they are approved by the GEF, and on the development of the POPs focal area.

Response to COP Guidance

5. Two documents underpin the future work of the GEF in the POPs focal area: the draft Operational¹ Program #14 on POPs (OP14) and the draft GEF POPs strategy². Both documents

¹ http://thegef.org/Operational_Policies/operational_programs/operational_programs.html

are grounded in COP guidance and specifically respond to Decision 1/9 of the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention adopted in May 2005. Both documents are being prepared in consultation with the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention.

6. The finalization of OP14 was on hold pending COP guidance. The GEF Council meeting in November 2005 has now instructed the GEF Secretariat, working with the GEF agencies, to finalize the Operational Program on POPs, taking into account the guidance approved at the first meeting of the COP.

7. The draft POPs strategy builds on the current strategic objectives for POPs welcomed by INC-7. The document responds to the guidance to the financial mechanism adopted by the COP at its first session (Decision SC-1/9), and notes in particular that “the strategic objectives proposed herewith are fully consistent with this emphasis of the [COP] guidance on the National Implementation Plan as main driver for implementation activities, and on capacity building”. The POPs focal area is marked by a shift from initial fact finding and priority setting phase (initial NIPs) to implementation. The strategy under development emphasises NIP implementation and capacity building in the framework of a country’s infrastructure for chemicals management, seeking to maximize coordination and potential synergies with other chemicals-related conventions and agreements, and assisting those countries that lag the farthest behind to establish basic foundational capacities for the sound management of chemicals. The strategy is expected to be completed by end 2006.

III. PROJECT ACTIVITIES IN THE POPs FOCAL AREA

8. The GEF, as the principal entity entrusted with the operations of the financial mechanism of the Stockholm Convention, on an interim basis, provides financing to country-driven projects consistent with guidance approved by the Conference of the Parties on policy, strategy, program priorities and eligibility. GEF-financed projects are mainly managed through its Implementing Agencies: UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank, as well as through its Executing Agencies under Expanded Opportunities³ (collectively referred to as “GEF agencies”). Information on all GEF projects is available at the GEF website (www.theGEF.org) under “Project Database and Documents”.

9. By the end of the reporting period, December 15, 2005, the GEF had committed an estimated US\$ 171 million to projects in the POPs focal area. This cumulative GEF POPs allocation has leveraged more than US\$ 128 million in co-financing to bring the total value of the GEF POPs portfolio to over US\$ 300 million.

10. In addition, it should be noted that GEF resources provided through other focal areas (biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, ozone, and international waters) often have cross-cutting benefits supportive of the objectives of the Stockholm Convention on POPs through the development of human resources and institutions, or are directly supportive of

² *GEF POPs Strategy (Working Draft)*, GEF/R.4/Inf.10, August 10, 2005

³ FAO, UNIDO, the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Inter-American Development Bank

activities broadly related to POPs issues such as integrated pest management or nutrient reduction.

Projects Approved (January 15, 2005 to December 15, 2005)

11. In the reporting period, 21 projects were approved by the GEF in the area of Persistent Organic Pollutants. Table 1 provides a breakdown of these projects by project type. Tables 2–4 provide more information on the projects, while Annex A includes a summary of the objectives and activities of each full-sized and medium-sized project approved during the reporting period.

Table 1: Projects approved in the POPs focal area, January 15 2005 to December 15 2005

Type of activity	Number of activities	GEF financing (in US\$ millions)	Co-financing (in US\$ millions)	Total financing (in US\$ millions)
Full and medium-sized projects	5	32.4	31.45	63.8
Enabling activities (NIPs)*	8	3.15	0.51	3.7
Project preparation PDFs	8	1.5	0.4	1.9
Total	21	37.0	32.4	69.4

* Including Russian Federation PDF-B

12. As indicated in Table 1, the GEF allocation during the reporting period in the area of POPs was US\$ 38.2 million in financing out of total project costs of over US\$ 71 million. Over US\$ 33 million was leveraged in co-financing for the project activities from the recipient countries, GEF agencies, bilateral partners, and the non-governmental and private sectors.

13. Table 2 lists the full-sized and medium-sized projects approved during the reporting period. The projects address a number of Stockholm Convention implementation issues, covering alternatives to POPs pesticides used for termite control, alternatives to DDT used for disease vector control, PCBs management and disposal, and management and destruction of pesticide containing waste.

14. Table 3 lists the 8 new enabling activity projects (for the development of a National Implementation Plans – NIPs) approved during the reporting period. Annex B lists all the countries receiving NIP funding from the GEF.

Pipeline and Project Development Facility Activities

15. There are 26 projects under preparation in the GEF pipeline at time of writing, corresponding to an estimated GEF allocation over US\$ 180 million, and expected to leverage over US\$ 200 million in co-financing. As a first step in project development, the GEF often provides financing to assist recipient countries to develop a project concept into a project proposal. During the reporting period, 8 grants from the Project Development Facility (PDF) were approved. These PDFs are listed in Table 4.

Table 2: Full-sized and medium-sized projects approved by the GEF Council, Jan 15 2005, December 15 2005

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing US\$ million	Total Financing US\$ million
China	Demonstration of Alternatives to Chlordane and Mirex in Termite Control	WB	14.64	28.3
Moldova	POPs Management and Destruction Project	WB	6.7	12.9
Regional (Ethiopia, Madagascar, Namibia, South Africa)	Demonstrating Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability of Environmentally-sound and Locally Appropriate Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Control in Africa	UNEP	5.87	11.9
Regional (Benin, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, Niger)*	Reducing Dependence on POPs and other Agro-Chemicals in the Senegal and Niger River Basins through Integrated Production, Pest and Pollution Management	UNEP	4.48	9.3
Global	Action Plan Skills Building for 15 Least Developed Countries to assist with National Implementation Plan Development under the Stockholm Convention	UNDP	0.7	1.45
Total	-	-	32.4	63.8

* Joint International Waters / POPs project

Table 3: Enabling Activities January 15 2005 to December 15 2005

Country	Agency
The Bahamas	UNEP
Belize	UNDP
Cape Verde	UNEP
Dominica	UNEP
Panama	UNEP
Tuvalu	UNEP
Uganda	UNEP

Table 4: Project Development Facility Grants

Country	Project Name	Implementing Agency	GEF Financing US\$ million
China	Improvement of Production Technology of Dicofol from DDT and Introduction of Alternative Technologies for Leaf Mites Control	UNDP	0.295
Romania	Disposal of PCB Wastes	UNIDO	0.048
Macedonia	Development of an MSP for Stabilization of POPs in Landfills and Preparation for Disposal	UNDP	0.025
Regional (Nigeria, Ghana)	Regional Project to Develop Appropriate Strategies for Identifying Sites Contaminated by Chemicals listed in Annexes A, B and/or C of the Stockholm Convention	UNIDO	0.65
Ghana	Capacity Building for PCB Elimination	UNDP	0.35
Lithuania	Development of a MSPs in priority areas identified during the formulation of Lithuania's NIP	UNDP	0.035
Kazakhstan	Development of a MSPs in priority areas identified during the formulation of Kazakhstan's NIP	UNDP	0.05
Armenia	Capacity Building for Implementation of the National Implementation Plan for Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants	UNEP	0.025

Progress in the NIP Program

16. As of December 15, 2005, National Implementation Plans for the Stockholm Convention are being funded by the GEF in 126 countries. Table 5 provides an overview of approval status and regional distribution, while table 6 provides an overview of implementation progress. As of November 15, 2005, 22 countries have a draft or completed NIP, 23 countries are in the drafting process, and another 23 countries have completed all fact finding activities, inventories, etc, and are in the process of defining their priorities. Four countries have submitted their NIP formally to the COP so far. A number of additional countries are expected to submit their NIP by the time the COP meets at its second session in May 2006.

IV. HIGHLIGHTS OF OTHER RELEVANT ACTIVITIES

17. During the reporting period, the GEF has undertaken other activities which are of relevance to its POPs portfolio. The GEF Council approved the *Action Plan to Respond to Recommendations for Improving GEF's Performance* and the document is available at the GEF website. The GEF continues its efforts to streamline its project cycle, and the Council has under discussion an action plan to respond to the recommendations of the evaluation of medium-sized projects. The GEF will continue to keep the Conference of the Parties informed of new progress in its future reports.

Table 5: Status of the NIPs Portfolio, as of Dec 15, 2005

<p>Status of approval</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 110 proposals have been approved under expedited procedures - India, Brazil, and Russian Federation are receiving PDF-B funding towards enabling full-sized project - China's full-sized project is under implementation - 12 countries are part of the pilot project
<p>Distribution of NIP Projects by Region (including 12 country pilot and PDFs)</p> <p>Africa: 44 countries Asia and the Pacific: 33 countries Europe and Central Asia: 24 countries Latin America and the Caribbean: 25 countries</p>

Table 6: Progress in NIP development: status as of Nov 15, 2005

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5*	Total
No countries	27	31	23	23	22	126

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

Operations Manual

18. The GEF is currently finalizing an operations manual to put together all the information needed by Parties to access GEF resources using the various modalities in a user-friendly format. The operations manual will be distributed to all Parties and will also be available at the GEF website. It will describe the detailed procedures in undertaking a project, as well as the approval process and documentation needed at each stage of the project cycle.

V. GEF MONITORING AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

19. During the reporting period, the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (GEF M&E) was established as an independent Office of Evaluation, reporting directly to the GEF Council. The mandate and independent mission of the Office of Evaluation was further defined through the

consideration by the GEF Council of the *Draft GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*⁴. Documents on GEF Monitoring and Evaluation are available at the GEF website (www.theGEF.org) under “Monitoring and Evaluation”.

Results of the Overall Performance Study of the GEF

20. During the reporting period, the Third Overall Performance Study of the GEF (OPS3) was completed. This independent and external review of the performance of the GEF since restructuring in 1994 was prepared to inform the fourth replenishment of the GEF. The terms of reference for the evaluation were approved by the GEF Council in May 2004, and implementation began in September 2004. Following an international search, the firm ICF Consulting, which has offices in Brazil, Canada, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, was selected to execute the study.

21. The OPS3 assesses the extent to which GEF has achieved, or is on its way towards achieving, its main objectives as laid down in the GEF Instrument and subsequent decisions by the GEF Council and the Assembly. Specifically, the study provided: (i) an overall assessment of the impacts and other results achieved since the GEF restructuring in 1994; (ii) an assessment of the effectiveness of GEF policies, strategies and programs; and (iii) key lessons and recommendations on how to render GEF support more effective in contributing to global environmental benefits.

22. The key conclusions of the OPS3 Evaluation with respect to the POPs focal area are as follows⁵:

“The GEF has achieved significant results, particularly at the outcome level, in the areas of Biodiversity, Climate Change, International Waters, and Ozone Depletion, and is well placed to deliver important results in the newer focal areas for Land Degradation and Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs).”

“In the Land Degradation and POPs focal areas, the OPS3 team finds that there are signs of health; in particular these focal area programs seem poised to learn from the experiences of the other, more mature focal areas, although it is premature to assess the likelihood of results generation. In the POPs focal area, there has been significant progress in implementing convention guidance through the funding of national implementation plans (NIPs) in more than 100 countries [...]”.

VI. FOURTH REPLENISHMENT OF THE GEF TRUST FUND

23. At its November 2004 meeting, the Council requested the Trustee of the Global Environment Facility, in cooperation with the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Facility, to initiate discussions on the fourth replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund with the

⁴ GEF/ME/C.27/1

⁵ ICF Consulting, “Third Overall Performance Study of the Global Environment Facility - Executive Version”, Washington DC, August 2005, PP 3&4.

convening of a planning meeting in early March 2005. All countries that have indicated their intention to contribute the equivalent of at least 4 million Special Drawing Rights for that replenishment are invited to participate in the replenishment discussions. Potential donors that do not intend to provide this minimum contribution are also invited to attend replenishment negotiations as observers.

24. GEF-3 resources fund Council work programs and administrative budgets for the period from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2006. Discussions on the GEF-4 were initiated in 2005 to ensure that GEF operations can continue uninterrupted after the end of the GEF-3 period and that GEF-4 resources are available to cover GEF operations from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2010.

25. The launch of replenishment discussions is essential to enable the GEF to fulfill its roles as the financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change and as a financial mechanism of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification. Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund will also enable the GEF to continue assisting donor countries in their efforts to contribute to the protection and management of the global environment, consistent with the Millennium Development Goal of ensuring environmental sustainability and with the Program of Implementation approved by the WSSD in 2002.

26. Negotiations on the fourth replenishment will continue in 2006 and are expected to conclude in a timely manner as to ensure continuity in GEF funding.

VII. OUTLOOK

27. The GEF POPs focal area is now well established and growing. This past year can be considered a transition year between an early phase which saw the maturation of pilot and demonstration projects that had been approved under the International Waters focal area, and an implementation phase that is commencing now with countries preparing projects to implement their NIPs. Indeed, while a limited number of projects were approved over the past year, a much greater and growing number of concepts were approved and project preparation activities funded.

28. By the end of the reporting period, the GEF had committed an estimated US\$ 171 million to projects in the POPs focal area and had leveraged additional financing from project partners leading to an overall portfolio of over US\$ 300 million. Looking forward, the pipeline of projects under preparation represents an estimated GEF allocation of over US\$ 180 million which is expected to leverage over US\$ 200 million in co-financing. A significant number of countries are nearing completion of their initial NIP and are expected to submit additional proposals to the GEF for further support of their efforts to implement the Stockholm Convention.

Annex A: Synthesis of Projects Approved during the Reporting Period January 15, 2005, to December, 15, 2005

The full and medium-sized projects approved during the reporting period, January 15 2005 to December 15, 2005 are listed below. Further information on the GEF Operational Strategy and Operational Programs is available on the GEF website: www.theGEF.org.

Full-sized Projects

China: Demonstration of Alternatives to Chlordane and Mirex in Termite Control

Implementation: WB; Execution: SEPA/FECO

GEF funding: US\$ 14.6 million; Total project cost: US\$ 28.3 million

The project aims to help China formulate a robust national program for phase-out of chlordane and mirex through environmentally sustainable and cost-effective non-chemical integrated termite management. Specifically, the project's objectives are to learn how to cost-effectively and sustainably eliminate the use of chlordane and mirex in termite control in the Zhejiang and Jiangsu provinces (demonstration area) through integrated pest management; and develop a national replication program for complete phase-out of chlordane and mirex in China consolidating the knowledge, lessons and experiences gleaned from the demonstration activities.

Moldova: POPs Management and Destruction Project

Implementation: WB; Execution: Ministry of Environment

GEF funding: US\$ 7.9 million; Total project cost: US\$ 15.3 million

With GEF financing and World bank assistance, Moldova was one of the first countries to have completed its NIP. This project addresses the three top priority POPs issues identified in the NIP. The objective of the project is to protect the environment and human health by safely managing and disposing of stockpiles of POPs contaminated pesticides and PCBs. The project will also strengthen the regulatory and institutional arrangement for the long term control of POPs and other toxic substances in line with the requirements of the Stockholm Convention and other related conventions and protocols ratified by Moldova.

Ethiopia, Madagascar, Namibia, South Africa:

Demonstrating Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability of Environmentally-sound and Locally Appropriate Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Control in Africa

Implementation: UNEP

Execution: WHO-AFRO; Ministries of Health in the participating countries

GEF funding: US\$ 5.9 million; Total project cost: US\$ 11.9 million

Malaria is a major public health problem in sub-Saharan Africa. Several countries of the region currently rely on DDT for malaria vector control. The project will demonstrate cost-effective, environmentally sound, and locally appropriate alternatives to DDT, ensuring their sustainable use through strengthened national and local capacity for malaria control. The project aims to move countries from traditional method of house spraying to Integrated Vector Management. The project comprises four components: 1) Strengthening of national and local capacities for malaria control; 2) Implementation of alternative methods of malaria vector control tailored to local circumstances; 3) Management of public health pesticides and disposal of stockpiles; and 4) Project coordination and management.

**Benin, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, Niger:
Reducing Dependence on POPs and other Agro-Chemicals in the Senegal and Niger River
Basins through Integrated Production, Pest and Pollution Management**

Implementation: UNEP; Execution: FAO

GEF funding: US\$ 4.5 million; Total project cost: US\$ 9.3 million

The project is focused on the two principal river basins in the West African sub-region, the Niger and Senegal River Basins, and addresses riverine contamination issues related mostly to irrigated-farming activities in six countries. Trends in irrigated agriculture over the past four decades in West Africa, as elsewhere, have been marked by overuse of agro-chemicals. Riverine areas support the highest proportions of biodiversity and it is also these areas where people concentrate to collect water for cooking and drinking, where they bathe and where domesticated animals are watered. The project objective is to protect transboundary waters in the Niger and Senegal River Basins through elimination of POPs pesticide-use and substantial reduction and elimination of other toxic pesticides used in agriculture; while augmenting agricultural productivity and net economic benefits to farmers. The project will demonstrate best practices for contaminant prevention and increased agricultural productivity through participatory farmer-education approaches. This is a joint POPs and International Waters project addressing POPs and Persistent Toxic Substances.

Medium-sized Projects

**Action Plan Training/Skills Building for 15 Least Developed Countries to assist with
National Implementation Plan Development under the Stockholm Convention**

Implementation: UNDP; Execution: UNITAR

GEF funding US\$ 0.7 million; Total project cost US \$ 1.4 million

Least Developed Countries that are receiving GEF funding for NIP development are required to develop action plans on specific Stockholm Convention-related issues. Skills building/training on action plan development, combined with concrete follow-up activities will assist least developed countries to have the necessary tools to fully plan for and document the costed interventions necessary for implementation of the Convention. Project objectives include ensuring training recipients are familiar with, and able to effectively use, key project planning and strategic tools and methodologies; applying such action plan development approaches in the context of the Stockholm Convention; sharing experiences and lessons learned between countries receiving the training; and identifying possible country-driven follow-up activities. This project complements and builds on an earlier MSP that worked with an initial group of 25 LDCs.

Annex B: List of Countries for Which POPs Enabling Activities Have Been Approved, as of December 15, 2005

Country	Agency	Country	Agency	Country	Agency
Albania	UNDP	Ghana	UNIDO	Niue	UNDP
Algeria	UNIDO	Guatemala	UNIDO	Oman	UNEP
Antigua and Barb.	UNEP	Guinea ¹	UNEP	Pakistan	UNDP
Argentina	UNEP	Guinea-Bissau	UNEP	Palau	UNEP
Armenia	UNIDO	Haiti	UNEP	Panama	UNEP
Azerbaijan	UNIDO	Honduras	UNDP	Papua New Guinea ¹	UNEP
Bahamas, The	UNEP	Hungary	UNIDO	Paraguay	UNEP
Bangladesh	UNDP	India ³	UNIDO	Peru	UNEP
Barbados ¹	UNEP	Indonesia	UNIDO	Philippines	UNDP
Belarus	World Bank	Iran	UNDP	Poland	UNIDO
Belize	UNDP	Jamaica	UNDP	Romania	UNIDO
Benin	UNEP	Jordan	UNEP	Russian Federation ³	UNEP
Bolivia	UNIDO	Kazakhstan	UNDP	Rwanda	UNIDO
Botswana	UNIDO	Kenya	UNEP	Samoa	UNDP
Brazil ³	UNEP	Kiribati	UNEP	Sao Tome and Prin.	UNIDO
Bulgaria ¹	UNEP	Korea DPR	UNDP	Senegal	UNEP
Burkina Faso	UNDP	Kyrgyzstan	UNEP	Serbia and Mont.	UNEP
Burundi	UNIDO	Lao PDR	UNIDO	Seychelles	UNIDO
Cambodia	UNEP	Latvia	UNDP	Slovak Republic	UNDP
Cameroon	UNEP	Lebanon ¹	UNEP	Slovenia ¹	UNEP
Cape Verde	UNEP	Lesotho	UNIDO	South Africa	UNEP
Central African Rep.	UNIDO	Liberia	UNIDO	Sri Lanka	UNEP
Chad	UNIDO	Lithuania	UNDP	St. Lucia	UNEP
Chile ¹	UNEP	Macedonia	UNIDO	Sudan	UNDP
China ²	UNIDO	Madagascar	UNEP	Syria	UNEP
Colombia	World Bank	Malaysia ¹	UNEP	Tajikistan	UNEP
Comoros	UNDP	Malawi	UNIDO	Tanzania	UNIDO
Congo	UNIDO	Mali ¹	UNEP	Thailand	UNEP
Costa Rica	UNEP	Marshall Islands	UNEP	Togo	UNIDO
Cote d'Ivoire	UNEP	Mauritania	UNEP	Tonga	UNEP
Croatia	UNIDO	Mauritius	UNDP	Tunisia	UNEP/UNIDO
Cuba	UNEP	Mexico	World Bank	Turkey	UNIDO
Czech Republic	UNIDO	Micronesia ¹	UNEP	Tuvalu	UNEP
Djibouti	UNIDO	Moldova	World Bank	Uganda	UNEP
Dominica	UNEP	Mongolia	UNIDO	Ukraine	UNEP
Ecuador ¹	UNEP	Morocco	UNDP	Uruguay	UNEP
Egypt	UNIDO	Mozambique	UNEP	Vanuatu	UNEP
Ethiopia	UNIDO	Nauru	UNEP	Venezuela	UNIDO
Fiji	UNEP	Nepal	UNIDO	Vietnam	UNDP
Gabon	UNIDO	Nicaragua	UNDP	Yemen	UNEP
Gambia	UNEP	Niger	UNIDO	Zambia ¹	UNEP
Georgia	UNDP	Nigeria	UNIDO	Zimbabwe	UNEP

Notes:

1. Part of the pilot project "Development of National Implementation Plans for the management of POPs"
2. Full-sized project under implementation
3. Full-sized project under preparation: PDF-B stage

Annex C: List of Projects (Excluding NIPs) Approved Since Adoption of the Stockholm Convention, May 2001, as of December 15, 2005

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regional: Africa Stockpiles Program, Phase I (WB/FAO); total \$60.7m, GEF \$25.7m

Regional: Demonstrating Cost-effectiveness and Sustainability of Environmentally-sound and Locally Appropriate Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Control in Africa (UNEP); total \$11.9m, GEF \$5.9m

Regional: Regional Program of Action and Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Vector Control in Mexico and Central America (UNEP); total \$13.9m, GEF \$7.5m

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

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

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

Global: Action Plan Skills Building for 15 LDCs to assist with National Implementation Plan Development under the Stockholm Convention (UNDP); total \$1.4m, GEF \$0.7m

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

Annex D: Reports Previously Submitted by the GEF to the Conference of the Parties to the Stockholm Convention

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

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

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