UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022)

Project Title:	*Demonstration of Best Available Techniques (BATs) and Best Environmental Practices (BEPs) in Open Burning Activities in Response to the Stockholm Convention on POPs*
GEF ID:	*5082*
UNIDO ID:	*150033*
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	*GEF-5*
Country(ies):	*Regional (*Cambodia, Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines, and Vietnam)
Region:	*EAP - East Asia and Pacific*
GEF Focal Area:	*Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)*
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs[1]:	*n/a*
Stand-alone / Child Project:	*n/a*
Implementing Department/Division:	*ENV / IPM*
Co-Implementing Agency:	*n/a*
Executing Agency(ies):	*Ministry of Environment (Cambodia), Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Lao PDR), Ministry of Nature and Environment and Tourism (Mongolia), Department of Environment and natural resources (Philippines), Vietnam Environment Administration, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Vietnam)*
Project Type:	*Full-Sized Project (FSP)*
Project Duration:	*60*
Extension(s):	*2*
GEF Project Financing:	*7,560,000.00 USD*
Agency Fee:	*718,200.00 USD*
Co-financing Amount:	*32,776,434 USD*
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	*1/26/2015*
UNIDO Approval Date:	*3/18/2015*
Actual Implementation Start:	*3/31/2015*
Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2022:	*7,530,370 USD*
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	11/19/2018
Original Project Completion Date:	*12/31/2020*

[1] Only for **GEF-6 projects**, if applicable

Project Completion Date as reported in FY21:	6/30/2022
Current SAP Completion Date:	6/30/2022
Expected Project Completion Date:	6/30/2022
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	4/1/2022
Expected Financial Closure Date:	12/31/2022
UNIDO Project Manager[2]:	*Carmela Centeno*

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective

The project aims to create resource-efficient waste management systems to reduce U-POPs emissions through the introduction of BAT/BEP in open burning sources and achieve a reduction of approx. 90% of current PCDD/PCDF releases at the pilot demonstration activities in the participating countries.

The project components include (i) Legislation Improvement; (ii) Institutional Strengthening; (iii) Demonstration Activities on pilot sites (iv) Education and Awareness Raising and (v) Monitoring & Evaluation. Particularly, the framework of the project foresees the following outcomes: Outcome 1: Strengthened legislative capacity for introducing BAT/BEP in the waste open burning source category; Outcome 2: Enhanced institutional capacity to carry out BAT/BEP implementation; Outcome 3: BAT/BEP implemented in open burning sources; Outcome 4: Improved knowledge and understanding on BAT/BEP and on risks connected with U-POPS, GHG emissions and other contaminants released through open burning; Outcome 5: Established project management structure and the system for monitoring/evaluation of project impacts.

The Project supports the participating countries in fulfilling the objectives reported in the NIPs and specific national plans. The project involves major stakeholders, e.g., ministries, municipalities, local authorities, research and academic institutions, and universities and environmental NGOs as executing partners while the private sector is also being tapped. The demonstration sites shall showcase the implementation of BAT/BEP, and make a shift from burning of waste to recycling or re-use.

Baseline

The Open burning sector, according to the PCDD/PCDFs inventories of the participating countries has been recognized as one of the leading sources of U-POPs. This is mainly due to the insufficient regulatory frameworks to address open burning, U-POPs emissions control, and BAT/BEPs, low institutional capacity to manage waste, the non-standardized inventory of waste disposal, limited education and training on waste management, and its non-inclusion in education at the university level, low women participation and the non-capability of laboratories to carry out UPOPs monitoring. In short, waste management that should have included BAT/BEPs, waste recycling, reuse, composting/waste-to-energy, etc. are generally not implemented, and external financial and technical assistance is required.

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY22. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY22.

In view of the GEF Secretariat's intent to start following the ability of projects to adopt the concept of adaptive management[3], Agencies are expected to closely monitor changes that occur from year to year and demonstrate that they are not simply implementing plans but modifying them in response to developments and circumstances or understanding. In order to facilitate with this assessment, please introduce the ratings as reported in the previous reporting cycle, i.e. FY21, in the last column.

[2] Person responsible for report content

[3] Adaptive management in the context of an intentional approach to decision-making and adjustments in response to new available information, evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation or research, and experience acquired from implementation, to ensure that the goals of the activity are being reached efficiently

Overall Ratings[4]	FY22	FY21
Global Environmental Objectives **(GEOs)** / Development Objectives **(DOs)** Rating	*Highly Satisfactory (HS)*	*Satisfactory (S)*
All of the targeted activities were completed and accomplished.		
Implementation Progress **(IP)** Rating	*Highly Satisfactory (HS)*	*Satisfactory (S)*
All of the targeted activities were completed and accomplished.		
Overall **Risk** Rating	*Low Risk (L)*	*Low Risk (L)*
No major impediments or hurdles were encountered during the implementation of project activities.		

II. Targeted results and progress to-date

Please describe the progress made in achieving the outputs against key performance indicator's targets in the project's **M&E Plan/Log-Frame at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval**. Please expand the table as needed.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Baseline	Target level	Progress in FY 2022
PROJECT OBJECTIVE: **Create resource efficient waste management to reduce U-POPs emissions through the introduction of BAT/BEP in open burning sources.**	mg TEQ/year of PCDD/PCDF estimated at the pilot demonstration sites in the participating countries.	Approximate values of mg TEQ/year at demonstration sites: 38 mg TEQ/year	Predicted UPOPs Reduction at predetermined demonstration sites with BAT/BEP intervention- mg TEQ/year: Cambodia: 543.7 Lao PDR: 8,113.3 Mongolia: 9,093.2 Philippines: 7,922.2 + 6,070.2 Vietnam: 3,424.6 with a Total of 37,167.2.	Calculations on the achieved reduction of UPOPs resulting from these BAT/BEP interventions showed that the **total achieved UPOPs emissions reduction of 41,126.1** mg TEQ/y from recycling activities is higher than those expected from the rehabilitation of dumpsites (37,167.2 mg TEQ/y) The Achieved UPOPs Reduction at actual demonstration sites with BAT/BEP intervention – mg TEQ/year: Cambodia: 4,876.77 Lao PDR: 4,347.2

[4] Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and assure that the indicated ratings correspond to the narrative of the report

				Mongolia: 22,150 Philippines: 4,526.0 + 1,131.5 Vietnam: 4,095.1 with a total of 41,126.1
Component 1	**Legislation Improvement**			
Outcome 1: STRENGTHENED LEGISLATIVE CAPACITY FOR INTRODUCING BAT/BEP IN WASTE OPEN BURNING SECTOR	Number of regulatory instruments in national legislations with requirements on BAT/BEP and U-POPs compliant with Stockholm Convention.	Insufficient regulatory frameworks to address open burning, U-POPs emissions control and BAT/BEPs.		All countries have issued regulatory instruments either in a form of a technical guideline/guidance, law amendment, or a commission resolution.
Output 1.1: Updated legal and regulatory frameworks for open burning to facilitate waste management improvements and BAT/BEP implementation, and to enable introduction of financing mechanisms.	Number of regulations aimed to discourage open burning in national legislations; existence of legal framework to enable incentive systems and financial support for integrated waste management systems. Availability of guidelines/guidance documents on BAT/BEP and incentive systems/financing mechanisms in participating countries. Number of persons trained (male female).	Legal framework does not enable incentive systems and/or encourage financial instrument to support integrated waste management. Institutional capacity is low and knowledge about BAT/BEPs, U-POPs and open burning issue is insufficient.	Inclusion of regulations aimed to discourage open burning in national legislations; setting up the legal framework to enable incentive systems and financial support for integrated waste management systems. Introduction of financing mechanisms and incentive systems in the updated legislation in support of BAT/BEP implementation. One toolkit for waste management and 1 manual for financing mechanisms/incentive systems in each participating country. At least one regional training program (training of trainers) with 4 trainees per country (2 male, 2 female) on policies, regulations and standards. Special consideration of gender.	All countries have conducted the assessment of the impacts of common and traditional open burning practices in terms of releases of U-POPs, GHG emissions, and other contaminants, and the effects/benefits of BAT/BEP application. **Regulations Issued:** *Lao PDR and Cambodia*: Technical Guidelines on Waste and Landfill Management Introducing BAT/BEP; *Mongolia:* amendment of Law on Waste (Approved and Ratified). *Philippines*: Issuance a resolution to fully enforce the provision on open burning of Municipal Solid Wastes including Agricultural Waste *Vietnam*: a) Technical guidance for writing environmental protection scheme for four types of craft villages; b) National technical regulation on industrial waste incinerators was amended; c) technical guideline on retrieval and disposal of discarded products in order to support the implementation of Circular 34/2017/TT-BTNMT Financing mechanisms and incentive systems were developed, introduced, and disseminated and the manuals completed in all countries.

				An Integrated Solid Waste Management Toolkit to Implement BAT and BEP in Open Burning was produced and a Regional Trainers Training was conducted and replicated/disseminated through National Training in each of the participating countries. In Vietnam, additional activities for Component 1 were also undertaken which included a) Assessment of the current status of production, use and treatment of POPs and articles, products and equipment containing POPs and propose solutions for sound management of these POPs and; b) Development of a Technical Guideline in information disclosure and label of POPs and articles, products containing POPs for sound management of POPs. A study on waste management mechanism to reduce open burning was also undertaken in Cambodia.
Component 2	**Institutional Strengthening**			
OUTCOME 2: ENHANCED INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO CARRY OUT BAT/BEP IMPLEMENTATION	Number of scientific/educational/ professional centers of competency for POP related topics to be involved in trainings Number of laboratories adopting best practices on monitoring/evaluation of U-POPs.	Despite differences among participating countries, the institutional capacity to address waste management requirements is insufficient in all of them.		All targeted activities in Component 2 were accomplished.
Output 2.1: Strengthened human resources/institutions on regional/national levels on waste management and BAT/BEP implementation in open burning of biomass and wastes, considering gender and social inclusiveness.	Availability of a platform for regional collaboration. Number of trainees (male female) on landfill management Number of trainees (male/female) on financing mechanisms and incentive systems	Knowledge transfer and cooperation in the region is limited. Very limited capacity on BAT/BEP waste management plans implementation in some countries. Inventory of waste disposal sites is based on very different, non-standardized	Introduction of a web-based platform for regional cooperation on academic and professional levels. At least 20 trainees on BAT/BEP and landfill management. At least 10 trainees on financing mechanisms and incentive systems	The project's regional website became a platform of sharing experiences, best practices, publication and updates not only among participating countries but to any interested stakeholder as well. (http://www.stopopenburning.org) All of the countries, have already conducted the National Trainings on BAT/BEP in Open Burning and waste management.

	Application of a standardized methodology for site inventory.	methodology and classification methods. Limited opportunities for education/training. Low women participation in waste management jobs.	Standardized methodology for site inventory adopted. National inventories on type and number of disposal sites updated	(based on the Regional ToT) and Workshops/ Trainings on Financing Mechanisms and Incentive Systems in support of BAT/BEP implementation. Inventory reports on type and number of disposal sites were all part of the assessment of Impacts of Open Burning Reports in all participating countries.
Output 2.2: Enhanced regional/national institutional capacity through the implementation of standardized analytical procedures, data collection, monitoring and reporting procedures and facilities.	Adoption of standardized methodologies for U-POPs release inventory. Number of laboratories and technicians/researcher (male female) in the region trained in conducting monitoring and analyses of U-POPs.	Currently only few regional laboratories (Vietnam, Thailand, Philippines) have the capability to carry out full monitoring of U-POPs. U-POP inventory update is often based on different calculation methods.	Standardized methodologies adopted for the continuous update of U-POPs release inventory. Capacity of at least 3 main laboratories in the region strengthened to enable U-POPs analyses/monitoring. 2-3 technicians trained for U-POPs analyses/monitoring in at least 3 laboratories. At least 1 researcher per country trained in evaluating and reporting on UP-POPs data At least 1 institution identified in the region to carry out trainings on U-POPs monitoring.	Regional Training of Trainers (TOT) on POPs Analysis and Sampling was conducted in 2017 and was attended by all participating countries. To further strengthen the Joint Laboratory for POPs analysis of Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Mongolian Academy of Sciences in Mongolia, some laboratory equipment was also provided by the project. Unintentionally produced POPs (U-POPs) inventory was done in 2006 and updated in 2015 in Cambodia while in 2013 in Mongolia. The methodology of UPOP inventory from open burning sources in Vietnam was also completed. The Dioxin lab, Centre of Environmental Monitoring in Hanoi, Vietnam carried out the regional training on monitoring, sampling and analysis UPOPs and GHG.
	–			
Component 3	**Demonstration activities on Pilot sites**			

Outcome 3: BAT/BEP IMPLEMENTED IN OPEN BURNING SOURCES	-Quantity of U-POPs and other relevant contaminants reduced at the demonstration sites. -Quantity of CO_2 emissions reduced. -Value of materials recycled. -Number of new businesses set up. -Number of jobs created. -Amount of new investments.	An estimation of CO_2 emissions, climate change mitigation/adaptation possibilities/needs has never been conducted at the sites.		Calculations made based on the different interventions in project sites revealed that the estimated total achieved UPOPs emissions reduction is 41,126.1 mg TEQ/y and the estimated total CO_2 reduction is 179,390.72 t/yr.
Output 3.1: Updated comprehensive assessment of the effects of current practices and impact indicators at the selected demonstration sites.	Quantity of U-POPs and other relevant contaminants reduced at the demonstration sites. Quantity of CO_2 emissions reduced.	Depending on country, limited studies carried out at the selected demonstration sites.	At least 5 sampling campaigns on each of the demonstration sites on ambient air, soil and leachate collected and analyzed for U-POPs and related contaminants at each demonstration site aimed to assess the effects of current practices. At least 20% CO_2 reduction achieved from the demonstration activities.	NCEM of Vietnam was the one who carried out the sampling in all countries. The report was finalized and submitted.
Output 3.2 BAT/BEP plans developed and implemented at the selected demonstration sites in each participating country.		None of the selected sites/municipalities has developed an integrated waste management system	Integrated waste management plans developed for the selected sites. BAT/BEP interventions carried out at the selected sites.	In each of the participating countries, either a plan, or guideline, was developed/ enhanced in SWM: *Cambodia* – Establishing a business model for a sustainable supply chain for recyclable waste in Battambang focusing on plastic and organic waste *Laos* – Ministerial regulation on Pollution Control and guideline for management of waste material; *Mongolia*- National Waste Management Action Plan; *Philippines*- SWM Plan of General Santos City and Koronadal *Vietnam*-Technical Guidelines on Segregation of Waste Generated from Recycling of Scrap Plastic.

	Grams U-POPs and other relevant contaminants reduced at the demonstration sites. Quantity of GHG emissions reduced. Value of materials recycled. Number of new businesses set up. Number of jobs created. Amount of new investments	Approximate values of mg TEQ/year at demonstration sites: 38 mg TEQ/year Currently, limited integrated waste management is in place at the selected sites. Institutional incentive systems/financing mechanisms are not provided on a public level.	At least 90% U-POPs reduction achieved in the demonstration sites Increase of at least 30% of reused/recycled materials. At least 30% CO_2 reduction achieved as co-benefit of the BAT/BEP implementation At least one business created/upgraded in the recycling/collection of different waste streams in all participating countries At least one additional job created in the enterprises involved.	The achieved reduction of UPOPs resulting from the BAT/BEP interventions showed that the total achieved UPOPs emissions reduction of 41,126.1 mg TEQ/y from recycling activities which was higher than what was targeted which was 37,167.2 mg TEQ/y. Estimated CO_2 reductions per country: Cambodia: 26,152.25 Lao PDR: 43,723.35 Mongolia: 71,450.00 Philippines: 18,250.00 Vietnam: 19,815.12 with an estimated total reduction of 179,390.72 t/yr.
		BAT/BEPs, waste recycling, reuse, composting/waste-to-energy, etc. are generally not implemented and external financial and technical assistance is required.	Enhancement of Composting Center of COMPED and Battambong Plastic Recycling Company, Cambodia Enhancement of Plastic Recycling in SAPLAST, Vientiane and the MRF for the promotion of 3Rs in Thakek District Khammouane Province, Laos PDR Landfill Cell for Ash Disposal and Storage and Maintenance Facility for Containers of chemicals and ash (Tsagaan Davaa Disposal Site, Ulaanbatar City, Mongolia) Central Materials Recovery Facility in General Santos City, Philippines and Plastic Recycling Facility in Koronadal	All countries have already completed their Major Intervention in the Demonstration Sites CAMBODIA: -Plastic recycling line in Battambang -Composting plant in Battambang -Recycling plant in Battambang-ADB Facility LAO PDR -Two lines to produce plastic pipes from recycled plastics at SAPLAST -Material Recovery Facility in THAKHEK MONGOLIA -Landfill cell to host ash from stoves used in ger area households PHILIPPINES -Central Material Recovery Facility in General Santos -Enhancement/ Provision of Equipment to the Plastic Recycling Facility in Koronadal VIETNAM -New plastic recycling line in Minh Khai

			Pilot facilities for plastic recycling in Phan Boi and Minh Khai Craft Villages, Vietnam	-Refurbishment of an existing plastic line in Phan Boi -Line to recycle waste plastic in Minh Khai and waste sorting was completed.
Component 4	**Education and Awareness Raising**			
Outcome 4- IMPROVED KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING ON BAT/BEP AND ON RISKS CONNECTED WITH U-POPs, GHG EMISSIONS AND OTHER CONTAMINANTS RELEASED THROUGH OPEN BURNING	Number of awareness raising campaigns and activities, disseminated materials, web-based platforms. Number of institutions in the region engaged and capable of delivering awareness raising campaigns. Number of universities offering courses that includes U-POPs/open burning topics	The general awareness of the UP-POPs and BAT/BEP issues is very limited. Waste management is not included in education at the university level. Knowledge/awarene ss and capability for valued-added waste treatment is not available.		All major activities in this Component were completed.
Output 4.1 Output 4.1: Awareness raising campaigns aimed to emphasize health and environment hazards of open burning practices, carried out on targeted relevant stakeholders	Number of targeted awareness raising and dissemination workshops for public at large available. Number of awareness raising campaigns/materials that include information on business opportunities and financing mechanisms in waste management sector. Number of training courses and number of trainees (male/ female) for public officials and authorities.	Awareness raising campaigns seldom focus on U-POPS and other negative effects of open burning. Limited access for population to information tools on U-POPs and possibilities of integrated waste management.	Project website developed and promoted at the regional level Materials produced in English and main local languages, including information on business opportunities and financing mechanisms in waste management sector. At least 2 targeted awareness raising campaigns implemented and delivered. At least 5 National training courses and one regional training program with 10 trainees on health and environmental topics of open burning practices	All national project websites established and linked to the regional website. All major awareness raising events delivered -photo and poster making contests (in all countries), -two fun-runs (Phils); -clean ups (Mongolia); -National Youth Debate (Cam); -running and cycling events (Vietnam); -2 tree planting events (Lao). All countries have already delivered their IEC/Short videos and video documentaries. Various materials and merchandise have been produced and distributed to various stakeholders: leaflets, posters, hats, shirts, pamphlets, brochures, booklets, eco & draw string bags, umbrellas, mugs, hand fans and coloring books

				All National Trainings have been conducted on health and environmental topics.
Output 4.2: Educational programs aimed at introducing and promoting alternatives to open burning practices, carried out on targeted groups at several levels	Number of training courses for local stakeholders and businesses. Number of universities involved in setting up dedicated courses.	Alternatives to open burning, integrated waste management opportunities, and U-POPs topics are rarely included in the educational system. Insufficient information is available for local business.	At least 1 training course on open burning and integrated waste management opportunities delivered per country. At least 1 training course for interested stakeholders and businesses carried out per demonstration site. At least 1 university curricula on U-POPs and BAT/BEPs developed per country.	All targeted trainings and workshops like, trainings on waste management i.e., alternative biomass utilization, recycling and reuse, plastic waste management and others, were completed already in each of the country. The education curricula at university level focused on BAT/BEP in waste management were also developed and completed: -*Cambodia,* curriculum on BAT/BEP in waste management -*Lao PDR,* course syllabus, adopted and now part of the teaching program in the department of Mechanical Engineering, National University. -*Philippines* and *Vietnam*, the courses were given to energy engineering and environmental students respectively - *Mongolia*, the textbook on solid waste management and U-POPs for university students was developed and online training for university professors for the implementation of the textbook for University students was organised.
Component 5	**Monitoring and Evaluation**			
OUTCOME 5: ESTABLISHED PROJECT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND THE SYSTEM FOR MONITORING/EVALUATION OF PROJECT IMPACT				
Output 5.1: Project impact monitoring system identified and implemented.				Regional Project Launch and Inception Workshop held on May, 2015 -1st May 2015 in Cambodia, -2nd December 2016 in Vienna -3rd February 2018 Philippines -4th March 2019 in Vietnam -5th June 2020 Virtual

				-6th April 2021 Virtual -June 2022 Final Workshop Technical Coordination Meetings (TCM) of NPMs -February 2016 Thailand -October 2017 Vienna -March 2019 Vietnam -August 12, 2021 Virtual -November 24, 2021 Virtual Annual Project Reports and Project Implementation Reports (Six PIRs Submitted) Mid-term external evaluation -Conducted November 2018 Final External Evaluation -Conducted May to June 2022 National Project Completion/Terminal Reports of each country -Submitted (May 2022) *(Attachments 5082_National PCR Cambodia/Lao PDR, Mongolia, Philippines/Vietnam)* Regional Project Completion Report -Submitted and for Printing *(Attachment 5082_Regional Project Completion Report)*

III. Project Risk Management

1. Please indicate the <u>overall project-level risks and the related risk management measures</u>: (i) as identified in the CEO Endorsement document, and (ii) progress to-date. Please expand the table as needed.

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 21	(i) Risk level FY 22	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk[5]
1	Delays in updating the legal framework and specific policy and technical guidance	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	All concerned stakeholders will be involved in the development of new/revised legislations.	No significant delay was encountered.	☐
2	Market-focused measures for	Modest risk (M)	Modest risk (M)	Representatives of the industrial and banking sectors will be	Representatives of these sectors were invited during consultation	☐

[5] New risk added in reporting period. Check only if applicable.

	supporting BAT/BEP implementation will not be supported by private sector investments.			involved in developing the market-focused measures for green investment promotion.	workshops and they were made resource persons in seminars and trainings. Partnerships with them were continued and explored.	
3	The regional network for information exchange will not be maintained after project completion.	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	The regional information exchange will be built on the currently available governmental and international infrastructures of the ESEA BAT/BEP Forum.	All national websites were developed and linked to the official or government websites in each country.	☐
4	Training not fully relevant to the stakeholders	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	Training needs will be assessed and pre- and post- training analysis will be undertaken. Relevant institutions will be identified.	All trainings were found to be relevant by government partners and various stakeholders who in one way or another was dealing with problems in waste management and POPs in general.	☐
5	Not all participating countries will have the necessary resources to maintain UP-POPs laboratory up to standard	Modest risk (M)	Modest risk (M)	National laboratories with the necessary resources can serve as the main partner for other countries in ensuring that UP-POPs analysis can be undertaken	The Training conducted by the Vietnam Dioxin Laboratory have capacitated National Laboratories by training lab technicians coming from each of the participating countries who helped during the sampling and monitoring activities.	☐
6	Preliminary monitoring campaigns may not be representative	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	Assessment and monitoring campaign will be carried out by national and international experts to assure reliable data	A strategy was developed to ensure that samples were taken despite the restrictions brought about by the pandemic.	☐
7	BAT/BEP measures and waste management plans in large landfills will not achieve the assumed positive results and thus will not be cost efficient within the project time	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	To address costs and time constraints, the project will focus on already existing landfills and on specific portion of them, in order to demonstrate cost/effective BAT/BEP implementation and technology transfers.	The implementation of the interventions was made after baseline information are known and provided to avoid duplication as well as to complement and build on what the countries have started or already have.	☐
8	The expected release reduction targets will not be achieved.	Modest risk (M)	Modest risk (M)	The release reduction targets will consider ongoing programs at the national level in order to set realistic and achievable targets for the participating countries.	The sampling in 5 countries was completed and the analysis of relevant emissions in the pilot sites was made.	☐
9	Low participation and interest from the stakeholders and general public.	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	Dedicated workshops will address broader issues than UP-POPs, such as waste management and agricultural activities..	All regional and national activities such as workshops, trainings, IECs were well attended by various stakeholders.	☐

10	Education programs not fully implemented due to lack of interest of relevant institutions	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	Partnership with relevant institutions will be timely established.	Modules and syllabi were already implemented in the universities and some have adopted and made them part of the teaching program of the university.	☐
11	Climate change risk: Natural disasters may result to destruction of the measures/ interventions applied to the demonstration sites.	Low risk (L)	Low risk (L)	The feasibility study prior to the construction of project facilities should consider the historical flood records and changes in the weather in the demonstration sites.	Historical records and plans were reviewed and validation missions were conducted prior to site selection and construction of project facilities.	☐

2. If the project received a sub-optimal risk rating (H, S) in the previous reporting period, please state the actions taken since then to mitigate the relevant risks and improve the related risk rating. Please also elaborate on reasons that may have impeded any of the sub-optimal risk ratings from improving in the current reporting cycle; please indicate actions planned for the next reporting cycle to remediate this.

NA

3. Please indicate any implication of the **COVID-19** pandemic on the progress of the project.

Just like what was reported in the previous PIR, activities implemented during the pandemic were partly affected by it. Delivery of materials, especially for the completion of Component 3 was deferred due to the Covid travel restrictions.

Also, work was affected locally in terms of the collaboration with partners due to the work-from-home mode or reporting in offices implemented in each of the countries. Workshops and meetings were done virtually and communications were still done electronically through the available various platforms as well as in reporting the progress of the project to partners and other interested stakeholders.

Nonetheless, all activities were completed and accomplished before the actual end of the project on June 30, 2022.

4. Please clarify if the project is facing delays and is expected to request an **extension**.

n/a

5. Please provide the **main findings and recommendations of completed MTR**, and elaborate on any actions taken towards the recommendations included in the report.

The MTR Of the project was done in 2018 and the key findings included the following: Project Design: The formulated log-frame has a clear thematically focused development objective and was considered to be adequate to address the issues. All project partners emphasized the high relevance of the project. Efficiency during the Mid-Term Evaluation was considered to be high and very acceptable considering that many activities have been accomplished and implemented during that time. Though one key finding that came out was the time left till the initial/planned project end which was less than 1.5 years during that time and was considered to be stringent to accomplish the demonstration component. A PMU has been set up in all five countries; and a Regional Coordinator selected, PSC meetings are regularly conducted, this UNIDO-based management, coordination, monitoring, quality control, and technical inputs of the PM are considered

to be very effective, timely, and helpful in effective project implementation. The national management and overall coordination mechanisms are reported and considered to be efficient and effective.
One key recommendation in the MTR was pertaining to the implementation of Component 3 - demonstration activities to be expedited and an extension of one year of the project duration was necessary to accomplish the foreseen technology transfer under Outcome 3. Lastly, effective communication between various stakeholders facilitates joint efforts for effective and efficient project implementation.

IV. Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS)

1. As part of the requirements for **projects from GEF-6 onwards**, and based on the screening as per the UNIDO Environmental and Social Safeguards Policies and Procedures (ESSPP), which category is the project?

☐ Category A project

☐ Category B project

☐ Category C project

(By selecting Category C, I confirm that the E&S risks of the project have not escalated to Category A or B).

Please expand the table as needed.

	E&S risk	Mitigation measures undertaken during the reporting period	Monitoring methods and procedures used in the reporting period
(i) Risks identified in ESMP at time of CEO Endorsement	N/A		
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	N/A		

V. Stakeholder Engagement

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes** regarding engagement of stakeholders in the project (based on the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent document submitted at CEO Endorsement/Approval).

As reported in the previous reporting, during project implementation, the engagement of stakeholders was undertaken through different strategies and approaches. The involvement and participation of the stakeholders in various stages in the implementation of various activities was ensured.

Stakeholders were reached through printed IEC materials (i.e., brochures, flyers, posters, and other merchandize) and different media platforms (tv, FB, newspapers, etc.). It was also ensured that various sectors were invited and encouraged to participate in the organized seminars and trainings, IEC activities (e.g., contests, fun runs, debates, clean-ups etc), and workshops.

Identified major partners (e.g. government, private sector, etc.) directly took part in the implementation of the project activities. As a result, the sense of ownership among the project partners and stakeholders was very high.

As stated in the previous report, the significance of communication and frequent consultation with stakeholders made the project implementation more meaningful and remarkable. The challenges and hurdles may always be there but, consulting them early on, involving them in planning, recognizing their interests, and incorporating their insights in the decision-making process had surely encouraged them to play important roles in project implementation and would definitely contribute to its success and sustainability.

2. Please provide any feedback submitted by national counterparts, GEF OFP, co-financiers, and other partners/stakeholders of the project (e.g. private sector, CSOs, NGOs, etc.).

Please summarize relevant feedback received on the project.

3. Please provide any **relevant stakeholder consultation** documents.

Please list here the documents which will be submitted in addition to the report, e.g.:

- *5082_Combined Co-Financing Statements of the 5 Countries (1&2)*
- *5082_Final Report UNIDO Sampling and Monitoring*

VI. Gender Mainstreaming

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please report on the **progress** achieved **on implementing gender-responsive measures** and **using gender-sensitive indicators,** as documented at CEO Endorsement/Approval (in the project results framework, gender action plan or equivalent),.

As reported in the previous PIR, due to the nature of the project itself, as well as not being a prerequisite for GEF 5 projects, gender mainstreaming strategies were not specifically ruminated in the project interventions.

However, it was evident that participation of both genders, in all the meetings, the PMU Team composition, and in all other activities, were taken into account during project implementation. All training workshops would show that the participation of both genders was greatly encouraged and assured. Most of the training and workshop reports generated have shown the participation number of each gender, including those awareness-raising events conducted in each of the countries.

Despite the fact that the main focus of the project is on the environment and open burning, both men and women can equally benefit from the project interventions. Communities not only living near dumpsites, but the cities where the interventions were introduced will surely enjoy a more organized and systematic waste management and recovery as well as the benefit of a cleaner and safer environment.

VII. Knowledge Management

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please elaborate on any **knowledge management activities / products**, as documented at CEO Endorsement / Approval.

The knowledge products generated by the project served as the main instrument to transfer information to targeted stakeholders as well as to present the benefits not to open burn and to avoid generation of POPs. For each of the components, each country had produced specific reports/documents tailored to answer the needs of each of the country including but not limited to the following:

- Component 1 - National Assessment Report on the Impacts of Open Burning (5); Technical Guidelines on waste and landfill management (KH/LAO; Law and Amendment of Law on Waste Management (MNG); Resolution to fully Enforce the Provision of RA 9003 on Open Burning of Municipal Solid Wastes including Agricultural Wastes (PH); Technical guidance for writing environmental protection scheme for four types of craft villages (VN); Amendment of the National technical regulation on industrial waste incinerators (VN); Technical guideline on retrieval and disposal of discarded products (VN); Report/Study of economic Instruments for environmental and waste management (VN); Financing mechanism and incentive systems manual (5); Integrated Solid Waste Management Toolkit to Implement BAT and BEP to Open Burning (5).
- Component 2 – Establishment of an ESEA regional website that serves as regional cooperation platform to specifically share accomplishments and lessons learned to address open burning issues; Inventory report on number and types of waste disposal facilities, dumpsites and landfills (5).
- Component 3 - Report on business model for a sustainable supply chain for recyclable waste in Battambang, Cambodia focusing on plastic and organic waste; National and Ulaanbatar Waste Management Implementation Action Plans ,Mongolia; SWM Plan of GSC, Philippines; Technical guidelines on segregation, preliminary processing of input materials and management of waste generated from the recycling of scrap plastic in Vietnam; Sustainability Management Plan (PH)
- Component 4 - establishment of the National Websites; IEC Videos; Information materials (brochures, leaflets, posters, handheld fans, coloring books, etc) Social Marketing and Advocacy Plan; Education Curricula; Textbook, etc.

2. Please list any **relevant knowledge management mechanisms / tools** that the project has generated.

Please list the relevant knowledge management mechanisms/tools and any documents that will be submitted in addition to the report, e.g.:

- *5082_Draft Regional Project Completion Report BAT & BEP in Open Burning*
- *5082_Draft Final Evaluation Report*
- *5082_VN Draft National regulation on the threshold for POPs in articles*
- *5082_VN Report on development of draft content of Decree guiding environmental protection law in 2020 related to hazardous waste Management*
- *5082_VN Report on development of draft content of Decree guiding*
- *5082_VN Report on Label and Information disclosure on POPs*
- *5082_VNCPC_Final Report_Plastic Recycling Project in Minh Khai and Phan Boi villages*

VIII. Implementation progress

1. Using the previous reporting period as a basis, please provide information on **progress, challenges and outcomes achieved/observed** with regards to project implementation.

As stated in the previous report, the management of the project especially a regional project like this one, became a bit difficult when the pandemic hits. Different restrictions and requirements have to be addressed and complied with. Nevertheless, through proper planning, concerted efforts, and strategizing, all targeted activities were accomplished and the project was completed.

It is worth noting though that even the additional activities, which were initially not included or targeted in project activities, but were also identified to help achieve the goals of the project, were also accomplished on time and successfully through the strong partnership and coordination of the PMU and project partners.

2. Please briefly elaborate on any **minor amendments**[6] to the approved project that may have been introduced during the implementation period or indicate as not applicable (NA).

Please tick each category for which a change has occurred and provide a description of the change in the related textbox. You may attach supporting documentation, as appropriate.

☐	Results Framework	*n/a*
☐	Components and Cost	*n/a*
☐	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	*n/a*
☐	Financial Management	*n/a*
☒	Implementation Schedule	*Extension until 30 June 2022 was requested*
☐	Executing Entity	*n/a*
☐	Executing Entity Category	*n/a*
☐	Minor Project Objective Change	*n/a*
☐	Safeguards	*n/a*
☐	Risk Analysis	*n/a*
☐	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	*n/a*
☒	Co-Financing	*Co-financing mobilized during implementation was higher than committed.*
☒	Location of Project Activities	*Some intervention sites changed/were added during implementation*
☐	Others	*n/a*

3. Please provide progress related to the **financial implementation** of the project.

As of June 30,2022, the financial progress of the project has a total disbursement of US$ 7,530, 370.32. The main expenditure with a cumulative total of US$ 5,086,388.12 was allocated for the major interventions in Component 3 on the implementation of BAT/BEP interventions. All other expenditures were related to the completion of all remaining activities including the additional ones pertaining to interventions to ensure the attainment of the benefits of the project.

The project has mobilized USD **42,411,592.29** co-financing which is **9,635,158.29 USD higher** than that of what was expected in the beginning of the project.

[6] As described in Annex 9 of the *GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines*, **minor amendments** are changes to the project design or implementation that do not have significant impact on the project objectives or scope, or an increase of the GEF project financing up to 5%.

PROJECT DELIVERY REPORT		Project:	150033 - DEMONSTRATION OF BAT AND BEP IN OPEN BURNING ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON POPS	Project Manager:	Carmela Centeno	Project Validity: Status:	01.04.2015 - 30.06.2022 Assess
Reporting Period:	**31.01.2015 - 30.06.2022**	**Project Theme:**	Energy and Environment	**Country:**	RegAsia-Pacific	**Region**	Asia and Pacific

Sponsor Nr.	Sponsor	Grant	Grant Description	Fund	Currency	Grant Status	Grant Validity
400150	GEF - Global Environment Facility	2000003040	GEFSTO_150033	GF	USD	Authority to implement	31.03.2015 - 30.06.2022

		Current Year				Cumulative to Date					
	Description	Released Budget Current Year (a)	Obligations Current Year (b)	Disbursements Current Year (c)	Expenditures Current Year (d=b+c)	Total Agreement Budget (e)	Released Budget (f)	Obligations + Disbursements (g)	Funds Available* (h=f-g)	Support Cost (i)	Total Expenditures (j=g+i)
2000003040	**Status: Authority to implement**										
150033-1-01-01	**BAT/BEP in Legislative Framework**	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	26,507.74	26,507.74	26,507.74	0.00	0.00	26,507.74
1500	Local travel	0.00	3,908.13	0.00	3,908.13	0.00	0.00	3,908.13	(3,908.13)	0.00	3,908.13
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	18,719.26	(9,567.21)	27,328.79	17,761.58	202,830.46	202,830.46	201,872.78	957.68	0.00	201,872.78
2100	Contractual Services	0.88	(23,840.00)	23,872.11	32.11	106,864.43	106,864.43	106,895.66	(31.23)	0.00	106,895.66
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,476.60	1,476.60	1,476.60	0.00	0.00	1,476.60
3500	International Meetings	43,475.00	20,668.22	20,392.06	41,060.28	43,971.01	43,971.01	41,556.29	2,414.72	0.00	41,556.29
4300	Premises	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,084.30	2,084.30	2,084.30	0.00	0.00	2,084.30
4500	Equipment	0.00	(3,842.52)	3,810.80	(31.72)	6,506.41	6,506.41	6,474.69	31.72	0.00	6,474.69
5100	Other Direct Costs	5,064.53	339.41	4,216.58	4,555.99	19,029.49	19,029.49	18,520.95	508.54	0.00	18,520.95
9300	Support Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80,715.82	80,715.82
150033-1-01-01	**Total**	**67,259.67**	**(12,333.97)**	**79,620.34**	**67,286.37**	**409,270.44**	**409,270.44**	**409,297.14**	**(26.70)**	**80,715.82**	**490,012.96**
150033-1-01-02	**Enhanced Institutional Capacity**	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.00	27,785.20	27,785.20	27,784.42	0.78	0.00	27,784.42
1500	Local travel	5.89	0.01	0.00	0.01	37,819.41	37,819.41	37,813.53	5.88	0.00	37,813.53
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	78.44	(7,502.04)	7,594.02	91.98	183,019.09	183,019.09	183,032.63	(13.54)	0.00	183,032.63
2100	Contractual Services	13.30	(0.01)	0.00	(0.01)	186,496.62	186,496.62	186,483.31	13.31	0.00	186,483.31
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,643.72	10,643.72	10,643.72	0.00	0.00	10,643.72
3500	International Meetings	0.43	0.01	0.00	0.01	100,416.70	100,416.70	100,416.28	0.42	0.00	100,416.28
4500	Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	616.72	616.72	616.72	0.00	0.00	616.72
5100	Other Direct Costs	0.17	(527.24)	527.78	0.54	10,925.36	10,925.36	10,925.73	(0.37)	0.00	10,925.73
9300	Support Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	52,983.40	52,983.40
150033-1-01-02	**Total**	**99.01**	**(8,029.27)**	**8,121.80**	**92.53**	**557,722.82**	**557,722.82**	**557,716.34**	**6.48**	**52,983.40**	**610,699.74**

*** Does not include Unapproved Obligations**

PROJECT DELIVERY REPORT		Project:	150033 - DEMONSTRATION OF BAT AND BEP IN OPEN BURNING ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON POPS	Project Manager:	Carmela Centeno	Project Validity: Status:	01.04.2015 - 30.06.2022 Assess
Reporting Period:	**31.01.2015 - 30.06.2022**	**Project Theme:**	Energy and Environment	**Country:**	RegAsia-Pacific	**Region**	Asia and Pacific

Sponsor Nr.	Sponsor	Grant	Grant Description	Fund	Currency	Grant Status	Grant Validity
400150	GEF - Global Environment Facility	2000003040	GEFSTO_150033	GF	USD	Authority to implement	31.03.2015 - 30.06.2022

		Current Year				Cumulative to Date					
	Description	Released Budget Current Year (a)	Obligations Current Year (b)	Disbursements Current Year (c)	Expenditures Current Year (d=b+c)	Total Agreement Budget (e)	Released Budget (f)	Obligations + Disbursements (g)	Funds Available* (h=f-g)	Support Cost (i)	Total Expenditures (j=g+i)
150033-1-01-03	**BAT/BEP Gradually Implemented**	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	28,702.85	3,599.98	15,086.48	18,686.46	198,191.96	198,191.96	188,175.57	10,016.39	0.00	188,175.57
1500	Local travel	11,848.76	6,516.71	10,009.71	16,526.42	92,012.75	92,012.75	96,690.41	(4,677.66)	0.00	96,690.41
1600	Staff Travel	2.66	0.00	60.22	60.22	59.63	59.63	117.19	(57.56)	0.00	117.19
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	42,260.47	(841.88)	35,237.65	34,395.77	175,739.58	175,739.58	167,874.88	7,864.70	0.00	167,874.88
2100	Contractual Services	62.91	(246,957.58)	244,905.71	(2,051.87)	2,877,911.75	2,877,911.75	2,875,796.97	2,114.78	0.00	2,875,796.97
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,811.22	2,811.22	2,811.22	0.00	0.00	2,811.22
3500	International Meetings	28,851.43	22,331.97	11,601.16	33,933.13	37,977.31	37,977.31	43,059.01	(5,081.70)	0.00	43,059.01
4300	Premises	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,037.87	2,037.87	2,037.87	0.00	0.00	2,037.87
4500	Equipment	4.77	0.00	161.87	161.87	1,672,981.76	1,672,981.76	1,673,138.86	(157.10)	0.00	1,673,138.86
5100	Other Direct Costs	2,487.33	3,854.82	4,211.46	8,066.28	31,107.19	31,107.19	36,686.14	(5,578.95)	0.00	36,686.14
9300	Support Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	483,196.16	483,196.16
150033-1-01-03	**Total**	**114,221.18**	**(211,495.98)**	**321,274.26**	**109,778.28**	**5,090,831.02**	**5,090,831.02**	**5,086,388.12**	**4,442.90**	**483,196.16**	**5,569,584.28**
150033-1-01-04	**Education and Awareness**	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	4.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,764.72	4,764.72	4,760.67	4.05	0.00	4,760.67
1500	Local travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,794.50	15,794.50	15,794.50	0.00	0.00	15,794.50
2100	Contractual Services	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	787,422.46	787,422.46	787,420.50	1.96	0.00	787,420.50
3000	Train/Fellowship/Study	5,252.50	0.00	773.01	773.01	17,155.73	17,155.73	12,676.24	4,479.49	0.00	12,676.24
3500	International Meetings	48.25	(5,358.91)	3,992.11	(1,366.80)	44,317.30	44,317.30	42,902.25	1,415.05	0.00	42,902.25
4500	Equipment	0.11	0.00	9.90	9.90	6,006.35	6,006.35	6,016.14	(9.79)	0.00	6,016.14
5100	Other Direct Costs	1,261.08	1,363.31	0.00	1,363.31	19,265.11	19,265.11	19,367.34	(102.23)	0.00	19,367.34
9300	Support Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	84,449.25	84,449.25
150033-1-01-04	**Total**	**6,567.95**	**(3,995.60)**	**4,775.02**	**779.42**	**894,726.17**	**894,726.17**	**888,937.64**	**5,788.53**	**84,449.25**	**973,386.89**

*** Does not include Unapproved Obligations**

PROJECT DELIVERY REPORT		Project:	150033 - DEMONSTRATION OF BAT AND BEP IN OPEN BURNING ACTIVITIES IN RESPONSE TO THE STOCKHOLM CONVENTION ON POPS	Project Manager:	Carmela Centeno	Project Validity: Status:	01.04.2015 - 30.06.2022 Assess
Reporting Period:	31.01.2015 - 30.06.2022	Project Theme:	Energy and Environment	Country:	RegAsia-Pacific	Region	Asia and Pacific

Sponsor Nr.	Sponsor	Grant	Grant Description	Fund	Currency	Grant Status	Grant Validity
400150	GEF - Global Environment Facility	2000003040	GEFSTO_150033	GF	USD	Authority to implement	31.03.2015 - 30.06.2022

		Current Year				Cumulative to Date					
	Description	Released Budget Current Year (a)	Obligations Current Year (b)	Disbursements Current Year (c)	Expenditures Current Year (d=b+c)	Total Agreement Budget (e)	Released Budget (f)	Obligations + Disbursements (g)	Funds Available* (h=f-g)	Support Cost (i)	Total Expenditures (j=g+i)
150033-1-51-01	Project Management	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	213.94	213.94	213.94	0.00	0.00	213.94
1500	Local travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,555.52	3,555.52	3,555.52	0.00	0.00	3,555.52
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	1.71	(0.05)	0.00	(0.05)	349,478.01	349,478.01	349,476.25	1.76	0.00	349,476.25
2100	Contractual Services	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	134.48	134.48	134.48	0.00	0.00	134.48
3500	International Meetings	303.04	(0.01)	0.00	(0.01)	16,680.32	16,680.32	16,377.27	303.05	0.00	16,377.27
4300	Premises	80.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,974.20	1,974.20	1,893.55	80.65	0.00	1,893.55
4500	Equipment	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8,177.18	8,177.18	8,177.18	0.00	0.00	8,177.18
5100	Other Direct Costs	1,073.13	818.47	189.10	1,007.57	7,176.89	7,176.89	7,111.33	65.56	0.00	7,111.33
9300	Support Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	36,758.48	36,758.48
150033-1-51-01	Total	1,458.53	818.41	189.10	1,007.51	387,390.54	387,390.54	386,939.52	451.02	36,758.48	423,698.00
150033-1-53-01	Evaluation and Monitoring	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD	USD
1100	Staff & Intern Consultants	31,853.79	7,983.65	8,062.83	16,046.48	49,877.07	49,877.07	34,069.76	15,807.31	0.00	34,069.76
1500	Local travel	0.00	0.00	344.97	344.97	350.65	350.65	695.62	(344.97)	0.00	695.62
1700	Nat.Consult./Staff	6,453.67	1,436.48	1,507.32	2,943.80	159,835.84	159,835.84	156,325.97	3,509.87	0.00	156,325.97
3500	International Meetings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5,932.80	5,932.80	5,932.80	0.00	0.00	5,932.80
5100	Other Direct Costs	0.00	0.00	4.76	4.76	4,062.65	4,062.65	4,067.41	(4.76)	0.00	4,067.41
9300	Support Cost	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	19,103.17	19,103.17
150033-1-53-01	Total	38,307.46	9,420.13	9,919.88	19,340.01	220,059.01	220,059.01	201,091.56	18,967.45	19,103.17	220,194.73
2000003040	Total	227,913.80	(225,616.28)	423,900.40	198,284.12	7,560,000.00	7,560,000.00	7,530,370.32	29,629.68	757,206.28	8,287,576.60
150033	USD Total	227,913.80	(225,616.28)	423,900.40	198,284.12	7,560,000.00	7,560,000.00	7,530,370.32	29,629.68	757,206.28	8,287,576.60

* Does not include Unapproved Obligations

IX. Work Plan and Budget

1. Please provide **an updated project work plan and budget** for the remaining duration of the project, as per last approved project extension. Please expand/modify the table as needed.

N/A

Outputs by Project Component	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				GEF Grant Budget Available (US$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Component 1 –													
Outcome 1:													
Output 1.1:													
Output 1.2:													
Component 2 –													
Outcome 2:													
Output 2.1:													
Output 2.2:													

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

The synergies achieved in each of the countries were attained in several ways. All countries have strongly collaborated with their government partner agencies where some of their programs and activities if not purposely undertaken, were aligned to help achieve the objective of the project. All IEC activities were undertaken parallel with the existing environment program of the government partner. The operations of the interventions are now accounted for as one major activity in their annual planning to ensure its continuous operations and sustainability.

3. Stories to be shared (Optional)

As emphasized in the previous reporting, the intervention, which is the constructed ash cell with ash bins for the households in Ulaanbatar City is making strides in Mongolia. Because of this intervention, open burning in the landfill site has been greatly reduced. The mixing of wastes and the hot ashes was avoided and the same is true in the households because of the ash bins provided to them. The households who now separate ash from other waste will put a stop to burning at yards/ plots. They also recycle the ashes now by utilizing them to make bricks to make pavements or pedestrian sidewalks.

Generally, in most of the interventions, Community recycling activities are maximized. The sorting and segregation of wastes in the MRF opens the way to other BAT practices such as composting and recycling technologies. The plastics segregated are now transformed into other products like bricks in the Philippines and plastic pellets in Cambodia and Lao PDR, and plastic chairs (in Philippines as well) and crafts in Vietnam. Segregated metal, glass, paper, and cardboard can also be converted to handicrafts or sold to junk shops. Product compost can be sold as soil conditioner for a variety of agricultural and commercial beneficial uses. Overall, an MRF reduces the total volume of residual wastes that are sent to the landfill.

The overall accomplishments of the project, in all participating countries, cannot just be ignored. Various activities that were carried out have surely affected the way how waste are managed in each of the countries and would have affected the way of life of the stakeholders.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2021 – 30 June 2022.

2. **Responsibility:** The responsibility for preparing the report lies with the project manager in consultation with the Division Chief and Director.

3. **Evaluation:** For the report to be used effectively as a tool for annual self-evaluation, project counterparts need to be fully involved. The (main) counterpart can provide any additional information considered essential, including a simple rating of project progress.

4. **Results-based management**: The annual project/programme progress reports are required by the RBM programme component focal points to obtain information on outcomes observed.

Global Environmental Objectives (GEOs) / Development Objectives (DOs) ratings	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yields satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modes overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environmental benefits.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Project is expected to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environmental objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress (IP)	
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components in not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings	
Risk ratings will access the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risk of projects should be rated on the following scale:	
High Risk (H)	There is a probability of greater than **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
Substantial Risk (S)	There is a probability of between **51%** and **75%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Moderate Risk (M)	There is a probability of between **26%** and **50%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only moderate risk.
Low Risk (L)	There is a probability of up to **25%** that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face only low risks.