UNITED NATIONS
INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

Project Implementation Report

(1 July 2023 – 30 June 2024)

Project Title:	Reduction of industrial persistent organic pollutant chemicals in manufacturing and recycling sectors through life-cycle approaches in Georgia
GEF ID:	11005
UNIDO ID:	220012
GEF Replenishment Cycle:	GEF-7
Country(ies):	Georgia
Region:	ECA - Europe and Central Asia
GEF Focal Area:	Chemicals and Waste (CW)
Integrated Approach Pilot (IAP) Programs[1]:	IAP – Commodities, IAP – Cities
Stand-alone / Child Project:	Stand-alone project
Implementing Department/Division:	ENV / IPM
Co-Implementing Agency:	N/A
Executing Agency(ies):	Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus (RECC)
Project Type:	Medium-Sized Project (MSP)
Project Duration:	36
Extension(s):	N/A
GEF Project Financing:	2,000,000 USD
Agency Fee:	190,000 USD
Co-financing Amount:	14,600,000 USD
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	6/16/2022
UNIDO Approval Date:	7/1/2022
Actual Implementation Start:	10/3/2022

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

Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June 2024:	1,330,428.67
Mid-term Review (MTR) Date:	N/A
Original Project Completion Date:	10/4/2025
Project Completion Date as reported in FY22:	10/4/2025
Current SAP Completion Date:	10/4/2025
Expected Project Completion Date:	10/4/2025
Expected Terminal Evaluation (TE) Date:	11/30/2025
Expected Financial Closure Date:	11/30/2026
UNIDO Project Manager[2]:	Vladimir Anastasov

I. Brief description of project and status overview

Project Objective

The objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment through a lifecycle approach aimed at reducing import, use and build-up of industrial persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in manufacturing and recycling sectors.

Core Indicators:

- Core Indicator 9. Reduction of POPs (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced) [ENV 2]
- Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender gaining awareness/knowledge on GC [KASA 1]
- Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender gaining skills on GC [KASA 2]
- Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender gaining skills [KASA 2]
- Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender gaining awareness/knowledge [KASA 1]
- Core Indicator 9. Reduction of POPs (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced) [ENV 2]
- Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender gaining skills [KASA 2]
- Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender gaining awareness/knowledge [KASA 1]

[2] Person responsible for report content

Baseline

The Project was approved by the GEF on 16 June 2022. The objective of the project is to protect human health and the environment through a life cycle approach aimed at reducing import, use and build-up of industrial persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in manufacturing and recycling sectors.

In Georgia the five most important manufacturing sectors are the following: manufacture of non-metaling products, basic metals, chemicals and chemical products, rubber and plastic products. Georgia has recently embarked on an accelerated path towards a transition to a circular economy. With the concerted efforts of the government and international partners, Georgia initiated the development of the circular economy strategy and took some important steps to introduce the Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) concept as part of implementation of the National Waste Management Code. Currently there are no specific collection processes or disposal facilities for the management of electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) or end-of-the life vehicles (ELV) in Georgia. Until 2016, there were no landfills for hazardous or special waste e.g. construction waste and only few landfills have separate cells for special waste, like asbestos waste.

Given the situation, materials containing or contaminated by POPs are dumped in landfills and from time to time are accidentally or intentionally burnt in the open. The consequence is the release of toxic fumes containing brominated and chlorinated dioxins, heavy metals, mercury, PAHs.

The project will strive to work on the sectors that will offer the greatest potential in term of POP reduction, energy saving, and recycling potential.

The general approach of the project will be streamlined as follows:

- Review of the current technical regulation concerning import, manufacturing and waste management to ensure its compliance with the Stockholm Convention (and the NDC)
- Identify manufacturing sectors with the greatest POPs and GHG reduction potential and design and implement pilot interventions;
- Identify and promote recycling sector with the greatest POPs and GHG reduction potential;
- Increase the awareness of key stakeholders and of the general population on circular economy, EPR, POPs and GHG reduction.

The Project has four components:

- Policy strengthening by integrating a life-cycle approach into the existing legislative framework to prevent future build-up of POPs in manufacturing and recycling sectors
- Life-cycle approaches and BAT/BEP for the reduction of POPs in the manufacturing and recycling sectors
- Capacity building and knowledge management

Monitoring and evaluation through results-based monitoring

Please refer to the explanatory note at the end of the document and select corresponding ratings for the current reporting period, i.e. FY24. Please also provide a short justification for the selected ratings for FY24.

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

[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

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. FY23, in the last column.

Overall Ratings[4]	**FY24**	**FY23**
Global Environmental Objectives **(GEOs)** / Development Objectives **(DOs)** Rating	*Satisfactory (S)*	*Satisfactory (S)*
No change since FY23		
Implementation Progress **(IP)** Rating	*Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*	*Moderately Satisfactory (MS)*
The project faced delays in signing the executing contract with the main executing partner. This subsequently delayed by several months the start of activities. The work plan has been revised to account for this delay. All project activities have now commenced and are progressing according to the updated schedule.		
Overall **Risk** Rating	*Low Risk (L)*	*Low Risk (L)*
The project executing partner RECC started activities in 2023. Currently, no risk is foreseen in executing activities as planned and meeting the objectives of the project.		

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.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to any supporting documents that may be submitted as annexes to this report.

Project Strategy	KPIs/Indicators	Baseline	Target level	Progress in FY24
Component 1 – Policy strengthening by integrating a life-cycle approach into the existing legislative framework to prevent future build-up of POPsin manufacturingand recycling sectors				
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced national policy and regulatoryframework to complywith the Stockholm Convention (SC) requirements on new POPs and implementnational circular economy tools in selected manufacturing and recycling sectors				
Output 1.1.1: New POPs integrated in the existing environmental regulation and inthe regulation on chemical management	# of capacity building activities related to POPs provided [TCO 1]	0	5	Two Policy trainings were organized, with participation of 33 decision makers in total. Out of the 33 participants, 12 were female and 21 were male.) One training for private companies (conducted on 05.02.2024), with participation of 14 participants. Out of the 14 participants, 4 were female and 10 were male.) One training for 5 state institutions and 2 municipalities (conducted on

[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

				29.02.2024) with 19 participants. Out of the 19 participants, 11 were female and 8 were male.)
	# of toolkits and guidelines related to POPs and life-cycle approaches produced [TCO 3]	0	3	The work of guidelines for the phase-out of industrial POPs in the plastics, metals and chemicals sectors commenced and is currently in progress. Started – January 2024 Expected finish date – September 2024
	# of people obtained POPs-related policy training [KASA 1]	0	100	Two Policy trainings were organized, with participation of 33 decision makers in total. Out of the 33 participants, 12 were female and 21 were male.) One training for private companies (conducted on 05.02.2024), with participation of 14 individuals. Out of the 14 participants, 4 were female and 10 were male.) One training for 5 state institutions and 2 municipalities (conducted on 29.02.2024) with participation of 19 individuals. Out of the 19 participants, 11 were female and 8 were male.)
	# of institutions obtained POPs resources (trainings, awareness raising) [KASA 2]	0	10	Trainings were attended by representatives from 4 private companies (14 participants 29% Female, 71% Male), 5 state institutions and two municipalities (19 participants 42% Female, 58 % Male) The training for private companies was conducted on 05.02.2024. The training for 5 state institutions and 2 municipalities was conducted on 29.02.2024.
Output 1.1.2: Policy tools (e.g customs monitoring tools, EPR schemes), including financial mechanism, with a focus on phase out of industrial POPs developed for selected manufacturing sectors as one of the pillars of the implementation of circular economy in Georgia	# of capacity-building events [CPO 1]	0	5	The capacity-building event for custom service representatives is being conducted on 1-3 August 2024.
	# policy tools outlined [TCO 3]	0	2	Development of Two EPR schemes related Policy tools initiated
	# of institutions obtained POPs resources (trainings, awareness raising)	0	10	• Waste and Chemicals Management Department of Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia • Department of Environmental Supervision Regional Division of Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia

				• Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia; • National Centre for Disease Control and Public Health of Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Health, Labour and Social Affairs of Georgia; • Customs Department of Revenue Service of Ministry of Finance of Georgia; • Customs Department Batumi Regional Division of Revenue Service of Ministry of Finance of Georgia; • Customs Department Kutaisi Regional Division of Revenue Service of Ministry of Finance of Georgia; • Customs Department Kobuleti Regional Division of Revenue Service of Ministry of Finance of Georgia; • Office of the Environment Protection and Natural Resources Committee of the Parliament of Georgia • Telavi Municipality • Kvareli Municipality
Output 1.1.3: Country specific guidelines for the phaseout of industrial POPs throughout the life-cyle drafted	# guidelines for the phase out of industrial POPs developed [TCO 3]	0	3	The work of guidelines for the phase-out of industrial POPs in the plastics, metals and chemicals sectors have started and is currently in progress.
Component 2 – Life-cycle approaches and BAT/BEP for the reduction of POPs in the manufacturing and recycling sectors implemented				
Outcome 2.1: POPs present in manufacturing or recycling sectors are disposed of using best available technologies (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP), and future POPs-containing material built-up prevented though life-cycle approaches reduction and phasing out of POPs in the manufacturing and recycling sectors implemented				
Output 2.1.1: Verification of manufacturing sectors potentially using or releasing industrial POPs like HBCDD (EPS/XPS manufacturing, plastic), SCCP (paint manufacturing), PFOS/PFOAs and PBDE (ELV recycling) carried out	# Manufacturing sector reports related to SC [TCO 3]	0	3	Manufacturing sector report is being prepared: Starting date – December 2023 To be ready by September 2024 They refer to: – Electronics and Electrical Equipment Manufacturing – Building insulation materials production – Car dismantling (end of life vehicle) – Firefighting Foams – Paint production

				– Textile Industry
Output 2.1.2: Specific environmentally sound management plans (ESM) for manufacturing and recycling sectors to reduce POPs, recycle valuable materials and final disposal of POPs-containing waste	# of people trained on ESM [KASA 2]	0	350	No activity planned for the reporting period
	# of people obtained SC, POPs, BAT/BEP and other related resources (trainings, awareness raising) [KASA 1]	0	300	No activity planned for the reporting period
Output 2.1.3: BAT and BEP for the reduction and final disposal of POPs in manufacturing and recycling sectors to facilitate the adoption of a circular approach for a POPs-free manufacturing and recycling industry, in at least one pilot facility	# of capacity building activities related to the pilot provided [TCO 1]	0	3	No activity planned for the reporting period
	# of new pilots developed [TEC 1]	0	1	
	# of people trained on pilot implementation and execution [KASA 2]	0	50	
Component 3 – Capacity building and knowledge management				
Outcome 3.1: Environmental authority, manufacturing and recycling sectors are empowered to phase out industrial POPs releases with positive effect on the establishment of a circular economy approach along the lifecycle of products				
Output 3.1.1: Multi-stakeholder platform created to sustain the phasing out of industrial POPs and to ensure the timely exchange of information and resources among business sectors and the regulators	# of multi-platform developed	0	1	No activity planned for the reporting period
Output 3.1.2: Capacity-building training, including gender dimensions, for selected manufacturing sectors, governmental stakeholders carried out on POPs and circular economy, and custom authorities strengthened to prevent the import of POP containing materials	# of people trained on selected manufacturing sectors [KASA 2]	0	100	No activity planned for the reporting period
	# of people trained [KASA 2]		40	
	# of people obtained SC, POPs, BAT/BEP and other related resources (trainings, awareness raising) [KASA 1]		60	

Output 3.1.3: Knowledge materials on POP management and their implication on circular economy developed and disseminated to wide range of stakeholders, including business sector	# of knowledge material developed		5	No activity planned for the reporting period
Component 4 - Monitoring and evaluation through results-based monitoring				
Outcome 4.1. Project implementation based on results-based management (RBM) and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated				
Output 4.1.1. RBM system of the project promoted adaptive management through capturing key results of the project				RBM plan was elaborated in October 2023. First Steering Committee Meeting organised in October 2023 (the meeting gathered 9 participants in total. Out of the 9 participants, 6 were female and 3 were male.)
Output 4.1.2. A Gender mainstreaming action plan elaborated and implemented				Implementation of Gender mainstreaming action plan continued in FY24 with particular focus on ensuring gender balanced participation in project activities.
Output 4.1.3. A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan in place				A Monitoring and evaluation plan is currently being developed.
Output 4.1.4. Mid-term review and terminal evaluation conducted				

III. Project Risk Management

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

Describe in tabular form the risks observed and priority mitigation activities undertaken during the reporting period in line with the project document. Note that risks, risk level and mitigations measures should be consistent with the ones identified in the CEO Endorsement/Approval document. Please also consider the project's ability to adopt the adaptive management approach in remediating any of the risks that had been sub-optimally rated (H, S) in the previous reporting cycle.

	(i) Risks at CEO stage	(i) Risk level FY 23	(i) Risk level FY 24	(i) Mitigation measures	(ii) Progress to-date	New defined risk[5]
1	The situation of the pandemic still not completely	L	L	The project will include measures aimed at protecting all project participants from infections	N/A	☐

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

	solved before the project at project implementation			associated to the virus, in line with the recommendation of health care authorities.		
2	Difficulties arising from the coordination among administrations of different levels	L	L	Representatives of different levels will be involved in the steering committee. The tasks of the PMU will include ensuring adequate communication with all project partners. The roles and composition of each project institution will be clarified and agreed upon since the inception of the project. The risk will also be mitigated through building understanding and capacity of project counterparts and stakeholders during project preparation and implementation to ensure stronger ownership of the project, and a clear definition of roles and responsibilities of counterparts, continuous monitoring, and periodic reporting to main Government counterparts and partners.	A steering committee with involvement of the representatives at various levels of decision making has been established, and communication and capacity-building among project partners have been undertaken, ensuring stronger ownership and effective project implementation.	☐
3	Project activity impactedby GHG or climatechange	L	L	The Project will not establish new infrastructure but only rearrange products,materials or industrial processes. Therefore, there will be no additional risk linked to climate change compared to the baseline.	N/A	☐
4	Gender Mainstreaming activities / goal notconducted or achieved	M	M	Georgia is a favourable country in term of GM policies, therefore no structural or cultural obstacle are expected to hinder the GM related project policies and activities. In any case, a detailed GM logical framework, with budget and indicators, will be integrated in the project. GM targets will be considered as core project targets.	A detailed GM work plan and logical framework with budget and SMART indicators has been integrated into the project, ensuring GM targets are considered as a core project targets	☐
5	Difficulties in evaluating GEB baseline and achievement	M	M	The main difficulties in assessing the GEB baseline will be addressed at the very initial stages of the project, where surveys on the manufacturing sectors will be undertaken. Criterial for the calculation of the reduced GEB achievable from the reduce consumption and release will be established in detail in these stages. A residual risk on the estimation of POPs cannot be completely eliminated, but adoption of conservative criteria for the estimation will ensure that the GEB	Surveys on manufacturing sectors are being conducted, criteria for calculating reduced GEB are also being established.	☐

				at project design are more likely underestimated than overestimated		
6	Small manufacturers not willing to participate, or not interested in improving their Qualitative or quantitative capacity	M	M	The risk that small manufacturers may not be very interested in participating in project activities will be addressed by properly communicating the economic benefit of taking part in project training activities, and the risk to be not prepared to the fulfilment of standards that may be endorsed by the government on the matter	N/A	☐
7	Proposed policies, Regulations and programs are not adequately adopted and implemented; weakening of political commitment.	M	M	This risk will be substantially mitigated by: – Engaging decision makers early on in the project preparation phase, building their understanding and keep them involved during the implementation; – Carefully designing and providing capacity building programs tailored to policy-makers and institutional specific needs.	N/A	☐
8	Companies and service providers fail tounderstand the technical/ business opportunitiesand potential benefits of implementing of POP- PBDE project.	M	M	This risk will be substantially mitigated by: – building clear understanding of target beneficiaries about POPs during project preparation; – preparing effective information packages; – carefully designing tailored capacity building programs for experts and enterprises clearly defining the targeted outcomes; – setting up intermediate performance indicators to monitor, verify and report on progress.	N/A	☐
9	Following the POP-implementation assessment and report, private sector might not be willing to invest in POP-reduction or avoidance project Complementing project activities	M	M	This risk will be substantially mitigated by: – providing training for enterprises' top management and key personnel to build or strengthen their understanding of strategic, economic and financial value of investing in circular and sound management of POP-PBDE through EPR schemes – During the project	N/A	☐

	with the ongoing and future investment projects will not be achieved			preparation/implementation phase active consultation meetings will be held with donors/investors, the private companies and state institutions to address this risk. Such coordination will clearly identify the complementing activities, their timelines and budgets, including rights and responsibilities of the concerned parties		

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

☒ X 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	Noise hazards at selected pilot facilities	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Health risk related to handling of hazardous chemicals (PFOS/PFAS, SCCPs in particular in the paint manufacturing industry) during interim storage and/or final disposal	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Health risks related to open burning of POPs-containing substances if stockpiles of POPs-containing material are not eliminated after segregation. This could apply in particular to PBDE-containing material for e-waste and HBCDD-containing material from ELV (also applicable to OS 9 and 10)	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Occupational accidents and injuries of pilot plant on staff	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Risk of switching to alternative chemicals, especially alternative to PFOAS and SCCP for the packaging and paint manufacturing sector (also applicable to OS 9)	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Leakage risk of chemicals and POPs due to improper maintenance of equipment	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage

	contaminates soil and/or groundwater (especially for PFOS/PFAS, SCCPs in the paint manufacturing industry)		
	Leakage risk of POPs during storage, transport and/or final disposal leads to contamination of soil and/or groundwater (especially for PFOS/PFAS, SCCPs in the paint manufacturing)	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Increased emission of uPOPs in pilot projects	Not applicable at this stage	Baseline estimate of uPOPs emissions is currently in progress. It is expected to be concluded by 2025.
	Risk of open dumping of sludge	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Depletion of ground waters due to unsound waste management (also applicable to OS 9)	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Exposure to POPs (inhalation, direct contact) if POPs-containing material is recycled into daily life material (e.g. PBDE-containing plastics recycled into daily life plastic products)	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Fire incidents due to the flammable nature of chemicals on the community	Not applicable at this stage	Not applicable at this stage
	Project information are not adequately shared with all project stakeholders, creating	Not applicable at this stage	Feedback from project partners during validation workshops has been documented in an appropriate manner

	reputational risks for executing entity and UNIDO		
	Climate risk: pilot industries may contribute to GHG emission and climate change	Not applicable at this stage	Baseline estimate of GHG emission is planned and will be conducted during pilot selection
	Gender risk: Low participation of women in the projects activities strengthens stereotypes and further impede their inclusion in the industrial sector	Gender action plan has been prepared for the project	Women well represented during the inception workshops. Women representation in technical activities and pilot selection will be monitored
	COVID-19 risk: In-persons meetings and on-site activities may increase risk of contamination to COVID-19	Project started when restrictions already lifted, no restrictions in Georgia related to COVID 19	N/A
(ii) New risks identified during project implementation (if not applicable, please insert 'NA' in each box)	N/A	N/A	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).

The First Project Steering Committee was attended by representatives from the: Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia (MEPA); Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development (MESD); Ministry of Finance (Department of Customs Revenue Service); United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO); Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus (REC Caucasus) (9 participants, 67 % Female and 33 % Male.)

The POPs-related Capacity Building Workshop (1) was attended by representatives from the: Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia (MEPA); Ltd Eco Service Georgia; Ltd Refix; Ltd Brili; Ltd Caparol Georgia; Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus (REC Caucasus) (14 participants 29% Female, 71% Male)

The POPs-related Capacity Building Workshop (2) was attended by representatives from the: Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia; Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development of Georgia; Different Municipalities (Kvareli and Telavi); National Centre for Disease Control and Public Health of Ministry of Internally Displaced Persons from the Occupied Territories, Health, Labour and Social Affairs of Georgia; Revenue Service of Ministry of Finance of Georgia; Office of the Environment Protection and Natural Resources Committee of the Parliament of Georgia and Project's implementing team from Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus (REC Caucasus). (19 participants 42% Female, 58 % Male)

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.).

Pops-related Capacity Building Workshop 1

"Today's training marks an essential milestone in our ongoing efforts to tackle the challenges posed by Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the industrial sector. I am pleased to see representatives from different companies across Georgia gathered here, your participation underscores the collective responsibility we share in safeguarding our environment and public health. The objective of this training is to equip you with both practical and theoretical knowledge of the legislation and guidelines concerning POPs, as part of our project aimed at reducing these hazardous chemicals in the manufacturing and recycling sectors through circular economy and lifecycle approaches. By understanding and implementing these guidelines, we can significantly mitigate the harmful impacts of POPs and move towards a more sustainable and environmentally-friendly industry. This training is not just a transfer of knowledge, but a call to action.

It is imperative that we all work together to ensure that the regulations are effectively implemented and adhered to. The health of our communities and the sustainability of our environment depend on our collective efforts." – mentioned Mrs. Irma Gurguliani Deputy Head of the Waste and Chemicals Management Department of the Ministry Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia

Pops-related Capacity Building Workshop 2

"Today marks a significant step forward in our collective efforts to reduce industrial Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Georgia. The importance of this project cannot be overstated, as it addresses the critical need to protect both our environment and the health of our citizens from the harmful effects of these substances. By adhering to the obligations outlined in the Stockholm Convention, we are taking decisive action to prevent the production, use, import, and export of the most dangerous chemicals, and implementing stringent measures to control those that are still in use.

Our commitment extends beyond mere compliance; it is about fostering a culture of environmental stewardship and public health awareness. Establishing robust regulatory frameworks is essential, but equally important is our collective effort to ensure these regulations are enforced effectively. This requires the cooperation of all stakeholders, including government agencies, industry representatives, and the broader community.

Our goal is not just to reduce, but to work towards the eventual elimination of these pollutants wherever feasible. This endeavor aligns with our broader mission to create a sustainable and healthy environment for future generations." - mentioned Mr. Solomon Pavliashvili Deputy Minister of the Ministry Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia

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

- GEF 11005_Work_plan_for_year_2023-2024
- GEF11005_Report_on_Project_Coverage
- GEF11005_Report_on_First_Steering_Committee_Meeting

- GEF11005_Report_on_POPs-related_capacity-building_workshop_1
- GEF11005_Report_on_POPs-related_capacity-building_workshop_2

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),.

Implementation of Gender mainstreaming action plan continued in FY24 with particular focus on ensuring gender balanced participation in project activities.

VII. Knowledge Management and Communication

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

Development of knowledge exchange platform on the import and use of POPs has been initiated in December 2023 to be finalized in December 2024.

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

The following communication materials of the project were prepared:

- GEF11005_Communication_Plan
- GEF11005_Gender_Action_Plan_GAP
- GEF11005_Awareness_Raising_Materials
- GEF11005_Stakeholder_Engagement_Plan
- GEFF11005_Gender-Sensitive_Project_Monitoring & Evaluation_Plan
- GEF11005_Report_on Review of existing EPR systems and identification of any technical or regulatory gap regarding POPs elimination throughout products' life cycle, including confirmation of priority sectors for new EPR schemes
- GEF11005_Report_on_GAP_Analysis_of_Georgian_Legislation_in_the_Area_of_New_POPs_and _Implementation_of_the_Stockholm_Convention
- GEF11005_Report_on_Update_the_technical_regulation_on_existing_EPR_schemes_to incorporate_POPs_management_and_or_alternatives
- GEF11005_POPs_Identification_of_sectors

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.

Following activities have been conducted:

- Activity 1.1.1.1 Report on gap analysis of Georgian legislation in the area of new POPs and implementation of the Stockholm Convention prepared
- Activity 1.1.1.2 Report on existing EPR systems and identification of any technical or regulatory gap regarding POPs elimination throughout products' life cycle, including confirmation of priority sectors for new EPR schemes prepared
- Activity 1.1.2.2. Report on Update existing EPR schemes (technical or regulatory documents developed) to incorporate POPs management and/or alternatives prepared
- Activity 4.1.1.2. First Steering Committee Meeting conducted
- Activity 1.1.1.5. Two POPs-related capacity building workshops conducted
- Activity 1.1.1.3. Prepare of package of amendments/draft legal act for integrating Stockholm Convention requirements on new POPs in the national regulatory framework, including: regulation on the restriction or prohibition of import or export of specific substances, mixture or products; regulation on the maximum authorized concentration of POPs in specific products (to be aligned with the EU regulation No 2019/1021); waste management regulations in progress

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	
☐	Components and Cost	
☐	Institutional and Implementation Arrangements	
☐	Financial Management	
☐	Implementation Schedule	
☐	Executing Entity	
☐	Executing Entity Category	
☐	Minor Project Objective Change	
☐	Safeguards	
☐	Risk Analysis	
☐	Increase of GEF Project Financing Up to 5%	
☐	Co-Financing	
☐	Location of Project Activities	
☐	Others	

[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%.

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

A total of 631,215.33 USD was obligated for FY24 as part of executing agreement with RECC (budget line 2600 support implementing partner). Funds were obligated across all outputs of the project and in line with project budget.

A large share of the funds (196,000 USD) is obligated against output 1 for activities scheduled for year 1 of the execution, related to integrating new POPs in regulations, enhancing policy tools and developing guidelines.

78,779 USD is obligated under output 2.1 for the upcoming surveys of manufacturing sectors, which will aim at selecting a pilot project to implement BAT/BEP and promote circular economy approaches

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.

Please fill in the below table or make a reference to a file, in case it is submitted as an annex to the report.

Outputs by Project Component	2023				2024				2025				GEF Grant Budget Available (US$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Component 1 – Policy strengthening by integrating a life-cycle approach into the existing legislative framework to prevent future build-up of POPsin manufacturingand recycling sectors													
Outcome 1.1: Enhanced national policy and regulatoryframework to complywith the Stockholm Convention (SC) requirements on new POPs and implementnational circular economy tools in selected manufacturing and recycling sectors													
Output 1.1.1: New POPs integrated in the existing environmental regulation and inthe regulation on chemical management													131,116.00
Output 1.1.2: Policy tools (e.g customs monitoring tools, EPR schemes), including financial mechanism, with a focus on phase out of industrial POPs developed for selected manufacturing sectors asone of the pillars of the implementation of circular economy inGeorgia													131,116.00
Output 1.1.3: Country specific guidelines for the phaseout of industrial POPs throughout the life-cyle drafted													131,116.00

Outputs by Project Component	2023				2024				2025				GEF Grant Budget Available (US$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Component 2 – Life-cycle approaches and BAT/BEP for the reduction of POPs in the manufacturing and recycling sectors implemented													
Outcome 2.1: POPs present in manufacturing or recycling sectors are disposed of using best available technologies (BAT) and best environmental practices (BEP), and future POPs-containing material built-up prevented though life-cycle approaches reduction and phasing out of POPs in the manufacturing and recycling sectors implemented													
Output 2.1.1: Verification of manufacturing sectors potentially using or releasing industrial POPs like HBCDD (EPS/XPS manufacturing, plastic), SCCP (paint manufacturing), PFOS/PFOAs and PBDE (ELV recycling) carried out													161,536.00
Output 2.1.2: Specific environmentally sound management plans (ESM) for manufacturing and recycling sectors to reduce POPs, recycle valuable materials and final disposal of POPs-containing waste													158,122.00
Output 2.1.3: BAT and BEP for the reduction and final disposal of POPs in manufacturing and recycling sectors to facilitate the adoption of a circular approach for a POPs-free manufacturing and recycling industry, in at least one pilot facility													206,673.00
Component 3 – Capacity building and knowledge management													
Outcome 3.1: Environmental authority, manufacturing and recycling sectors are empowered to phase out industrial POPs releases with positive effect on the establishment of a circular economy approach along the lifecycle of products													
Output 3.1.1: Multi-stakeholder platform created to sustain the phasing out of industrial POPs and to ensure the timely exchange of information and resources among business sectors and the regulators													89,409.00
Output 3.1.2: Capacity-building training, including gender dimensions, for													78,010.00

Outputs by Project Component	2023				2024				2025				GEF Grant Budget Available (US$)
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
selected manufacturing sectors, governmental stakeholders carried out on POPs and circular economy, and custom authorities strengthened to prevent the import of POP containing materials													
Output 3.1.3: Knowledge materials on POP management and their implication on circular economy developed and disseminated to wide range of stakeholders, including business sector													79,957.00
Component 4 - Monitoring and evaluation through results-based monitoring													
Outcome 4.1. Project implementation based on results-based management (RBM) and lessons learned/good practices documented and disseminated													
Output 4.1.1. RBM system of the project promoted adaptive management through capturing key results of the project													15,033.00
Output 4.1.2. A Gender mainstreaming action plan elaborated and implemented													15,033.00
Output 4.1.3. A Gender-Sensitive Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan in place													15,033.00
Output 4.1.4. Mid-term review and terminal evaluation conducted													37,000.00
Project management													119,666.67

X. Synergies

1. **Synergies** achieved:

The project will synergize with relevant initiatives, specifically the NIP update project and the PCB-free Electricity Distribution in Georgia project, to enhance POPs management in the country.

Synergy with NIP Update Project:

The synergy with the NIP update project is established through the sharing of POPs inventory data. This data serves as a baseline for the POPs project. The NIP update project also informs POPs project activities related to the prioritization of legal actions. These legal actions will be implemented in accordance with

the updated NIP, ensuring alignment and coherence in POPs management efforts.

Synergy with PCB-free Electricity Distribution in Georgia Project:

In relation to the PCB-free Electricity Distribution in Georgia project, which is in its final stage of implementation, the synergy is built on the lessons learned from training and awareness-raising activities. The POPs project builds upon the already established capacity, leveraging these insights to enhance its own training and awareness initiatives. This approach ensures that the knowledge and experience gained are effectively utilized to strengthen POPs management in the country.

3. Stories to be shared (Optional)

N/A

XI. GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as OpenStreetMap or GeoNames use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: https://coordinates-converter.com Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking here

Location Name	Latitude	Longitude	Geo Name ID	Location and Activity Description
Tbilisi	41.69411	44.83368	611717	
Lopota (Telavi municipality)	42.00742,	45.49626	613172	

Please provide any further geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions is taking place as appropriate.

Pilots locations are not selected at this stage of the project

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. **Timing & duration:** Each report covers a twelve-month period, i.e. 1 July 2023 – 30 June 2024.

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.