

1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	9421	Umoja No:	SB-007599.09
Project Title	Demonstration of non-thermal treatment of DDT wastes in Central Asia (Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan)		
Duration months	<i>Planned</i> 60	GEF financing amount	USD 15,120,000
	<i>Extension</i>	Co-financing amount	USD 29,062,033
Division(s) Implementing the project	UNEP GEF Unit, Economy division	Date of CEO Endorsement	13-Feb-20
Name of co-implementing Agency	UNEP GEF Unit, Economy division	Start of Implementation	16-Sep-20
Executing Agency(ies)	UNEP Regional Office for Europe	Date of first disbursement	04.10.2020
Names of Other Project Partners	Swiss Fund for Mine Action FSD (Tajikistan), National Ozone Centre (Kyrgyzstan)	Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 936,062
Project Type	Full Size Project	Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 78,293
Project Scope	Regional	Expected Mid-Term Date	1-Apr-23
Region (<i>delete as appropriate</i>)	Central Asia	Completion Date	<i>Planned</i> 30-Jun-25
Countries	Republic of Tajikistan, Kyrgyz Republic		<i>Revised</i>
Programme of Work	Chemicals and Pollution Action	Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	1-Jun-26
GEF Focal Area(s)	Chemicals and Waste-2 Programme 3 Reduce the prevalence of harmful chemicals and waste and support the implementation of clean alternative technologies/substances	Expected Financial Closure Date	31.12.2025

EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages

The project document makes no direct reference to the UNDAF strategic objectives of the project countries. Still, this report includes a selection of the relevant project countries UNDAF strategic objectives the project could contribute to. As documented in the report *United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2016-2021 for Tajikistan, Outcome 6 People in Tajikistan are more resilient to natural and man-made disasters and benefit from improved policy and operational frameworks for environmental protection and sustainable management of natural resources* focuses on support of the Sustainable Development Agenda including sound management of Chemicals and Waste. In turn, *The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Kyrgyz Republic 2018-2022, Priority III. Environment, climate change, and disaster risk management* highlights the national support to SDG 3 Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages including risks from hazardous chemicals and SDG 12 Ensure sustainable consumption and production including sound management of chemicals and waste.

EA: Link to relevant SDG target(s) & indicator(s)

SDG 3 Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
SDG 12 Ensure sustainable consumption and production

1.2 Project description

The main objective of the project is to dispose of 5000 tons of hazardous waste including DDT and build national capacity for the Environmentally Sound Management of hazardous waste and other POPs in line with the requirements of the Basel and Stockholm conventions.

Implementing Agency: UNEP GEF Unit, Economy division

Executing Agency: UNEP Regional Office for Europe, UNEP Subregional Office for Central Asia

Governmental Partners: Committee for Environmental Protection under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision of the Kyrgyz Republic

National Delivery Partners: Swiss Fund for Mine Action - FSD (Republic of Tajikistan), Ozone Center (Kyrgyz Republic)

Component 1: Demonstration of technology and disposal of 5000t of POPs. **Expected outcome:** Recipient governments manage DDT and other wastes at major high-risk sites in line with Basel and Stockholm Conventions

Component 2: Long-term capacity building for improved hazardous waste management. **Expected outcome:** Countries adopt policies and commit resources, technical skills and knowledge to manage hazardous waste in line with the requirements of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions

1.3 History of project revisions (TM)

Version	Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Rev0 (CEO)		No revisions to date

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW

UNEP Subprogramme(s)

Subprogramme 5: Chemicals and pollution action

Specify the relevant POW Outcome(s) and Outcome Indicator(s) and Direct Outcomes

PoW Outcomes: 3A, 3B and 3C
PoW Outcomes Indicators: i, ii, iii, iv, v and vi
Direct outcomes to which project contributes: 3.1, 3.2, 3.5, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.13

TM: Progress towards delivering the stated PoW

Due to COVID-19 related and other project start-up delays, no progress towards delivering the stated PoW expected accomplishments & indicators to be reported to date. However, the project is expected to start delivering in the next financial year and contribute to supporting countries in meeting their obligations towards Stockholm Convention through project activities.

2.2. GEF Core Indicators

GEF Core Indicators

<p>Core indicator 9: Reduction, disposal/ destruction phase out, elimination, and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials, and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced) Core indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment</p>	<p>9.1. Solid and liquid persistent organic pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type) 9.4. Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste (not foreseen in the project document)</p>
<p>5,000 tons of DDT and associated waste, 150,000 people (50% female, 50% male)</p>	<p>With only two inception meetings and one Regional Technical Meeting implemented thus far, there is too little data to report on the number of direct beneficiaries of the project.</p>

Indicative expected Results

TM: GEF core indicators targeted by the

Indicators	Expected value at	
	Mid-term	End-of-project
9.1. Solid and liquid persistent organic pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)	Preliminary POPs destruction testing completed in US On site pilot testing of iSCWO completed to confirm treatment technology including emission testing	5,000 tons of Cat I POPs wastes undergoing treatment
9.4. Number of countries with legislation and policy implemented to control chemicals and waste	Advice for updating legislation submitted to government Strategy and Action Plan for ESM of hazardous waste management developed	2 national hazardous waste management strategies approved
11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	Not specified	150,000 people (50% female, 50% male)

Implementation Status

2022

Ongoing

tus & Risk

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 3.3)
FY 2022	1st	MU	MU	M
FY 2021				
FY 2020				
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

2.3 Implementation sta

EA: Summary of status
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

The project is seriously delayed due to COVID-19. Reorganizations within the Ministry of Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision of the Kyrgyz Republic and changes of the project focal point also delayed the start-up phase of the project. Two inception meetings, one Regional Technical Meeting have been organized.

Component I contract for testing of Super Critical Water Oxidation (SCWO) is being negotiated with the sole contractor. The technical and financial assessment along with the proposed timeframe of the proposal by contractor found not in line with the approved project planning and UNEP (IA). Initial consultation was held with GEF Secretariat and STAP to review options, in the event that the negotiation should be unsuccessful. Considering different circumstances, UNEP (IA) has initiated exploring the possibilities for Plan B which includes several options identified in the project document including use of cement kilns for co-processing of wastes.

A contract with FSD, National Delivery Partner in Tajikistan has been signed. A contract with Ozone Centre, National Delivery Partner in Kyrgyzstan has been signed. A dedicated project manager was contracted by the executing agency. Expert in co-processing of POPs waste using cement kilns was contracted. Technical Advisor, Environmentally Sound Waste Management was selected contract is pending. Gender Expert has been contracted. With the fulfillment of contractual formalities for different partners and consultants, it is expected that the project will experience significant progress in coming year. EA will work closely with all the stakeholders to deliver the project outcomes efficiently.

2.4 Co-finance

EA:Planned Co-finance

USD 29,062,033

EA: Actual to date:

\$152,740.00

EA: Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges.

In line with COVID-19 delays, materialization of co-financing is lagging behind. However, with the two national delivery partners contracted and many of project consultants contracted and or being recruited, the project is picking-up speed and the materialization of co-financing is expected to increase sharply in the coming year.

2.5. Stakeholder

EA: Stakeholder engagement
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

At the Inception Meetings (on 12 July 2021 in Dushanbe and in Bishkek on 15 June 2021) project stakeholders were well represented to be informed about the project goals and implementation planning. In line with the stakeholder engagement plan from the project document, NGOs and representatives of scientific institutions from Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan (who participated predominantly online in the Regional Technical Meeting on 28 and 29 June 2022) have been informed that the project is encouraging their participation in awareness raising and communication activities of the project. During that meeting, the possibility of participation of individual NGO representatives candidates for the different national expert positions was also highlighted as an important way of active participation of NGO stakeholders in the project.

2.6. Gender

EA: Gender mainstreaming
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Since gender equality is of key importance to GEF and UNEP, the role of the project's Gender Equality Specialist is to provide guidance to all project partners on how to make sure that the project is implemented in line with Gender policies of GEF, UNEP, the National Delivery Partners and the approved project document.

As part of a subcontract to FSD the National Delivery partner in Tajikistan, the international Gender Equality Specialist, Mr. Fouad Bergigui, was selected and contracted on 17-06-2022.

With the priority deliverables to develop i) an overall Gender Equality policy brief for the project and ii) to develop practical guidance for a Gender Equality approach throughout the project cycle including reporting instructions for the registration of gender disaggregated data, Mr Bergigui gave a short presentation on his approach to Gender mainstreaming during the Regional Technical Meeting on 28 and 29 June 2022 in Almaty.

Further guidance on Gender mainstreaming within the different aspects of project implementation will be received from Mr Bergigui on short notice. The total number of participants in the two inception meetings in Dushanbe and Bishkek and the Regional Technical Meeting in Almaty was 83 participants, 54 men and 29 women. Respectively: Dushanbe 23 participants, 18 men and 5 women, Bishkek: 31 participants, 15 men and 16 women, Almaty 29 participants, 21 men and 8 women.

2.7. ESSM

EA: Environmental and social safeguards management
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Due to the early stage of the project to date, none of the environmental risks listed in the Project document (Table 12 indicated risks, p.68) pose any risks that should be managed or mitigated.

Generally the same is true for the identified social risks (See also Table 12 indicated risks, p.68), It should be mentioned, however, that the identified risk that stakeholders would not accept the proposed technology, appeared to become an important risk when Tajik stakeholders at the project's Inception meeting appeared to be very much in favour of co-incineration of DDT wastes in cement kilns (an option that the project is only considering as an alternative in case that it would be concluded that the proposed non-thermal treatment would not be feasible).

In detailed discussions with the relevant Tajik stakeholders, it was explained that "demonstration of non thermal treatment of DDT waste" is the approved objective of the project that cannot be changed because individual stakeholders are in favour of alternative disposal technologies. As a result of these discussions the objective of the project was supported again by the relevant stakeholders.

2.8. KM

EA: Knowledge activities and products
(will be uploaded to GEF Portal)

Due to the delayed start-up of the project there are currently no knowledge activities and products to be reported.

2.9. Stories

EA: Stories to be shared
(section to be shared with communication division/ GEF communication)

Due to the delayed start-up of the project there are currently no Stories to be reported.





3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes

Project objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	EA: Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	TM: Progress rating
Objective						
National and regional capacity for the Environmentally Sound Management (ESM) of hazardous waste including Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT) and other POPs in place in both countries in line with the requirements of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions	EA to fill There is no project objective indicator mentioned in the project results framework	EA to fill There is no baseline level mentioned for the project objective in the results framework	EA to fill There are no Mid-Term Targets or Milestones for the project objective in the results framework	EA to fill There is no End of Project Target mentioned for the project objective in the results framework	EA to fill Due to the delayed start-up of the project and pending negotiations with the technology provider General Atomics, there is currently no attainment of indicators & targets with regard to the project objective to be reported.	MU
Outcome 1						
Recipient governments manage DDT and other wastes at major high-risk sites in line with the Basel and Stockholm Conventions	Tons of DDT and other POPs waste destroyed in an environmentally sound manner	wastes identified and quantified at Vakhsh, 2,254 at Suzak A during PPG Previous safeguarding initiatives at multiple sites in the two countries – 246 tons of additional Cat 1 wastes available for destruction at other sites in the project countries	There are no Mid-Term Targets or Milestones for project outcome 1 mentioned in the results framework	End of project: 5,000 tons of Cat 1 POPs wastes undergoing treatment Risk reduction of 36,000 tons of Cat 2 and 3 wastes overlaying Cat 1 wastes (additional target)	Due to the delayed start-up of the project and pending negotiations with the technology provider General Atomics, there is currently no attainment of indicators & targets with regard to outcome 1 to be reported	MU
	Number of facilities licenced and equiped to ESM hazardous waste in Kyrgyz Republic and Republic of Tajikistan	No treatment facilities exist to treat wastes and exiting cement kilns not able to co-process wastes	There are no Mid-Term Targets or Milestones for project outcome 1 mentioned in the results framework	Licenced facilities able to destroy hazardous waste in the region	Due to the delayed start-up of the project and pending negotiations with the technology provider General Atomics, there is currently no attainment of indicators & targets with regard to outcome 1 to be reported	MU
Outcome 2						
Countries adopt policies and commit resources, technical skills and knowledge to manage hazardous waste in line with the requirements of the Basel and Stockholm Conventions	Number of trained national experts on hazardous waste management	Lack of inspectors Some NGO and government experts from previous projects.	NA	Environmental inspection protocols and annual reports 260 inspectors; 10 NGO staff; policy makers trained	Due to the delayed start-up of the project and difficulties to establish working relations with project counterparts from the Kyrgyz Republic, there is currently no attainment of indicators & targets with regard to outcome 2 to be reported	MU

	Number of hazardous waste management strategies being implemented in both countries	Incomplete legislative framework - Hazardous waste is treated in the same way as municipal and other types of wastes. No systematic national policy or regulations for separate treatment. Fragmented administrative responsibilities	NA	2 national hazardous waste management strategies approved. Risks reduction measures elaborated for ten priority sites	Due to the delayed start-up of the project and difficulties to establish working relations with project counterparts from the Kyrgyz Republic, there is currently no attainment of indicators & targets with regard to outcome 2 to be reported	MU
	Number of individuals reporting activities to reduce risk and exposure	Communities mining waste sites and unaware of health risks	NA	Behavioural change reported by at least 150 community members and policy makers. Gender Action Plan implemented	Due to the delayed start-up of the project and difficulties to establish working relations with project counterparts from the Kyrgyz Republic, there is currently no attainment of indicators & targets with regard to outcome 2 to be reported	MU

Outcome 3

The project's Results framework does not specify outcomes for Outcome 3 Monitoring & Evaluation. For output results that are included in the Results framework, please refer to Under Comp 3 below.	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2021 (%)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%)	EA: Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	TM: Progress rating
Under Comp 1					
Output 1.1: Demonstration technology piloted and results used to confirm commissioning	2024	1%	5%	Contract negotiations with technology provider GA started in Q2 2020. There is not much progress and negotiations are pending.	MU
Output 1.2 Site specific management plans disclosed and submitted to government for approval	Q1 2024	0%	2%	Selection of the project Technical Advisor, Environmentally Sound Waste Management is complete. The originally planned direct hire by UNEP failed because of HR regulations. (The selected consultant is employed by a company) As an alternative option it was decided to hire the consultant through the FSD subcontract. Contracts with National Delivery Partners are in place to facilitate the work of the above mentioned technical advisor and the two National waste management consultants.	MU
Output 1.3: Non-thermal technology is scaled up and site installations complete	2025	0%	0%	NA	MU
Output 1.4 Excavated POPs wastes are destroyed in an environmentally sound manner	2025	0%	0%	NA	MU

Under Comp 2

Output 2.1: Hazardous waste management strategies that include improved legislation and regulations aligned with the Stockholm and Basel Conventions submitted to government for adoption	Q4 2023	0%	5%	PM was contracted in Q1, 2022. With the subcontracts of both National Delivery Partners in place, the project prepared for the recruitment of the International legal expert and the two National legal experts. Recruitment of the International legal expert is in progress under the responsibility of FSD. The EA is directly involved with the selection and has provided a ToR for the selection of the expert. The number of responses to the consultancy advertisement was lower than expected and the EA has asked FSD to advertise the position more widely. Recruitment of the National legal expert in Tajikistan is in progress under the responsibility of FSD. recruitment of the National legal expert in Kyrgyzstan under the responsibility of Ozone Center is pending.	MS
Output 2.2 Capacity of national environmental inspectors on environmental licensing and monitoring increased	2024	0%	5%	PM was contracted in Q1, 2022. With the subcontracts of both National Delivery Partners in place, the project prepared for the recruitment of the International Inspections and BRS Reporting Trainer and the other National experts that will contribute to the delivery of Output 2.2.. The TOR for International Inspections and BRS Reporting Trainer is developed. Recruitment of the International Inspections and BRS Reporting Trainer is planned for later under the responsibility of FSD. The EA is directly involved with the selection and has provided a ToR for the selection of the expert. Recruitment of the National legal expert in Tajikistan is in progress under the responsibility of FSD. Recruitment of the National legal expert in Kyrgyzstan under the responsibility	MS
Output 2.3: Stakeholder engagement and awareness raising campaigns conducted	2025	0%	5%	PM was contracted in Q1, 2022. With the subcontracts of both National Delivery Partners in place, the project prepared for the recruitment of the International awareness raising and communication expert. The TOR for the International awareness raising and communication expert is developed. The EA is directly involved with the selection. Recruitment of the expert is planned for Q3, 2022.	MS
Output 2.4: Risk management at 10 additional sites designed and implementation started	Q4,2023	0%	2%	In preparation of this activity FSD and Ozone Center are preparing themselves by studying the internationally Best Available Practices described in the Risk based Environmental Management Toolkit for Obsolete Pesticides developed by FAO. The partner organizations are also familiarizing themselves with the baseline situation in the two project countries.	MU
Output 2.5: Appropriate strategy for continued private and public investment to sustain and expand project results shared with key stakeholders	2025	0%	0%	NA	MU
Under Comp 3					
Output 3.1 Quarterly financial reports and annual progress reports monitoring status of project execution	Continuously ongoing	NA	NA	Quarterly financial reports and annual progress reports monitoring status of project execution were delivered in line with the obligations set out in the project PCA.	S
Output 3.2 Midterm and Terminal evaluations of project impacts shared with project stakeholders	The project MTR will be carried out by Q 2, 2023 The project Terminal evaluation is planned to be carried out shortly after completion of the project.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Under Comp 4					
Under Comp 5					

The Task Manager will decide on the relevant level of disaggregation (i.e. either at the output or activity level).



Table A. Risk-log

Implementation Status		Risk Rating								Variation respect to last rating	
Risk	Risk affecting:	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification	
	Outcome / outputs										
Operational/delivery risks											
Complex procurement, including lack of suppliers with adequate capacity and experience.	C1/ Output 1.1, 1.3	H	H							= This is first rating. Procurement process are lengthy and complex, EA and IA are required to follow up on the issue.	
Delays in import of equipment	C1/ Output 1.1, 1.3	M	M							= To be followed up after the pilot stage.	
Lack of capacity available to manage sites	C2/ Output 2.4, 2.5	H	H							= Training to be provided to the local experts by project partners.	
Project unable to transfer risk of operating technology to technology provider/ third party	C1/ Output 1.3	H	H							= To be followed up after the pilot testing of technology.	
Challenges with executing field activities in countries, including lack of transparency in financial management	C1, C2/ Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 / Output 2.4	M	M							= EA to work closely with participating countries in terms of execution at local level.	
Inadequate resources to support disposal and remediation efforts, including risk of higher-than-anticipated quantities of wastes to be addressed (inaccuracies in site baseline investigations during PPG)	C1, C2/ Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 / Output 2.4	H	H							= EA to work closely with participating countries in terms of execution at local level.	
Governments do not adopt revised hazardous waste management legislation	C2 / Output 2.1	L	L							= The activities have just started. EA to work closely with participating countries in reviewing and updating their	
Technical risks											
Treatment method / and or technology do not function as intended at full scale capacity	C1 / Output 1.3	M	M							= This is to be determined after pilot testing of the technology.	
Local infrastructure is not provided or is not adequate for project needs	C1 / Output 1.3	M	M							= This is not applicable presently, in future EA to work closely with the participating countries.	
Environmental safeguard risks											
Accident or spill during the field waste operations.	C1 / Output 1.1, 1.3	H	H							= This is not initiated. Adequate HSE plan to be put in place.	
Emissions to air and water during waste treatment	C1 / Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4	M	M							= This is not initiated. Adequate HSE plan to be put in place.	
Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project	C1 / Output 2.5	M	M							= This is not initiated. Adequate HSE plan to be put in place.	
Access of people or animals to site during operationa	C1, C2/ Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 / Output 2.4	L	L							= This is not initiated. Adequate HSE plan to be put in place.	
Climate change risks	C1 / Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4	M	M							= This need to be worked out in coming year/s.	
Social risks											
Child or forced labour engaged at project sites	C1, C2/ Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 / Output 2.4	L	L							= N/A at this stage.	
Stakeholders including the public country do not accept technology	C1 / all outputs	M	M							= The project has just started and such challenge has been identified during the inception meeting. EA to work with participating countries and stakeholders through consultative process.	
Existing inspectors are available to participate in training and able to translate learning into improvements in practices	C2 / Output 2.2		L							= The original text in the ProDoc reads "Existing inspectors are available to participate in training and able to translate learning into improvements in practices." and no risk rating is assigned to that identified risk. It is assumed that by mistake the word "not" was omitted. The risk would then be that the existing inspectors would NOT be available. As the project is endorsed by the two countries, this risk is assumed to be low.	
Local communities and media reluctant or unable to support risk-reduction measures and change behaviours as proposed by project	C2 / Output 2.3, 24	M	M							= N/A at this stage.	
Consolidated project risk		M	M							= This section focuses on the variation. The overall rating is discussed in section 2.3.	

Table B. Outstanding medium & high risks

List here only risks from Table A above that have a risk rating of M or worse in the current PIR

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom
Complex procurement, including lack of suppliers with adequate capacity and experience.	NA	Complex procurement was handled by UNEP's specialized procurment office in New York with strategic input from UNEP's GEF Unit	Close cooperation between UNEP's different offices, and close cooperation between UNEP and National Delivery	22/23	UNEP (IA) and UNEP (EA)
Delays in import of equipment	NA	As above	Close cooperation between UNEP's different offices, and close cooperation between UNEP and National Delivery partners.	22/23	UNEP (IA) and UNEP (EA)
Lack of capacity available to manage sites	NA	As reported in the Cofinancing report, FSD has carried out infrastructure improvements and erosion control measures such as tree planting at Vakhsh burial site in Tajikistan based on private donations to the organization.	Close cooperation with FSD in Tajikistan and in Kyrgyzstan with Ozone Center	22/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners
Project unable to transfer risk of operating technology to technology provider/ third party	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Close cooperation between UNEP's different offices, and close cooperation between UNEP, national governments and National Delivery partners.	22/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, national governments

List
H
S
M
L
Not
Applicable

L

Challenges with executing field activities in countries, including lack of transparency in financial management	NA	Due diligence was carried out in the selection of National Delivery partners. Sub-contracting PCAs include clear activity and output deliverables, clear requirements on transparency for the recruitment of project personnel & consultants and regular reporting & audit requirements for the sub-contracted funds.	Systematic monitoring of the implementation of the planned activities and investment in partnership building with project partners by regular visits to the countries.	22/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, national governments
Inadequate resources to support disposal and remediation efforts, including risk of higher-than-anticipated quantities of wastes to be addressed (inaccuracies in site baseline investigations during PPG)	NA	Additional surveys are included to confirm the site investigations carried out during the PPG	Prioritization of planned additional surveys to confirm PPG investigations to provide for timely adaptive management when required.	22/23	UNEP (EA)
Local infrastructure is not provided or is not adequate for project needs	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Close cooperation with National Delivery Partners and Governments to identify this risk when relevant.	22/23	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, national governments
Accident or spill during the field waste operations.	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Propper HSE plan timely developed and endorsed by contractors and governments	24/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, contractors
Emissions to air and water during waste treatment.	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Propper HSE plan timely developed and endorsed by contractors and governments	24/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, contractors
Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Close cooperation with National Delivery Partners and Governments to identify this risk when relevant.	24/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, contractors
Climate change risks	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Solar power investment is planned to off-set carbon foot print.	24/25	UNEP (EA) and UNEP (IA)
Stakeholders including the public country do not accept technology	NA	Regular consultation with stakeholders at all levels throughout project duration are planned. At the Tajik Inception meeting, stakeholders argued in favour of the project's "plan B" cement kiln disposal option. In detailed discussions with those stakeholders it was explained that "demonstration of non-thermal treatment of DDT waste" is the approved objective of the project that cannot be changed because individual stakeholders are in favour of alternative disposal technologies. As a result of this discussions the objective of the project was supported again by the relevant stakeholders.	Regular consultation with stakeholders at all levels throughout the project implementation and regular visits to the two project countries to invest in the quality of the project's stakeholder cooperation	22/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, national governments
Local communities and media reluctant or unable to support risk-reduction measures and change behaviours as proposed by project	NA	As the risk is not relevant in the start-up phase of the project, there are no actions to be reported	Regular consultation with stakeholders at all levels throughout the project implementation and regular visits to the two project countries to invest in the quality of the	22/25	UNEP (EA), national delivery partners, national governments

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.
Significant Risk (S): There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that **assumptions** may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
Medium 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 modest risks.
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 modest risks.

To Step 4





Project Minor Amendments

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% as described in Annex 9 of the Project and Program Cycle Policy Guidelines.

Minor amendments	Changes
Results framework	No
Components and cost	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements	Yes
Financial management	No
Implementation schedule	No
Executing Entity	No
Executing Entity Category	No
Minor project objective change	No
Safeguards	No
Risk analysis	No
Increase of GEF project financing up to 5%	No
Co-financing	No
Location of project activity	No
Other	No

Minor amendments
The National Ozone Center in Kyrgyzstan was designated by the Kyrgyz government as National Delivery partner for the project in the Kyrgyz Republic, directly after the project started. In the prodoc it was foreseen FSD would act as implementing partner in both countries.

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 Required field	Latitude Required field	Longitude Required field	Geo Name ID Required field if the location is not an exact site	Location Description Optional text field	Activity Description Optional text field
Vaksh Polygon	37.714742	68.91916	Vaksh Polygon	Dumpsite	
Suzak A	40.994217	72.896224	Suzak A	Dumpsite	

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





[Annex any linked geospatial file]