

GEF - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)

Document Generated by: GEF Coordination Office CO

At: 2024-09-09 07:04:29

Table of contents

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	3
1.1 Project Details	3
1.2 Project Description	4
1.3 Project Contacts.....	5
2 Overview of Project Status.....	6
2.1 UNEP PoW & UN.....	6
2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators	7
2.3. Implementation Status and Risks	8
2.4 Co Finance	10
2.5. Stakeholder	10
2.6. Gender	11
2.7. ESSM	11
2.8. KM/Learning.....	12
2.9. Stories	13
3 Performance.....	14
3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes	14
3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)	18
4 Risks.....	24
4.1 Table A. Project management Risk	24
4.2 Table B. Risk-log.....	24
4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.....	29
5 Amendment - GeoSpatial.....	37
5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM).....	37
5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)	38

UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2024
Reporting from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

1 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1.1 Project Details

GEF ID: 9421	Umoja WBS: SB-007599
SMA IPMR ID: 33851	Grant ID: S1-32GFL-000632
Project Short Title: GEF-CW.9421.Central Asia DDT	
Project Title: Demonstration of non-thermal treatment of DDT wastes in Central Asia	
Duration months planned:	60
Duration months age:	44
Project Type:	Full Sized Project (FSP)
Parent Programme if child project:	
Project Scope:	Regional
Region:	Asia Pacific
Countries:	Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan
GEF Focal Area(s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF financing amount:	\$ 15,120,000.00
Co-financing amount:	\$ 29,062,033.00
Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval:	2020-02-13
UNEP Project Approval Date:	2020-03-02
Start of Implementation (PCA entering into force):	2020-09-16
Date of Inception Workshop, if available:	2021-06-15
Date of First Disbursement:	2020-10-30
Total disbursement as of 30 June 2024:	\$ 2,395,561.00
Total expenditure as of 30 June:	\$ 1,439,386.00

Midterm undertaken?:	Yes
Actual Mid-Term Date, if taken:	2023-09-28
Expected Mid-Term Date, if not taken:	
Completion Date Planned - Original PCA:	2025-06-30
Completion Date Revised - Current PCA:	2025-06-30
Expected Terminal Evaluation Date:	2026-06-30
Expected Financial Closure Date:	2026-12-30

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 Project Contacts

Division(s) Implementing the project	Industry and Economy Division
Name of co-implementing Agency	
Executing Agency (ies)	UNEP Regional Office for Europe, UNEP Subregional Office for Central Asia
names of Other Project Partners	Swiss Fund for Mine Action - FSD (Republic of Tajikistan), Ozone Center (Kyrgyz Republic)
UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Kevin Helps
UNEP Task Manager(s)	Jitendra Sharma, Alexander Romanov
UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Edward Aput
UNEP Support Assistants	Alexander Romanov
Manager/Representative	Tomas Marques
Project Manager	Wouter Pronk
Finance Manager	Erika Mattsson
Communications Lead, if relevant	

2 Overview of Project Status

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN

UNEP Current Subprogramme(s):	Thematic: Chemicals and pollution action subprogramme
UNEP previous Subprogramme(s):	
PoW Indicator(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution: (i) Number of Governments that, with UNEP support, are developing or implementing policies, strategies, legislation or action plans that promote sound chemicals and waste management and/or the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements and the existing framework on chemicals and waste • Pollution: (ii) Number of Governments developing or implementing policies, strategies and mechanisms to prevent or reduce waste and ensure environmentally sound waste treatment or disposal, including in the context of disaster or conflict-related environmental emergencies, with UNEP support • Pollution: (iii) Number of policy, regulatory, financial and technical measures developed with UNEP support to reduce pollution in air, water, soil and the ocean • Pollution: Change in action by the private sector and civil society on pollution prevention and control as a result of UNEP action Progress in the chemicals- and pollution-related aspects of the 2030 Agenda on which UNEP focuses its work
UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	The relevant project countries UNDAF strategic objectives the project contributes to are: 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.
Link to relevant SDG Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages • Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all • Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns • Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
Link to relevant SDG Targets:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.9 By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere • 5.5 Ensure women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life • 10.2 By 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status • 12.4 By 2020, achieve the environmentally sound management of chemicals and all wastes throughout their life cycle, in accordance with agreed international frameworks, and significantly reduce their release to air, water and soil in order to minimize their adverse impacts on human health and the environment
--	--

2.2. GEF Core and Sub Indicators

GEF core or sub indicators targeted by the project as defined at CEO Endorsement/Approval, as well as results

Indicators	Targets - Expected Value			Materialized to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
9.1-Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) removed or disposed (POPs type)	Preliminary POPs destruction testing completed in USOn site pilot testing of iSCWO completed to confirm treatment technology including emission testing	5,000	5,000 tons of DDT and associated waste	
10.1- Countries with legislation and policy implemented to control emissions of OPs to air	Advice for updating legislation submitted to governmentStrategy and Action Plan for ESM of hazardous waste management developed	2	2 national hazardous waste management strategies approved	
11- People benefitting from GEF-financed investments	Not specified	150,000	150,000 people	2,238 People
11.2- Female	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1,036
11.1- Male	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	1,202

2.3. Implementation Status and Risks

	PIR#	Rating towards outcomes (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2024	3rd PIR	MS	MS	L
FY 2023	2nd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2022	1st PIR	MU	MU	M
FY 2021				
FY 2020				
FY 2019				
FY 2018				
FY 2017				
FY 2016				
FY 2015				

Summary of status

During the third year of PIR reporting, the project has made significant progress against the approved annual workplan and budget.

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the project was carried out between April and September 2023 with the report finalized in April 2024. Notwithstanding the serious delays the project faced in the start-up phase, the MTR rated the project as Moderately Satisfactory. In response to the occurred delays that were caused among others by COVID-19 and the unsuccessful tender for the procurement of the project’s original disposal technology iSCWO, the MTR recommended to request the GEF for a 2-year project extension and propose project logframe and workplan revision.

A project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting was organized in November 2023 to discuss progress, workplan, budget expenditures, MTR recommendations, and initiate discussions on the corrective actions needed to effectively implement the project. As both countries had serious concerns about the safety and practical feasibility of cement kiln co-processing, it was decided at the PSC meeting that containment of the project waste remained the only way forward as a last resort disposal option in line with the General Technical Guidelines of the Basel Convention. Following the PSC decision to continue with containment as disposal technology the Executing Agency has held detailed negotiations with the countries and the Implementing Agency on proposed changes required for the implementation of the containment disposal option. The proposed changes are approved by the Implementing Agency and require country approval in a online Extraordinary PSC, planned for July 2024.

A summary of project progress by components is provided below:

Component 1: A feasibility study on the potential to apply cement kiln co-processing as disposal technology was completed in December 2023. The study on co-processing with the aim to investigate alternative disposal technologies/methods approved by the Basel Convention technical guidelines was included in the original prodoc as a contingency plan in the case that the iSCWO technology could not be applied.

For quality assurance a peer review was commissioned upon request of the GEF Unit. The peer review critically commented that there is a lack of scientific references in the study but endorsed the study's recommendation to carry out a test burn in the Kyrgyz Republic. Based on both countries concerns about the safety of co-processing, however, further initiatives to assess the practical applicability of co-processing as a disposal option for DDT and associated waste in the Kyrgyz Republic were discontinued.

The option of mobile incineration earlier proposed by Tajikistan was found unsuitable for application due to a lack of evidence that the technology would be safe and comply with the requirements of the Technical Guidelines of the Basel Convention.

Site-specific risk management plans were developed for both burial sites of concern: Vakhsh in Tajikistan and Suzak A in the Kyrgyz Republic. The plans are 80 % ready and will be completed following the agreement with the PSC on the project's revision for the implementation of containment as disposal option. A contract is being negotiated with the Seifullin Agricultural Research University from Astana, Kazakhstan for bioremediation trials in Tajikistan and leachate testing using diatomite.

Component 2: A set of legal resolutions has been developed in both countries to enable the implementation of planned technical works. A Strategy on Environmentally Sound Management of POPs chemicals and waste has been developed in Tajikistan. A similar strategy is being developed in the Kyrgyz Republic. Endorsement and adoption of the resolutions and strategies by government is still pending. Discussions with focal points are ongoing whether there is a need to develop additional resolutions to enable Containment, following the PSC decision on the disposal technology of the project.

A Guideline on Licensing and a Guideline on Inspections have been developed by the project. In Kyrgyzstan the National waste management consultant adapted these guidelines to national requirements. In Tajikistan negotiations are ongoing on how to proceed further with the guidelines. One training on environmental licensing and inspection was organized in Kyrgyzstan. Further training is planned for both countries.

National and local awareness raising campaigns have been developed and carried out in both countries. Plans are being developed for further awareness raising during the second phase of the project.

Rapid Environmental Assessments have been carried out for a total of 21 high risk sites. Risk management plans are being developed for carrying out planned risk reduction measures. In Tajikistan, risk reduction measures at one high risk site have been completed.

The IA, EA and project countries are coordinating closely on the progress of project and any corrective measures needed during the implementation. This is carried out through a consultative process and key points are included in the agenda of PSC meetings. The project risks are closely monitored and evaluated from time to time by EA and IA and necessary steps are undertaken/planned.

Regarding the financial progress, the project expenditure (~\$778,450) largely matched forecasted amounts (~\$747,199).

2.4 Co Finance

Planned Co-finance:	\$ 29,062,033
Actual to date:	1,014,614
Progress	<p>Justify progress in terms of materialization of expected co-finance. State any relevant challenges:</p> <p>When committing its co-finances to the project, FSD anticipated that the project would start much earlier. Unfortunately, the project start was delayed and much of the committed co-financing from the side of the organization was already spent before the official start of the FSD contract. ROE contributed in the form of PMC of its key officers including Programme coordinator, Head of Subregional Office in Central Asia, FMO, Deputy Director.</p> <p>Tajikistan's focal point together with the vice-chairman of the Committee for Environmental Protection is repeatedly requesting to reduce amount of co-financing as the organization fears that it will not be able to report the expected co-finances.</p> <p>At PIR3 the total co-financing materialized equals to USD1,206,185.</p>

2.5. Stakeholder

Date of project steering committee meeting	2023-11-30
Stakeholder engagement (will be uploaded to GEF Portal)	<p>National NGOs are engaged with the project execution through the projects National Delivery Partners. The MTR advised the project to more legitimately engage NGOs as partners and with clearer scopes of work. According to review, this would foster an improved sense of ownership over the project results.</p> <p>In line with the stakeholder engagement plan from the project document, NGOs and representatives of scientific institutions from Tajikistan and the Kyrgyz Republic are encouraged to participate in the activities of the project.</p> <p>A consortium of local Kyrgyz NGOs carried out awareness campaigns in Kyrgyzstan, while in Tajikistan this work is being implemented by FSD with involvement of local stakeholders. A Tajik NGO carried out Rapid Environmental Assessment based on experience the NGO gained with this activity in previous international projects on the subject of POPs pesticides.</p> <p>For the second phase of the project, the EA is considering ways to more directly engage national NGOs with the project.</p>

2.6. Gender

Does the project have a gender action plan?	Yes
Gender mainstreaming (will be uploaded to GEF Portal):	<p>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. The project is executed in line with a Gender Equality policy brief and practical guidance for a Gender Equality approach throughout the project cycle including reporting instructions for the registration of gender disaggregated data. The guidance documents were developed by the Gender expert at the start of the project.</p> <p>The Second project Gender Workshop took place on 22 December 2023. The results of the project approach to Gender mainstreaming were evaluated by the Project Gender expert and suggestions were made on further gender mainstreaming and protection of vulnerable groups within the project. Following lessons learned were reported. The different teams successfully in Kyrgyzstan reached women otherwise absent from public meetings by the organization of interventions at schools, holding events directly in the homes of participants and gathering small groups of women on the streets. In Tajikistan the teams identified points of contact / ambassadors for the issue of POPs pesticide risks in villages. The points of contact were individually trained to spread the message on the risks from POPs pesticides especially among women who tend not to participate in public awareness raising meetings. Finally, in both countries imams and local village leaders were actively involved with the issue.</p> <p>In this reporting period the project a total of 1954 stakeholders were involved in meetings, trainings and seminars of the project, 1005 men and 949 women. The percentage of women involved has gone up in this reporting period from 21% (PIR 1), 35% (PIR 2) to 49% (PIR 3).</p>

2.7. ESSM

Moderate/High risk projects (in terms of Environmental and social safeguards)	<p>Was the project classified as moderate/high risk CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?</p> <p>No</p>
New social and/or	Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period?

environmental risks	No If yes, describe the new risks or changes? \n
Complaints and grievances related to social and/or environmental impacts	Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period? No If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail, including the status, significance, who was involved and what actions were taken?
Environmental and social safeguards management	Due to the transition from the proposed selected technology to another alternative, only several risk of the environmental risks listed in the Project document (Table 12 indicated risks, p.66) remain relevant and pose risks that should be managed or mitigated. These risks include “Accident or spill during the field waste operations,” “Emissions to air and water during treatment,” “Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project.” For these risks adequate mitigation measures are provided. (Please refer to 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.) Regarding the social risks, the change of disposal technology to containment is expected to cause little adverse reactions by stakeholders. Only the risk “Local communities and media reluctant or unable to support risk-reduction measures and change behaviours as proposed by the project” remains relevant. The design of the project and the experience with stakeholder engagement during the implementation of the first phase of the project provide adequate mitigation measures to avoid unacceptable risks. (Please refer to 4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks.)

2.8. KM/Learning

Knowledge activities and products	Under the knowledge management activities of the project, representatives of the two project countries participated in the The Eurasian “Green Energy & Waste Recycling Forum 2023” organized in July 2023. In September 2023, an online Disposal strategy disclosure meeting was organized. An international scientist in the field of combustion and non-combustion technologies of POPs disposal introduced the project stakeholders to risks from thermal and non-thermal disposal technologies and presented a review of international research of cement kiln co-processing.
Main learning during the period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both countries rejected the high-tech disposal technology of co-processing in cement plants based on the provided extensive feasibility study. A practical study tour to neighboring China, where POPs have been disposed of in a cement plant might have been a more effective way to present of the technology. • After draft versions of the MTR highlighted the need for a project revision, proposed changes were initially presented at the PSC Meeting in November 2023 held in Almaty, Kazakhstan. To successfully agree with the countries on the technical, budgetary and

	<p>workplan changes needed for containment as disposal technology, country visits and in person coordination with Focal Points significantly improved the communication and approval process of the budget revision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For the project revision, the project has offered to increase the number of risk reduction measures at an increased number of POPs contaminated sites, despite initial resistance of the Kyrgyz Government. However, after having public meetings in country about the subject, the government decided to prioritise risk reduction activities realizing the significance of the problem. The presentation of the Rapid Environmental Assessments was instrumental in raising awareness about health risks from contaminated sites in the Kyrgyz Republic.
--	---

2.9. Stories

Stories to be shared	Not the case yet.
-----------------------------	-------------------

3 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	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
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	There is no project objective indicator mentioned in the project results framework	There is no baseline level mentioned for the project objective in the results framework	There are no Mid-Term Targets or Milestones for the project objective in the results framework	There is no End of Project Target mentioned for the project objective in the results framework	There is no numeric, percentage or binary target in the results framework	Project outputs such as the risk based management plans, legal gap analyses, waste management strategies and licensing guidelines to support capacity building for ESM are being completed. Endorsement and adoption by Government is still pending. Capacity building of national Inspectors has started.	MS
	There is no project objective indicator mentioned in the project results framework	There is no baseline level mentioned for the project objective in the results framework	There are no Mid-Term Targets or Milestones for the project objective in the results framework	There is no End of Project Target mentioned for the project objective in the results framework	N/A	Project outputs such as the risk based management plans, legal gap analyses, waste management strategies and licensing guidelines to support capacity building for ESM are currently becoming available. Actual capacity building will take place in the coming year.	MS
Recipient governments manage DDT and other wastes at major high-risk sites in line with the	Tons of DDT and other POPs waste destroyed in an environmentally sound	3,348 tons of Cat 1 wastes identified and	There are no Mid-Term	End of project: 5,000 tons of Cat 1 POPs	30%	The project's decision making process on the selection of a suitable disposal technology is completed. The process	MS

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
Basel and Stockholm Conventions	manner	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	Targets or Milestones for project outcome 1 mentioned in the results framework	wastes undergoing treatmentRisk reduction of 36,000 tons of Cat 2 and 3 wastes overlaying Cat 1 wastes (additional target)		included unsuccessful and discontinued iSCWO procurement and a feasibility study on cement kiln co-processing. The process was completed at the 2023 Steering Committee Meeting, when both countries confirmed that they had serious concerns about the safety and practical applicability of co-processing. A overall project revision is being prepared to enable the implementation of the only remaining disposal option to contain the waste in line with the technical guidelines of the Basel Convention. A Steering Committee Meeting is prepared to take place in July to approve the revised project documents and budget required for the implementation of the containment option.Establishment of licensed facilities will start once the required project revisions to implement Containment as disposal option are approved by the Steering Committee. However, the International Expert Licensing and subsequent National Experts have developed Guidance on environmental licensing and inspections for waste management activities and facilities in line with best international practice. Endorsement and	

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
						adoption of those guidelines by national governments is still pending.	
	Number of facilities licenced and equipped 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	20%	Establishment of licensed facilities will start once the required project revisions to implement Containment as disposal option are approved by the Steering Committee. However, the International Expert Licensing and subsequent National Experts have developed Guidance on environmental licensing and inspections for waste management activities and facilities in line with best international practice. Endorsement and adoption of those guidelines by national governments is still pending.	MS
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 inspectorsSome NGO and government experts from previous projects.		Environmental inspection protocols and annual reports 260 inspectors; 10 NGO staff; policy makers trained	61 Kyrgyz inspectors have been trained	Based on the developed licensing and inspection guidance documents, 61 inspectors have been trained in the Kyrgyz Republic. More trainings are planned in both countries.	S
	Number of hazardous waste management strategies being implemented in both countries	Incomplete legislative framework - Hazardous waste is		2 national hazardous waste management strategies	60%	A set of legal resolutions has been developed in both countries to enable the implementation of planned technical works. A Strategy on Environmentally Sound Management of POPs chemicals and	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
		treated in the same way as municipal and other types of wastes. No systematic national policy or regulations for separate treatment. Fragmented administrative responsibilities		approved. Risks reduction measures elaborated for ten priority sites		waste has been developed in Tajikistan. A similar strategy is being developed in the Kyrgyz Republic. Endorsement and adoption of the resolutions and strategies by government is still pending. Discussions with focal points are ongoing whether there is a need to develop additional resolutions to enable Containment, following the PSC decision on the disposal technology of the project.	
	Number of individuals reporting activities to reduce risk and exposure	Communities mining waste sites and unaware of health risks		Behavioural change reported by at least 150 community members and policy makers Gender Action Plan implemented	50%	National and local campaigns have been carried out in both countries. A Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) survey carried out in the Kyrgyz Republic reported that 149 of 187 participants of the survey changed their behaviour after the local campaigning and took precautionary measures to avoid places where burial sites or obsolete pesticide stores are located. Before the campaign 100 individuals stated that they had a neutral view on pesticides, 44 individuals stated that they had a positive view on pesticides and 36 individuals stated that they had a negative view on pesticides. More campaigning will be planned for the 2nd	S

Project Objective and Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-Term Target or Milestones	End of Project Target	Progress as of current period (numeric, percentage, or binary entry only)	Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June	Progress rating
						phase of the project. The KAP survey reporting from Tajikistan is not yet available. The project's Gender action plan is being implemented	

3.2 Rating of progress implementation towards delivery of outputs (Implementation Progress)

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
1 Disposal and risk reduction of POPs	Output 1.1: Demonstration technology piloted and results used to confirm commissioning	2024-12-31	20%	20%	The iSCWO technology is not available to the project and piloting the technology is no longer feasible. Regarding co-processing, both countries have officially declined the project's Plan B to dispose of the DDT waste using cement kilns. At the PSC meeting in November 2023 containment was selected as the only remaining disposal option in line with the General Technical Guidelines of the Basel Convention. Output indicator target: On-site pilot testing of iSCWO completed to confirm treatment technology including emissions testing. Progress: Tendering procedures to select a manufacturer of iSCWO and negotiations with the technology	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
					provider have been carried out. Negotiations did not result in a contract.	
	Output 1.2 Site specific management plans disclosed and submitted to government for approval	2024-12-31	80%	80%	Drafts of site specific management plans are 80% ready. The plans will be completed after agreement has been reached with the GEF Unit and the countries on the project revisions required for containment as disposal option. Output Indicator: 2 site specific clean-up plans for all wastes. Progress: 2 draft site specific management plans are ready and being finalized.	S
2 Long term capacity building for improved hazardous waste management	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	2023-12-31	40%	75%	A set of legal resolutions has been developed in both countries to enable the implementation of planned technical works. A Strategy on Environmentally Sound Management of POPs chemicals and waste has been developed in Tajikistan. A similar strategy is being developed in the Kyrgyz Republic. Endorsement and adoption of the resolutions and strategies by government is still pending. Discussions with focal points are ongoing whether there is a need to develop additional resolutions to enable Containment, following the PSC decision on the disposal technology of the project. Output indicator target:	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
					Strategy and Action Plan for ESM of hazardous waste management developed. Progress: Ongoing as explained above.	
	Output 2.2 Capacity of national environmental inspectors on environmental licensing and monitoring increased	2024-12-31	30%	75%	A Guideline on Licensing and a Guideline on Inspections have been developed by the project. In Kyrgyzstan the National waste management consultant adapted these guidelines to national requirements. In Tajikistan negotiations are ongoing on how to proceed further with the guidelines. One training on environmental licensing and inspection was organized in Kyrgyzstan. Further training is planned for both countries.	S
	Output 2.3: Stakeholder engagement and awareness raising campaigns conducted	2024-06-30	35%	90%	The awareness raising and communication training of national stakeholders has been completed. National and local awareness raising campaigns have been developed and carried out in both countries. In the Kyrgyz Republic 68 media stories on POPs have been published, (63 Social media posts, 4 internet blogs, 1 TV item) . In Tajikistan 1 media story has been published (National TV item). Since the start of the project 73 meetings were organized, 44 of them can be categorized as local community event close to a high risk site. Plans are being developed for further awareness raising during the	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
					second phase of the project. Output indicator target: Training of national NGOs, community organizations and political decision makers2 national campaign strategies developed. At least 20 media stories on POPs per country. At least 80 community events at 10 high risk sites. Progress: Trainings completed. Campaign strategies developed and implemented. More than 20 media stories published in Kyrgyzstan, less than required in Tajikistan. More than 50% of the required community events at high risk sites organized.	
	Output 2.4: Risk management at 10 additional sites designed and implementation started	2023-12-31	40%	70%	In cooperation with national governments 20 sites have been prioritized as high-risk sites. National Delivery Partner Ozone Center carried out 11 REA's in the Kyrgyz Republic. FSD subcontracted the NGO Peshaf that carried out 10 REA's in Tajikistan. Guidance was provided by the Technical Expert. Risk management plans are being developed by an engineering company in the Kyrgyz Republic. FSD is taking the responsibility for this in Tajikistan. Guidance is provided by the Technical Expert. Risk mitigation actions will start after the completion of the management plans in the Kyrgyz Republic.	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
					Risk mitigation actions at the national priority site Oykamar in Tajikistan have been completed. Output indicator target: Prioritization of top 20 risk sites. 10 Management Plans, and implementation of Risk reduction measures at 2 sites (one in each country). Progress: Prioritization of 20 sites completed. Management plans in progress. Risk reduction activities have been completed in Tajikistan and have not started yet in the Kyrgyz Republic.	
	Output 2.5: Appropriate strategy for continued private and public investment to sustain and expand project results shared with key stakeholders	2025-12-31	10%	20%	Under the knowledge management activities of the project, representatives of the two project countries participated in the The Eurasian “Green Energy & Waste Recycling Forum 2023” organized in July 2023. In September 2023, an online Disposal strategy disclosure meeting was organized. An international scientist in the field of combustion and non-combustion technologies of POPs disposal introduced the project stakeholders to risks from thermal and non-thermal disposal technologies and presented a review of international research of cement kiln co-processing. Output indicator target: Lessons and perspective publication on	S

Component	Output/Activity	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of previous reporting period (%)	Implementation status as of current reporting period (%)	Progress rating justification, description of challenges faced and explanations for any delay	Progress Rating
					demonstration pilot results. Exit/investment strategy developed with at least 5 banks and other regional partners. Progress: Ongoing as explained above.	
3 Long term capacity building for improved hazardous waste management	Output 3.1 Quarterly financial reports and annual progress reports monitoring status of project execution		N/A	N/A	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. Output indicator target: 20 quarterly reports; 5 PIR reports; 5 regional SC meetings. Progress: Reporting is as planned.	S
	Output 3.2 Midterm and Terminal evaluations of project impacts shared with project stakeholders		N/A	N/A	The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the project was completed in September 2023. Notwithstanding the serious delays the project faced in the start-up phase, the MTR rated the project as Moderately Satisfactory. In response to the occurred delays that were caused among others by COVID-19 and the unsuccessful tender for the procurement of the project's original disposal technology iSCWO, the MTR recommended to request the GEF for a 2-year project extension and propose a major project revision.	S

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

4 Risks

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

Please refer to the Risk Help Sheet for more details on rating

Risk Factor	EA Rating	TM Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low	Low
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Low	Low
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate	Moderate
4 Budget	Low	Low
5 Financial Management	Low	Low
6 Reporting	Low	Low
7 Capacity to deliver	Moderate	Moderate

If any of the risk factors is rated a Moderate or higher, please include it in Table B below

4.2 Table B. Risk-log

Implementation Status (Current PIR)

Insert ALL the risks identified either at CEO endorsement (inc. safeguards screening), previous/current PIRs, and MTRs. Use the last line to propose a suggested consolidated rating.

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
Complex procurement. including lack of suppliers with adequate capacity and experience.	C1/ Output 1.1. 1.3	H	H	H	M				↓	This risk has already occurred with the iSCWO technology. The risk can be lowered to Medium. now the decision is taken to select

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										containment as disposal option.
Delays in import of equipment	C1/ Output 1.1. 1.3	M	M	L	L				=	No technology import is expected as no iSCWO nor cement kiln co-processing will not be piloted in the project.
Lack of capacity available to manage sites	C2/ Output 2.4. 2.5	H	H	M	M				=	Training and guidance will be provided by project technical experts.
Project unable to transfer risk of operating technology to technology provider/ third party	C1/ Output 1.3	H	H	L	L				=	With containment as the selected disposal technology. design and construction will take place under the project's responsibility. For management of the containment sites after the end of the project. training and guidance will be provided by project technical experts.
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	M	M				=	EA to tender larger technical works through UNOPS and work closely with NDPs and participating countries in terms of execution of remaining contracting and procurement 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	H	H				=	Detailed site investigation in Tajikistan revealed more pesticides at the Vakhsh burial site. the pesticides were also buried deeper underground than anticipated during the PPG phase. Detailed site investigation in Kyrgyzstan met with resistance from local authorities. who

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										prohibited the use of an excavator. As a result it was impossible to confirm the site assessment from PPG phase.
Governments do not adopt revised hazardous waste management legislation	C2 / Output 2.1	L	L	L	L				=	EA to work closely with participating countries in reviewing and updating their legislations through a consultative procedure.
Treatment method / and or technology do not function as intended at full scale capacity	C1 / Output 1.3	M	M	N/A	N/A				=	This risk has already occurred with the iSCWO technology. It does not have the potential to become a risk for co-processing as this disposal technology is globally widely used for hazardous waste disposal and international best practices on co-processing are ready for use.
Local infrastructure is not provided or is not adequate for project needs	C1 / Output 1.3	M	M	L	L				=	The main prerequisite of this risk is the lack of suitable road to Suzak A. to transport the waste off site. when an alternative containment location will be designated by the government. Costs to improve the quality of the road are included in the revised project budget.
Accident or spill during the field waste operations.	C1 / Output 1.1. 1.3	H	H	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	M	M				=	This is not initiated. Baseline emission monitoring will be carried out in line with best practices for emission control and emission monitoring will

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										be followed including the guidelines of the Basel Convention.
Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project	C1. C2 / Output 1.4. 2.4	M	M	M	M				=	This is not initiated. The Risk based management plans will include additional containment measures to contain lower level wastes and polluted soils when required.
Access of people or animals to site during operations	C1. C2/ Output 1.1. 1.3. 1.4 / Output 2.4	L	L	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	L	L				=	Containment of pesticides does not affect climate change risk.
Child or forced labour engaged at project sites	C1. C2/ Output 1.1. 1.3. 1.4 / Output 2.4	L	L	L	L				=	N/A at this stage.
Stakeholders including the public country do not accept technology	C1 / all outputs	M	M	H	L				=	NGOs in Kyrgyzstan have lobbied against thermal disposal technologies. Both governments were concerned that co-processing would not be safe. With containment as the selected disposal technology there is a very low risk that stakeholders will not accept the disposal technology.
Existing inspectors are available to participate in training and able to translate learning into improvements in practices	C2 / Output 2.2		L	L	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

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										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	M	M				=	Regular consultations with stakeholders at all levels were carried out and regular visits to the two project countries were organized to invest in the quality of the project's stakeholder cooperation. First Knowledge. Attitudes and Practices (KAP) survey reporting from the Kyrgyz Republic has shown that local communities are able to change their behaviour as a result of well implemented awareness raising activities. It is planned to continue the campaigning activities in the second phase of the project when the actual implementation of technical works starts.
		M	M	M	L				↓	At PIR 3 the assessment of risks has been lowered for 2 indicated risks. 1 Complex procurement and 2 Non acceptance of the disposal technology by stakeholders. With the change of disposal technology to

Risks	Risk affecting: Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	Current PIR	Δ	Justification
										containment is assessed to be low.

4.3 Table C. Outstanding Moderate, Significant, and High risks

Additional mitigation measures for the next periods

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
Implementation schedule	In view of the delays incurred the EA project team focused strongly on efficient project implementation.	The same approach to avoid further implementation delays continued during this reporting period. Also the team followed-up with the MTR review recommendation to revise the project and request for a project extension. Adaptive management was needed to deal with the concerns of the countries about the safety and practical applicability of co-processing.	EA to continue focusing on efficient implementation. MTR/ RPSC to advise on the need for a project extension.	24/25	EA
Capacity to deliver	Regarding the non-availability of a project focal point for the Kyrgyz Republic. the EA wrote a series of official letters asking for the appointment of a Focal Point and met with the Minister of Natural	After some temporary appointments the issue was finally solved by the appointment of the current Kyrgyz Focal Point on 11 July 2023. Similarly. in Tajikistan. changes were made and on	To strengthen country project ownership and commitment to the project the EA will need to further intensify its communication and cooperation with the Focal	24/25	EA

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
	resources. Ecology and Technical Supervision.	29-September 2023 a new project Focal Point was appointed. To create more county ownership and commitment to the project the EA has had frequent contacts with the new Kyrgyz and Tajik Focal Points.	Points in both countries.		
Complex procurement. including lack of suppliers with adequate capacity and experience.	Anticipating future needs of highly technical specialized services for waste handling and or containment measures the EA with support of IA has been contacting specialized companies in the region to understand what services are regionally available to the project.	Close cooperation between the EA and IA resulted in the decision to prioritize the use of tendering procedures via a UN specialized agency for the implementation of major planned technical works of waste handling and containment measures. The rest of the planned activities will be implemented via the project's NDPs and direct contracting and procurement of the EA.	Acquired knowledge about available technical specialized companies. NGOs and scientific institutes needs to be developed further.	24/25	EA
Lack of capacity available to manage sites	In close cooperation with FSD in Tajikistan and Ozone Center in Kyrgyzstan guidance and support from the project's Technical Advisor was provided on how to	The same approach of providing the required guidance was implemented during this project period.	During the implementation of the second phase of the project. capacity building of national experts and authorities will be prioritized in view of future	24/25	EA/NDP's

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
	implement technical project tasks at the relevant sites.		governmental responsibilities for sound management of the relevant sites after completion of the project.		
Challenges with executing field activities in countries, including lack of transparency in financial management	In line with the EA's policy due diligence is carried out in the selection process of organizations contracted under the project. Contracts 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. The EA worked closely with partners from participating countries and activities were coordinated from both Almaty and Geneva offices.	The EA approach to the mentioned challenges in the previous reporting period was quite successful and was repeated in this reporting period. Systematic monitoring of the implementation of the planned activities was carried out and an investment was made in partnership building with project partners by regular visits to the countries.	The same approach will be repeated.	24/25	EA/NDP's
Inadequate resources to support disposal and remediation efforts, including risk of higher-	Site surveys in Tajikistan have provided sufficient additional information to provide for timely adaptive management	The project's approach to the risk that there are inadequate resources to dispose anticipated quantities	The same approach will be repeated.	24/25	EA and IA

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
than-anticipated quantities of wastes to be addressed (inaccuracies in site baseline investigations during PPG)	based on the project decision to select containment as disposal technology. In Kyrgyzstan the use of an excavator has been prohibited by local authorities and the PPG investigation could not be confirmed in great detail. Additional investigations might be needed in Kyrgyzstan.	implemented earlier was repeated in this reporting period. Additional investigations might be needed in Kyrgyzstan depending on the national government decision on where to contain the Suzak A. pesticide waste. (A decision on where to contain the waste is pending. The Kyrgyz authorities prioritize containment away from the current location at Suzak A. but have not yet designated a suitable alternative location.)			
Accident or spill during the field waste operations.	As the risk was not relevant in the start-up phase of the project. there are no actions to be reported	As the risk was not relevant in this phase of the project. there are no actions to be reported	Proper HSE plan timely developed and endorsed by contractors and governments	24/25	EA. national delivery partners. contractors
Emissions to air and water during waste treatment	As the risk was not relevant in the start-up phase of the project. there are no actions to be reported	Planning for emissions control for Plan C (containment) has commenced . including specific elements of the legal update. environmental impact assessment and permitting on approval of the EIA by national authorities.	Proper HSE plan timely developed and endorsed by contractors and governments. Development of EIA. improved emissions laboratory capacity and permitting of the	24/25	EA. national delivery partners. contractors

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
			containment facilities.		
Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project	As the risk was not relevant in the previous phase of the project. there are no actions to be reported	As the risk was not relevant in this phase of the project. there are no actions to be reported	The Risk based management plans will include additional containment measures to contain lower level wastes and polluted soils when required. Close cooperation with National Delivery Partners and Governments to identify this risk when relevant.	24/25	EA. national delivery partners. contractors
Local communities and media reluctant or unable to support risk-reduction measures and change behaviours as proposed by project	Regular consultations with stakeholders at all levels including national and local awareness raising campaigns were carried out and regular visits to the two project countries were organized to invest in the quality of the project's stakeholder cooperation.	The same approach to stakeholder cooperation at all levels was repeated during this reporting period.	The same approach to stakeholder cooperation at all levels will be repeated. With the decision taken to select containment as the project's disposal technology. awareness raising and communication will now focus more on planned containment measures.	24/25	EA. NDP's and awareness raising partner NGOs
Stakeholders and Safeguards: Local communities and workers engaged with the implementation of the	An International expert with experience in mainstreaming gender equality and protection of vulnerable groups was contracted.	Embedded in the project's Gender Policy Brief and the project's Gender Guidance. developed by the Gender Expert a project stakeholder	The same approach to stakeholder safeguards will be repeated during this reporting period. This approach will include	24/25	EA. NDPs and other project partners engaged with the implementation of the project.

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
<p>project's technical works run health and safety risks associated with the project activities.</p>		<p>grievance and redress mechanism was established using existing UNEP arrangements on: Integrity and Fraud and Corruption https://www.unep.org/about-un-environment-programme/policies-and-strategies/unesp-integrity-and-fraud-and-corruption and Prevention and Response to Sexual Misconduct https://www.unep.org/about-un-environment-programme/policies-and-strategies/prevention-and-response-sexual-misconductThe establishment of the project's grievance and redress mechanism was coordinated with UNEP legal staff members. A project seminar was organized for National Delivery Partners and Project Experts to introduce the Gender policy and guidance and highlight the stakeholder grievance and</p>	<p>amongst others a review by the Gender expert of draft versions of the project's Risk based management plans associated Health & Safety plans.</p>		

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
		redress mechanism. Further safeguards for stakeholders are being dealt with in the Project's different Risk Based Management Plans and associated Health & Safety Plans.			
Gender: Women and vulnerable groups are treated unequally by the project. will be excluded from capacity building opportunities and possibly face extra health and safety risks associated with the project implementation.	An International expert with experience in mainstreaming gender equality and protection of vulnerable groups was contracted. Embedded in the project's Gender Policy Brief and the project's Gender Guidance. developed by the Gender Expert a project stakeholder grievance and redress mechanism was established using existing UNEP arrangements on: Integrity and Fraud and Corruption https://www.unep.org/about-un-environment-programme/policies-and-strategies/unep-integrity-and-fraud-and-corruption and	The same approach to Gender mainstreaming was repeated during this reporting period. Additional measures were taken to further raise the percentage of women participation.	The same approach to Gender mainstreaming will be repeated during this reporting period. This approach will include amongst others a review by the Gender expert of draft versions of the project's Risk based management plans and associated Health & Safety plans. Additional measures will be prepared to further raise the percentage of women participation and ways to properly record participation of vulnerable groups.	24/25	EA. NDPs and other project partners engaged with the implementation of the project.

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIRt-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	What	When	By Whom
	Prevention and Response to Sexual Misconduct https://www.unep.org/about-un-environment-programme/policies-and-strategies/prevention-and-response-sexual-misconduct . Further safeguards for stakeholders are being dealt with in the Project's different Risk Based Management Plans and associated Health & Safety Plans.				

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. 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 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.

5 Amendment - GeoSpatial

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. Please tick each category for which a change occurred in the fiscal year of reporting and provide a description of the change that occurred in the textbox. You may attach supporting document as appropriate

5.1 Table A: Listing of all Minor Amendment (TM)

Minor Amendments	Changes
Results Framework:	No
Components and Cost:	No
Institutional and implementation arrangements:	No
Financial Management:	No
Implementation Schedule:	
Executing Entity:	No
Executing Entity Category:	No
Minor project objective change:	No
Safeguards:	No
Risk analysis:	No
Increase of GEF financing up to 5%:	No
Location of project activity:	No
Other:	

Minor amendments

5.2 Table B: History of project revisions and/or extensions (TM)

Version	Type	Signed/Approved by UNEP	Entry Into Force (last signature Date)	Agreement Expiry Date	Main changes introduced in this revision
Original Legal Instrument		2020-09-16	2020-09-16	2025-12-31	
Amendment 1	Revision	2023-10-02	2023-10-02	2025-12-31	Amendment of agreement with additional activities with budget added.

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 Description	Activity Description
Vakhsh Polygon	37.714742	68.91916	Vakhs	Dumpsite	
Suzak A Polygon	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]

Additional Supporting Documents:

Filename	File Uploaded By	File Uploaded At	
Map KG and TJ.jpg	Executing Agency	2024-07-25 15:39:26	Download
GEFID_9421_Central Asia DDT_PIR_2023_final.pdf	CW TM	2024-06-25 11:38:08	Download