



UNEP GEF PIR Fiscal Year 2023

1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023

1- Identification

1.1 Project details

GEF ID	9421	SMA IPMR ID	33851
Project Short Title	DDT Central Asia	Grant ID	S1-32GFL-000632
		Umoja WBS	SB-007599
Project Title	Demonstration of non-thermal treatment of DDT wastes in Central Asia (Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan)		
Project Type	Full Sized Project (FSP)	Duration months	Planned 60
Parent Programme if child project			Age 35.0 months
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	Completion Date	Planned - original PCA 30-Jun-25
Project Scope	Regional		Revised - Current PCA
Region	Asia Pacific	Date of CEO Endorsement/Approval	13-Feb-20
Countries	Republic of Tajikistan Kyrgyz Republic	UNEP Project Approval Date (on Decision Sheet)	2-Mar-20
GEF financing amount	USD 15,120,000	PCA entering into force	16-Sep-20
Co-financing amount	USD 29,062,033	Start of Implementation (Date of 1st Disbursement)*	30-Oct-20
Total disbursement as of 30 June	USD 2,403,510	Date of Inception Workshop, if available	15-Jun-21
Total expenditure as of 30 June	USD 700,087	Midterm undertaken?	Yes
		Actual Mid-term Date, if taken	On-going
		Expected Mid-Term Date**	31-Aug-23
		Expected Terminal Evaluation Date	30-Jun-26
		Expected Financial Closure Date	30-Dec-26

* As per Legal Agreement signed with the EA, project effectiveness is defined as "the date of receipt of first disbursement or sub-allotment".

**A Mid-Term will be undertaken only if projects expenditures are 30% or above planned budget. If below the 30% threshold, a management review will be carried out by PM/TM.

1.2 EA: 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 Contact

Division(s) Implementing the project	Industry and Economy Division, GEF Chemicals and Waste Unit	Executing Agency(ies)	UNEP Regional Office for Europe, UNEP Subregional Office for Central Asia
Name of co-implementing Agency		Names of Other Project Partners	Swiss Fund for Mine Action - FSD (Republic of Tajikistan), Ozone Center (Kyrgyz Republic)
TM: UNEP Portfolio Manager(s)	Ludovic Bernaudat	EA: Manager/Representative	Mijke Hertoghs
TM: UNEP Task Manager(s)	Russell Cobban	EA: Project Manager	Wouter Pronk
TM: UNEP Budget/Finance Officer	Anuradha Shenoy	EA: Finance Manager	Erika Mattsson
TM: UNEP Support/Assistant		EA: Communications lead, if relevant	

2- OVERVIEW OF PROJECT STATUS

2.1 UNEP PoW & UN	TM: UNEP Current Subprogramme(s) TM: PoW Indicator(s)	Chemicals and Pollution Action PoW Outcomes: 3A, 3B and 3C PoW Indicators: i, ii, 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: UNEP previous Subprogramme(s)	n/a
	EA: UNSDCF/UNDAF linkages	<p>The relevant project countries UNDAF strategic objectives the project contributes to are:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>		

EA: Link to relevant SDG Goals

SDG 3 Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
 SDG7 Clean and affordable energy
 SDG 12 Ensure sustainable consumption and production
 SDG 13 Measures to combat climate change

EA: Link to relevant SDG Targets

SDG3 Target: 3.9
 SDG7 Target: 7b.
 SDG 12 Target: 12.4
 SDG 13 Targets: 13.1, 13.2

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

2.2 GEF Core or Sub Indicators

Indicators	Targets - Expected value			Materialised to date
	Mid-term	End-of-project	Total Target	
9.1: Solid and liquid Persistent Organic Pollutants (POP) destroyed	Preliminary POPs destruction testing completed in US On site pilot testing of iSCWO completed to confirm treatment technology including emission testing	5,000	5,000 tons of DDT and associated waste	0
9.4: Countries with legislation and policy implemented	Advice for updating legislation submitted to government Strategy and Action Plan for ESM of hazardous waste management developed	2	2 national hazardous waste management strategies approved	0
11: People benefitting from GEF-financed investment	Not specified	150,000	150,000 people	193
11.1: Male		75,000	75,000 male	125 male
11.2: Female		75,000	75,000 female	68 female

Implementation Status 2023 2nd PIR

	PIR #	Rating towards outcomes (DO) (section 3.1)	Rating towards outputs (IP) (section 3.2)	Risk rating (section 4.2)
FY 2023	2nd PIR	MS	MS	M
FY 2022	1st PIR	MU	MU	M

2.3 Implementation status & Risk

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

During the second year of PIR reporting, the project has made significant progress against the approved annual workplan and budget, particularly in Component 2 despite of the challenges faced during the implementation which includes procurement. A project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting followed by a Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting was organized to discuss the progress, finalize workplan and initiate discussions on the corrective actions needed to effectively implement the project. UNEP initiated the Mid-Term Review of the project in April 2023 and is expected to complete by Q3 2023. The summary of project progress by components is provided below:

Component 1: Progress in the implementation of Component 1 has encountered significant challenges due to various reasons including COVID-19 pandemic and procurement of approved Industrial Supercritical Water Oxidation (iSCWO) technology. UNEP completed the full process of procurement of iSCWO technology with the only commercial vendor available globally. However, the negotiations with vendor were not successful due to number of reasons including substantial price rises, of approximately double the estimated cost, and the vendor's reservations to accept UN contractual conditions. The reason for prices increase was attributed to supply chain issues caused by COVID-19 and other global challenges including instability in the region. As a result of the non-feasibility iSCWO, the decision was made in consultation with PSC and TWG to investigate alternative disposal technologies/methods approved by the Basel Convention technical guidelines as a contingency plan. The assessment of alternative technologies mentioned in the pro-doc is being carried out. Recently, the Government of Tajikistan communicated with UNEP that mobile incineration would be a safer disposal option and provided information on a possible technology provider that builds mobile incineration plants. The request is being reviewed by UNEP and appropriate action will be taken in line with the Basel Convention technical guidelines and MTR recommendations.

Component 2: On track. Legal GAP analyses were carried out for the 2 countries and preliminary report has been prepared and being updated to follow the project requirement. Detailed site investigations in both countries are complete including geological and radiological investigations. REA activities are complete in Kyrgyzstan and being carried out in Tajikistan. The planned risk-based site management plan is being developed for Tajikistan. The site management plan for Kyrgyzstan was put on hold while assessment of alternative technologies is being carried out. Bioremediation trials are being initiated in partnership with Kazakhstani academia for Tajikistan while the project is waiting for FAO funded trial results in Kyrgyzstan to assess whether funding further bioremediation trials using the same approach would be useful. Awareness raising trainings were conducted for stakeholders in both countries by national delivery partners.

The ongoing MTR will provide recommendations of further corrective actions that may support project in effective implementation. Recommendations from the MTR will also be used as important input for a possible redesign of the project as the original proposed disposal technology of iSCWO is no longer available to the project. 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 and TWG 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 (~\$613,844) largely matched forecasted amounts (~\$627,686) amidst the cancellation of procurement under Component 1.

2.4 Co-finance

EA: Planned Co-finance

USD 29,062,033

EA: Actual to date:

USD 519,515

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

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. 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. Because of the fact that the Kyrgyz Focal Point has stepped down, it is very difficult to get confirmation from the country on realized co-financing. The here provided amount is an estimate that needs of be further confirmed with the government.

ider

EA: Date of project steering committee meeting

11/15/2022

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

At the Steering Committee Meetings (Regional and National) 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 have been informed that the project is encouraging their participation in awareness raising and communication activities of the project. A consortium of local Kyrgyz NGOs was selected to carry out the awareness raising activities and campaigning in Kyrgyzstan, while in Tajikistan this work is being implemented by FSD with involvement of local stakeholders.

2.6. Gender

TM: Does the project have a gender action plan? Yes

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

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. Project's international Gender Equality Specialist developed overall 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 first project Gender Workshop took place on 20 December 2022, Mr Bregigui and both project managers gave presentations on the approach to Gender mainstreaming and spoke to wide audience of project partners on importance of gender equality and protection of vulnerable groups. In this reporting period the project a total of 193 stakeholders were involved in meetings, trainings and seminars of the project, 125 men and 68 women. The percentage of women involved has gone up in this reporting period from 21% (PIR 1) to 35% (PIR 2).

2.7. ESSM

TM: Was the project classified as moderate/high risk at CEO Endorsement/Approval Stage? Yes

TM: If yes, what specific safeguard risks were identified in the SRIF/ESERN?
 SS 2: Resource Efficiency, Pollution Prevention and Management of Chemicals and Wastes

TM: Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during the reporting period? No

TM: If yes, please describe the new risks, or changes

TM & EA: Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential) during the reporting period? No

TM & EA: If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the status, significant

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

Due to the transition from the proposed selected technology to another alternative, 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, has a potential to become an important risk as the project lacks any non-thermal disposal technologies to be used as plan B. Therefore, the negative perception of any combustion treatment particularly in Kyrgyzstan may cause significant disruption to project activities. Since Tajikistan has already issued a letter declining the proposed method of co-processing in cement kilns the project may be forced to divert to a containment option instead of any type of disposal. To manage Environmental and Social Risks from co-processing using cement plants and in compliance with GEF STAP requirements regarding co-processing, the project is collecting additional information on amongst others compliance of co-processing with Basel Convention, EU directives and other international standards, fate of heavy metals and mercury, baseline emission data of involved cement plants, impacts on climate change, liability insurance. In addition the project is carrying out a series of Disposal Strategy Meetings where independent information on risks of different disposal technologies including co-processing are provided to country stakeholders.

2.8. KM/Learning

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

The Project manager presented the project and its achieved results at a BRS COP side event to an international audience of DDT project stakeholders on May 3rd, 2023 in Geneva.
A first Disposal Strategy Disclosure Meeting was held during the Regional Steering Committee Meeting of the project in November 2022. The Project's International Expert Co-processing Ed Verhamme gave his analysis of the potential to co-process DDT waste in Central Asian cement plants as a commercially viable and sustainable technology for POPs (and other waste streams) disposal in the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan.
Preparations were made to invite project partners to the Green Energy & Waste Recycling Forum (GEWR) that will take place on 4 and 5 July 2023 in Astana Kazakhstan. The project will bring together governmental representatives of the two project countries to discuss lessons learned from the project as an input for governmental strategic decision making on the feasibility of co-processing.

Please attach a copy of any products

EA: Main learning during the period

Delay in nomination of focal points: In Kyrgyzstan, there have been difficulties in gaining a nomination for the Project Focal Point representing the Ministry for Natural Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision. The EA is continuing to emphasize the importance of this position to the project and its successful outcome.
Technology identification: In both The Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan more regular occasions will be made to bring decision makers together to discuss the longer term potential of commercially viable and sustainable technologies for waste disposal such as co-processing using cement kilns. The project is designed to discuss longer term waste management at different stages with national governments and this will give further opportunity for planned discussions on the decision making process. UNEP has received an official letter from the Tajik government stating that its experts have concluded that co-processing is not a safe enough disposal option in view of risks for public health and the environment. More regular meetings will allow concerns by either party to be raised to prevent them from becoming more serious.

2.9. Stories

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

Not the case yet.

3. RATING PROJECT PERFORMANCE

3.1 Rating of progress towards achieving the project outcomes (Development Objectives)

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)	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	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 currently becoming available. Actual capacity building will take place in the coming year.	MS
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	3,348 tons of Cat 1 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)	20%	Procurement process of iSCWO technology was concluded and negotiations with the only commercial vendor were discontinued due to substantial rises in costs and transfer of risk and responsibility to the project and local partners. Risk reduction of contaminated soil is directly linked to the selection of the project's disposal technology. If plan B would be adopted, then the total of category II soils would be also disposed in cement kilns as a mixing agent to reduce the chlorine content of the waste. Therefore, before governments and the GEF approve the project's disposal technology neither 5000 tons of POPs, nor 36000 of contaminated soils can be managed.	MS
	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	10%	Establishment of licensed facilities will start once the project's disposal technology is selected. However, an International Expert Licensing and subsequent National Experts have been recruited and started to develop Guidance on environmental licensing and impact assessment for waste management activities and facilities in line with best international practice.	MS
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.	N/A	Environmental inspection protocols and annual reports 260 inspectors; 10 NGO staff; policy makers trained	5%	Due to the delays at project start and the change in the proposed disposal technology, training of inspectors have not started yet. However, as mentioned above, project experts have started their work on the subject of licensing, permitting and inspection. Planned trainings will follow suit.	MS

	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	N/A	2 national hazardous waste management strategies approved. Risks reduction measures elaborated for ten priority sites	15%	Legal GAP analyses were carried out for the 2 countries, but the documents focused too much on agricultural lifecycle aspects of pesticides and the project management recruited a different International legal expert to achieve a better focus on the planned technical work of the project. Hazardous Waste Management strategies will be prepared after completion of legal gap analysis and recommendations to the governments.	MS
	Number of individuals reporting activities to reduce risk and exposure	Communities mining waste sites and unaware of health risks	N/A	Behavioural change reported by at least 150 community members and policy makers Gender Action Plan implemented	25%	The International awareness raising and communication expert carried out a training programme for local partners in the countries in preparation of national campaigns and local campaigns aimed at vulnerable groups living close to the burial sites of concern and other hotspots throughout both countries. Activities are planned to start in Q3 2023. The project's Gender action plan is being implemented	MS

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	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
--	-----	--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

For joint projects and where applicable ratings should also be discussed with the Task Manager of co-implementing agency.

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

Output	Expected completion date	Implementation status as of 30 June 2022 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	Implementation status as of 30 June 2023 (%) (Towards overall project targets)	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	5%	20%	The iSCWO technology is not available to the project and piloting the technology is no longer feasible. Regarding co-processing, Tajikistan has officially declined the project's Plan B to dispose of the DDT waste using cement kilns. A decision making process with Kyrgyzstan and the Aravan cement company is on-going. 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 provider have been carried out. Negotiations did not result in a contract.	MS
Output 1.2 Site specific management plans disclosed and submitted to government for approval	Q1 2024	2%	80%	Drafts of site specific management plans are for 80% ready. Without a final agreement with the governments of both project countries on the disposal technology it is not possible to further progress with site specific management plans as the volume of the contaminated soil to be managed is not clear. Based on the co-processing feasibility studies and further discussions with the two governments, the options of co-processing in cement kilns or waste containment will be assessed in line with the project's decision making process as described in the project document. Output Indicator: 2 site specific clean-up plans for all wastes. Progress: 2 draft site specific management plans are ready and being finalized.	S
Output 1.3: Non-thermal technology is scaled up and site installations complete	2025	0%	N/A	As above. It is understood that based on the MTR the results framework of the project will need to be updated. The outcome of an agreement with the two governments on the disposal technology needs also to be included in this update. Output Indicator target: iSCWO imported and installed in 2 countries Power and water supply in place Solar farm commissioned. Progress: No progress as iSCWO technology is not available to the project.	MS

Output 1.4 Excavated POPs wastes are destroyed in an environmentally sound manner	2025	0%	N/A	As above. It is understood that based on the MTR the results framework of the project will need to be updated. The outcome of an agreement with the two governments on the disposal technology needs also to be included in this update. Output indicator target: Pre-treatment and blending of Cat I wastes – Est 40,000 tons of liquid feedstock. Progress: Feasibility Study on co-incineration using cement kilns and other project activities in support of Plan B are strongly progressing.	MS
---	------	----	-----	---	----

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	5%	40%	Legal activities needed correction from the project team to make sure that the legal work would enable all planned technical works of the project, including Plan B co-processing activities. A new International Expert with hands on experience in drafting POPs laws was selected. Gap Analyses and recommendations on legal reform and a strategic approach to hazardous waste developed under guidance of the previous International Legal Expert are being updated. After agreeing the recommendations with both governments the hazardous waste management strategies will be developed. Output indicator target: Strategy and Action Plan for ESM of hazardous waste management developed. Progress: Ongoing as explained above.	S
Output 2.2 Capacity of national environmental inspectors on environmental licensing and monitoring increased	2024	5%	30%	Licensing and permitting activities were delayed by setbacks in the recruitment of the project's international experts. The International Licensing and Permitting Expert supported the selection process of national experts. She also prepared for licensing kick-off meetings in TJ and KG and is carrying out an assessment of the baseline situation regarding licensing and permitting in project countries. Output Indicator target: 260 inspectors trained . Progress: Ongoing as explained above.	S
Output 2.3: Stakeholder engagement and awareness raising campaigns conducted	2025	5%	35%	Awareness raising and communication training of national stakeholders in support of the development of national and local campaigns in the two project countries is complete. National campaign strategies are being developed. Output indicator target: Training of national NGOs, community organizations and political decision makers 2 national campaign strategies developed. At least 20 media stories on POPs per country. At least 80 community events at 10 high risk sites. Progress: Ongoing as explained above.	S
Output 2.4: Risk management at 10 additional sites designed and implementation started	Q4,2023	2%	40%	Prioritization of 10 highest risk sites was completed in both countries in cooperation with the national governments. In Tajikistan in direct dialogue with the project's Focal Point, in Kyrgyzstan in dialogue with the National Delivery partner Ozone Center and subsequent endorsement by the Ministry of National Resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision at the National Steering Committee. National Delivery Partner Ozone Center carried out 11 REA's under guidance of Technical Expert. FSD subcontracted the NGO Peshaf that is carrying out the REA's in Tajikistan. Risk management plans will be developed by the National Delivery Partners under Guidance of the Technical Expert upon completion of the REA's and prioritization the highest risk sites. Risk mitigation actions will start after endorsement by the national government of the Risk management plans. Output indicator target: Prioritization of top 20 risk sites. 10 Management Plans and 2 Risk Reduction. Progress: Prioritization of 20 sites completed. Management plans under progress. Risk reduction will be carried out at later stage.	S
Output 2.5: Appropriate strategy for continued private and public investment to sustain and expand project results shared with key stakeholders	2025	0%	10%%	As the project has not completed the decision making process on the selection of the proposed Plan B disposal technology of co-processing yet, lessons learned and publications on the subject have not been developed. In terms of knowledge sharing, compliance with GEF requirements on environmental and social safeguards for co-processing and to support transparent decision making, the project is organizing a series of Project Disposal Strategy Meetings to inform project stakeholders on the potential of introducing co-processing in cement plants as a commercially viable and sustainable technology for POPs (and other waste streams) disposal in the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan. A knowledge session is planned to share best practices of long-term emission sampling of Dioxins/POPs; International research on non-combustion technologies and POPs destruction; and International experience with different types of combustion technologies. Output indicator target: Lessons and perspective publication on deminstration pilot results. Exit/investment strategy developed with at least 5 banks and other regional partners. Progress: Ongoing as explained above.	S

Under Comp 3

Output 3.1 Quarterly financial reports and annual progress reports monitoring status of project execution	Continuously ongoing	NA	NA	<p>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.</p> <p>Progress: Reporting is as planned.</p>	S
Output 3.2 Midterm and Terminal evaluations of project impacts shared with project stakeholders	<p>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.</p>	NA	NA	MTR is underway.	S

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

4 Risk Rating

4.1 Table A. Project management Risk

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

Risk Factor	EA's Rating	TM's Rating
1 Management structure - Roles and responsibilities	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Well developed, stable Management Structure and Roles/responsibilities are clearly defined/understood. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
2 Governance structure - Oversight	Moderate: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Moderate: Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet at least once a year and Active membership and participation in decision-making processes. SC provides direction/inputs. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
3 Implementation schedule	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Moderate: Project progressing according to work plan and Adaptive management and regular monitoring. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
4 Budget	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Activities are progressing within planned budget and Balanced budget utilisation including PMC. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
5 Financial Management	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for and Audit reports provided regularly and confirm correct use of funds. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
6 Reporting	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.	Low : Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and Reports are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues. Low likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery.
7 Capacity to deliver	Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery	Moderate: Sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners and Capacity gaps were addressed before implementation or during early stages. Moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the project delivery

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)

2nd 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.

Risk	Risk affecting:	Risk Rating						Variation respect to last rating		
	Outcome / outputs	CEO ED	PIR 1	PIR 2	PIR 3	PIR 4	PIR 5	PIR 6	Δ	Justification
Operational/delivery risks										
Complex procurement, including lack of suppliers with adequate capacity and experience.	C1/ Output 1.1, 1.3	H	H	H					=	This risk has already occurred with the iSCWO technology and has a high potential to occur also when plan B will go forward.
Delays in import of equipment	C1/ Output 1.1, 1.3	M	M	L					↓	No technology import is expected as iSCWO will not be piloted in the project. There might be a low risks of delays in the import of equipment for technical modification of cement kilns.
Lack of capacity available to manage sites	C2/ Output 2.4, 2.5	H	H	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						↓	When co-processing will be applied the operation of the cement plant will rest with the cement company itself. If cement companies would evaluate co-processing as a high risk, they will not cooperate with the project.
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						=	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	H						=	Detailed site investigation in Tajikistan revealed more pesticides at the Vaksh 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 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						=	Based on the gap analyses currently being developed, recommendations will be drafted to propose an adequate revision of hazardous waste management legislation through a set of degrees regulating the planned technical works of the project. EA to work closely with participating countries in reviewing and updating their legislations through a consultative procedure.
Technical risks											
Treatment method / and or technology do not function as intended at full scale capacity	C1 / Output 1.3	M	M	Not Applicable						↓	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						=	The main prerequisite of this risk is the lack of suitable road to Suzak A. to transport the iSCWO facility. Since iSCWO is not available for the project the category of this risk is downgraded to low.
Environmental safeguard risks											
Accident or spill during the field waste operations.	C1 / Output 1.1, 1.3	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						=	This is not initiated. In line with the extra GEF STAP requirements for co-processing in cement kilns, baseline emission monitoring will be carried out when governments agree to use co-processing as disposal technology and international best practices for emission control and emission monitoring will be followed in line with the guidelines of the Basel Convention and other international standards.
Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project	C1 / Output 2.5	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						=	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						↓	Since wastes can be used as alternative fuels in cement plants, co-processing of wastes in cement kilns reduces the risks climate change. Containment of pesticides does not affect climate change risk.
Social risks											
Child or forced labour engaged at project sites	C1, C2/ Output 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 / Output 2.4	L	L	L						=	N/A at this stage.
Stakeholders including the public country do not accept technology	C1 / all outputs	M	M	H						↑	This is a high risk. EA has received a letter from the Tajik Committee for Environmental Protection that it assesses co-processing not a safe enough disposal option. Also NGOs in Kyrgyzstan have lobbied against thermal disposal technologies. In compliance with GEF requirements on environmental and social safeguards for co-processing and to support transparent decision making, the project is organizing a series of Project Disposal Strategy Meetings to inform project stakeholders on the potential of introducing co-processing in cement plants as a commercially viable and sustainable technology for POPs (and other waste streams) disposal in the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan.
Existing inspectors are available to participate in training and able to translate learning into improvements in practices	C2 / Output 2.2		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 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						=	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. However, as the technical works and the campaigns did not start yet, it is not clear whether this risk will become an issue.
Consolidated project risk		M	M	M						=	At PIR 2 the assessment of risks has been lowered for 4 outputs. Only the risk that stakeholders do not accept the proposed disposal technology has been assessed as increased from Moderate to High.

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

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

Risk	Actions decided during the previous reporting instance (PIR-1, MTR, etc.)	Actions effectively undertaken this reporting period	Additional mitigation measures for the next periods		
			What	When	By whom

Governance structure - Oversight	During the previous reporting period a Regional Technical Meeting was held instead of the planned Regional Steering Committee Meeting as official representation of the Kyrgyz Government could not be guaranteed caused by the lack of a Project Focal Point.	The organization and implementation of the Regional and National Steering Committee's went well in the previous reporting period. However, given the non-availability of a project Focal Point in Kyrgyzstan structural communication with the Kyrgyz governmental stakeholders was difficult. EA wrote a series of official letters asking for the appointment of a Focal Point and met with the Minister of Natural resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision during a country visit in September 22.	EA will announce the date of the second Regional Steering Committee Meeting well in advance to secure participation of all relevant project stakeholders.	2023	EA
Implementation schedule	In view of the occurred delays, EA Project team has been focusing very much on starting up project activities and speeding up the project implementation starting from March 2022.	The same approach to avoid further implementation delays continued during this reporting period.	EA to continue focusing on efficient implementation. MTR/ RPSC to advise on the need for a project extension.	2023	EA/MRT reviewer
Capacity to deliver	In view of the non-availability of a Project Focal Point until March 22, project communication with project stakeholders in support of the development of a sound technical and managerial capacity of institutions and other project partners was difficult to achieve. There is a strong focus within the Tajik Government on it's priority issue of mini dumpsites, the project team has tried in bilateral meetings with the Tajik Focal Point tried to focus back on the agreed project document and the services and capacity building that the project intends to provide to the country.	As during the previous reporting period. In addition EA wrote a series of official letters asking for the appointment of a Focal Point and met with the Minister of Natural resources, Ecology and Technical Supervision during a country visit in September 22.	With a Focal Point appointed since March 22, EA will need to intensify its communication and cooperation with Kyrgyz Governmental Stakeholders and continue close cooperation with the Tajik Focal Point.	23/25	EA
Complex procurement, including lack of suppliers with adequate capacity and experience.	Complex procurement was handled by UNEP's specialized procurement 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 partners. 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.	The inventory of available technical specialized companies needs to be developed further. As before larger complex procurement needs to be handled by UNEP's specialized procurement office with strategic input from EA and IA.	23/25	EA and IA
Lack of capacity available to manage sites	As reported in the Co-financing report of PIR 1, 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, including guidance and support from the project's Technical Advisor van de Coterlet to the NDP's on how to implement technical tasks at the relevant project sites.	The inventory of available technical specialized companies needs to be developed further.	23/24	EA and NDP's
Challenges with executing field activities in countries, including lack of transparency in financial management	Due diligence was carried out in the selection of National Delivery partners. Sub-contracting PCA's 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. EA to 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.	23/25	EA and NDP's

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)	Additional surveys were included to confirm the site investigations carried out during the PPG	Additional surveys in Tajikistan have provided sufficient additional information to provide for timely adaptive management when required based on project decision making regarding the disposal technology and or containment measures. In Kyrgyzstan the use of an excavator has been prohibited by local authorities and the PPG investigation could not be confirmed in great detail. However, it was agreed with Technical Advisor Guido van de Coteleret who is developing the Risk based management plans to perform additional site investigation using an excavator in case co-processing in the cement kiln of the Aravan cement plant will be used as disposal technology. In support of the development of an economic model for co-processing in the region, attempts where not yet successful to seek cooperation with the EBRD in connection with the organization's landfill reconstruction projects.	The same approach will be repeated. Regarding possible cooperation with the EBRD it might work to liase with a higher level management within the organization.	23/25	EA and IA
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 B (cement kilns) 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	24/25	EA, national delivery partners, contractors
Untreated wastes of all categories remain on site post project	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	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
Stakeholders including the public country do not accept technology	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.	EA has received a letter from the Tajik Committee for Environmental Protection that it assesses co-processing not a safe enough disposal option. Also NGOs in Kyrgyzstan have lobbied against thermal disposal technologies. In compliance with GEF requirements on environmental and social safeguards for co-processing and to support transparent decision making, the project is organizing a series of Project Disposal Strategy Meetings to inform project stakeholders on the potential of introducing co-processing in cement plants as a commercially viable and sustainable technology for POPs (and other waste streams) disposal in the Kyrgyz Republic and Tajikistan.	The project will adhere to international guidelines and standards to mitigate any perceived and actual risks. Peer review of alternative disposal technologies will be undertaken by internationally recognised experts.	24/25	EA and NDP's
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 were carried out and regular visits to the two project countries were organized to invest in the quality of the project's stakeholder cooperation. However, as the technical works and the campaigns did not start yet, it was not clear whether this risk will become an issue.	The same approach to stakeholder cooperation at all levels was repeated during this reporting period.	The same approach to stakeholder cooperation at all levels was repeated during this reporting period. When the decision on the project's disposal technology and or containment measures will be taken more targetted communication with local communities will be developed.	24/25	EA, NDP's and awareness raising partner NGOs

<p>Stakeholders and Safeguards: Local communities and workers engaged with the implementation of the project's technical works run health and safety risks associated with the project activities.</p>	<p>An International expert with experience in mainstreaming gender equality and protection of vulnerable groups was contracted.</p>	<p>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 Prevention and Response to Sexual Misconduct https://www.unep.org/about-un-environment-programme/policies-and-strategies/prevention-and-response-sexual-misconduct The 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 redress mechanism. Further safeguards for stakeholders are being dealt with in the Project's different Risk Based Management Plans and associated Health & Safety Plans.</p>	<p>The same approach to stakeholder safeguards 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 associated Health & Safety plans.</p>	<p>24/25</p>	<p>EA, NDPs and other project partners engaged with the implementation of the project.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>An International expert with experience in mainstreaming gender equality and protection of vulnerable groups was contracted.</p>	<p>A Gender Policy Brief and the project's Gender Guidance was developed. A project seminar was organized for National Delivery Partners and Project Experts to introduce the Gender policy and guidance. See also above under Stakeholders and Safeguards.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>24/25</p>	<p>EA, NDPs and other project partners engaged with the implementation of the project.</p>

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.

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	Yes
Financial management	No
Implementation schedule	Explain in table B
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

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		16/09/2020	16/09/2020	31/12/2025	
Amendment 1	Revision	10/2/2023	10/2/2023	31/12/2025	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 (<https://www.openstreetmap.org/#map=4/21.84/82.79>) or GeoNames (<http://www.geonames.org/>) 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\(https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx\)](https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/assets/general/Geocoding%20User%20Guide.docx)

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
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]