



# GEF-6 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF)

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF TRUST FUND

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

|                             |   |                              |                          |
|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Project Title:              | GEF-6 Belarus POPs Legacy and Sustainable Chemicals Management Project  |                              |                          |
| Country(ies):               | Republic of Belarus   | GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup> | 8017                     |
| GEF Agency(ies):            | UNDP  | GEF Agency Project ID:       | 5532                     |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection  | Submission Date:             | 2014-12-30               |
| GEF Focal Area(s):          | Chemicals and Waste   | Project Duration (Months)    | 48                       |
| Integrated Approach Pilot   | IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/> | Corporate Program: SGP       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of parent program:     | N/A   | Agency Fee (\$)              | 798,000                  |

### A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES<sup>2</sup>

| Objectives/Programs (Focal Areas, Integrated Approach Pilot, Corporate Programs)   | Trust Fund   | (in \$)               |                   |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
|  |              | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing      |
| CW-1 Program 2: Support enabling activities and promote their integration into national budgets and planning processes, national and sector policies and actions and global monitoring | GEFTF        | 200,000               | 200,000           |
| <b>CW-2 Program 3: Reduction and elimination of POPs</b>   | <b>GEFTF</b> | <b>8,200,000</b>      | <b>37,963,000</b> |
| Total Project Cost   |              | 8,400,000             | 38,163,000        |

### B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

| Project Objective: Protection of health and environment through elimination of retained POPs legacies and development of sustainable POPs management capacity within a sound chemicals management framework in the Republic of Belarus |                             |   |   |            |                       |              |
|--|-----------------------------|---|---|------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Project Component  | Financing Type <sup>3</sup> | Project Outcomes  | Project Outputs   | Trust Fund | (in \$)               |              |
|  |                             |   |   |            | GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| 1.0: Sustainable PCB Management  | TA                          | 1.1 PCB phase out plan implementation support for sustainable and accelerated PCB phase out | 1.1.1 Technical procedures and practice manuals for PCB equipment holders covering registration, labelling, reporting, handling and tracking of PCB equipment in-service and as stockpiled pending elimination developed.<br>1.1.2 Standardized screening practices applicable to transformer maintenance respecting cross contamination operational.<br>1.1.3 PCB inventory and tracking system fully operational and integrated | GEFTF      | 100,000               | 500,000      |

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC and to be entered by Agency in subsequent document submissions.

<sup>2</sup> When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#).

<sup>3</sup> Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

|   |     |  |   |       |           |            |
|---|-----|--|---|-------|-----------|------------|
|   |     |  | with national and global POPs inventory systems.  |       |           |            |
|   | Inv | 1.2 Sustainable PCB management infrastructure developed and operational in the Republic of Belarus serving national and regional markets                     | 1.2.1 Centralized PCB storage developed and in operation.<br>1.2.2 PCB equipment decontamination and dismantling, PCB cross contaminated mineral oil treatment capability, and PCB treatment and disposal capability developed.<br>1.2.3 Marketing and business plan for provision of PCB management services in the region in place. | GEFTF | 500,000   | 8,500,000  |
|   | Inv | 1.3 Environmentally sound elimination of present equipment PCB stockpiles (1,000 t) and accelerated phased out of PCB equipment during the Project (2,100 t) | 1.3.1 Environmentally sound elimination of consolidated existing PCB equipment stockpiles (estimated 1,000 t) completed.<br>1.3.2 Progressive environmentally sound elimination of PCB equipment as generated in accordance with the PCB phase out plan during the project (estimated 2,100 t) completed.                             | GEFTF | 2,600,000 | 21,013,000 |
| 2.0: Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Legacies | Inv | 2.1 Environmentally sound elimination of remaining OP storage site stockpiles (3,000 t/144 storage sites)  | 2.1.1 Repackaging, transport and environmentally sound destruction of 3,000 t of currently stored OP stockpiles completed.<br>2.1.2 Clean up and restoration of an estimated 144 obsolete pesticide stores completed.   | GEFTF | 3,800,000 | 3,650,000  |
|   | TA  | 2.2 Obsolete pesticide burial site containment (4 sites)   | 2.2.1 Detailed assessment, containment/ clean up design and remediation technology selection for fourth remaining OP burial sites undertaken.<br>2.2.2 Containment, selective excavation of priority OPs and enhanced monitoring from four remaining OP burial sites completed.   | GEFTF | 200,000   | 2,000,000  |

|   |    |  |  |       |         |         |
|---|----|--|--|-------|---------|---------|
| 3.0: Capacity Strengthening and Planning for Sound Chemicals Management | TA | 3.1 Legal, institutional and regulatory review of national chemicals management system with updates consistent with current sound chemicals management practice including EU legislation | 3.1.1 Legislative and regulatory gap analysis respecting general sound chemicals management bench marked against EU REACH legislation undertaken.<br>3.1.2 Legislative and regulatory amendments for compliance with latest SC amendments developed and promulgated.   | GEFTF | 50,000  | 300,000 |
|   | TA | 3.2 Development of a national contaminated sites management system   | 3.2.1 Development of legislation respecting the identification, registration, prioritization and corrective action of contaminated sites.<br>3.2.2 Development of consolidated national contaminated sites inventory framework completed.<br>3.2.3 Legal guidance on assignment of liabilities and responsibilities for contaminated sites developed.<br>3.2.4 Financial mechanisms for addressing contaminated sites developed.<br>3.2.5 Standards for contaminated site and risk assessment, and remediation technology selection developed. | GEFTF | 100,000 | 400,000 |
|   | TA | 3.3 Expanded national program for monitoring chemicals in the environment developed and implemented  | 3.3.1 Detailed assessment of national environmental monitoring and analytical capability undertaken.<br>3.3.2 Upgraded national environmental monitoring program developed.<br>3.3.3 Supporting capacity and infrastructure upgrading investment.  | GEFTF | 250,000 | 900,000 |
|   | TA | 3.4 NIP Update prepared, endorsed and submitted in accordance with SC obligations  | 3.4.1 POPs inventories inclusive of current U-POPs tool kit methodology and for “new” POPs updated.<br>3.4.2 POPs national program 2015-2020 prepared and approved.<br>3.4.3 NIP in GEF/SC format based on the POPs National Program developed and submitted.  | GEFTF | 200,000 | 200,000 |

|  |          |  |   |       |           |            |
|--|----------|--|---|-------|-----------|------------|
|  | TA       | 3.5 Supporting public awareness and stakeholder awareness and information exchange for measures on POPs and sound chemicals management | 3.5.1 Continuing public awareness program on POPs and chemicals management imbedded in MNREP activities<br>3.5.2 Web and social media based tools supporting the public awareness program operational and maintained<br>3.5.3 Active support for partnerships related POPs and chemicals management with ENGO and civil society organizations sustained | GEFTF | 100,000   | 100,000    |
| 4.0 Project Monitoring and Evaluation      | (select) |  |   | GEFTF | 100,000   | 200,000    |
| Subtotal                                   |          |  |   |       | 8,000,000 | 37,763,000 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC) <sup>4</sup> |          |  |   | GEFTF | 400,000   | 400,000    |
| <b>Total Project Cost</b>                  |          |  |   |       | 8,400,000 | 38,163,000 |

If Multi-Trust Fund project :PMC in this table should be the total and enter trust fund PMC breakdown here ( )

<sup>4</sup> For GEF Project Financing up to \$2 million, PMC could be up to 10% of the subtotal; above \$2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

**C. INDICATIVE SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE, IF AVAILABLE**

| Sources of Co-financing   | Name of Co-financier                                       | Type of Co-financing | Amount (\$)       |
|---------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| GEF Agency                | UNDP   | Grant                | TBA               |
| GEF Agency                | UNDP   | In-Kind              | TBA               |
| Recipient Government      | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection | Grant                | 7,350,000         |
| Recipient Government      | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection | In-Kind              | 2,950,000         |
| Recipient Government      | Ministry of Emergency Situations /Ministry of Agriculture  | In-Kind              | TBA               |
| Private Sector            | PCB Holders  | Grant                | 22,813,000        |
| Private Sector            | PCB Holders  | In-Kind              | 4,300,000         |
| Donor Agency              | European Union   | Grant                | 750,000           |
| Donor Agency              | NEFCO/Nordic Development Bank                              | Grant                | TBA               |
| <b>Total Co-financing</b> |  |                      | <b>38,163,000</b> |

**D. INDICATIVE TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS <sup>a)</sup>**

| GEF Agency                 | Trust Fund | Country/<br>Regional/ Global | Focal Area          | Programming of Funds | (in \$)                   |                              |                  |
|----------------------------|------------|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
|                            |            |                              |                     |                      | GEF Project Financing (a) | Agency Fee (b) <sup>b)</sup> | Total (c)=a+b    |
| UNDP                       | GEFTF      | Republic of Belarus          | Chemicals and Waste | POPs                 | 8,400,000                 | 798,000                      | 9,198,000        |
| <b>Total GEF Resources</b> |            |                              |                     |                      | <b>8,400,000</b>          | <b>798,000</b>               | <b>9,198,000</b> |

a) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](#).

**E. PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)<sup>5</sup>**

Is Project Preparation Grant requested? Yes  No  If no, skip item E.

**PPG AMOUNT REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), TRUST FUND, COUNTRY(IES) AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS**

| Project Preparation Grant amount requested: \$200,000 |            |                             |                     |                      | PPG Agency Fee: \$19,000 |                             |                 |
|---|------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| GEF Agency  | Trust Fund | Country/<br>Regional/Global | Focal Area          | Programming of Funds | (in \$)                  |                             |                 |
|   |            |                             |                     |                      | PPG (a)                  | Agency Fee <sup>6</sup> (b) | Total c = a + b |
| UNDP  | GEFTF      | Republic of Belarus         | Chemicals and Waste | POPs                 | 200,000                  | 19,000                      | 219,000         |
| <b>Total PPG Amount</b>                               |            |                             |                     |                      | <b>200,000</b>           | <b>19,000</b>               | <b>219,000</b>  |

<sup>5</sup> PPG requested amount is determined by the size of the GEF Project Financing (PF) as follows: Up to \$100k for PF up to \$3 mil; \$150k for PF up to \$6 mil; \$200k for PF up to \$10 mil; and \$300k for PF above \$10m. On an exceptional basis, PPG amount may differ upon detailed discussion and justification with the GEFSEC.

<sup>6</sup> PPG fee percentage follows the percentage of the Agency fee over the GEF Project Financing amount requested.

## F. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS<sup>7</sup>

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

| <b>Corporate Results</b>  | <b>Replenishment Targets</b>  | <b>Project Targets</b>                 |
|---|---|--|
| 1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society  | Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares   | <i>hectares</i>                        |
| 2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)   | 120 million hectares under sustainable land management  | <i>hectares</i>                        |
| 3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services | Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;        | <i>Number of freshwater basins</i>     |
|   | 20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels   | <i>Percent of fisheries, by volume</i> |
| 4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path   | 750 million tons of CO <sub>2e</sub> mitigated (include both direct and indirect)   | <i>metric tons</i>                     |
| <b>5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern</b>   | <b>Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)</b>   | <b><i>6,100 metric tons</i></b>        |
|   | Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury   | <i>metric tons</i>                     |
|   | Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)  | <i>ODP tons</i>                        |
| <b>6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks</b>   | <b>Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries</b> | <b><i>Number of Countries: 1</i></b>   |
|   | <b>Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries</b>       | <b><i>Number of Countries: 1</i></b>   |

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

1. *Project Description*. Briefly describe: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

### Background

The accumulation of historical POPs and related chemical stockpiles and legacies in the form of phased out PCB equipment, obsolete pesticides (OPs) and addressing associated land/water resource contamination has been a primary focus and priority of the Stockholm Convention since its inception and likewise for the GEF through its POPs and now Chemicals and Waste focal area. This issue is of particular concern in many countries in the Former Soviet Union (FSU) where, through the period of economic transition, environmental legacies were generally neglected, resulting in substantial inventories of both PCBs (as stockpiles and in aging operational equipment) and OPs remain and continue to present significant local risks to health and the environment as well as a major latent source of POPs and other chemical pollutant transfer into the global environment. Likewise similar legacies in the form of contaminated land and water from POPs and more generally chemicals have only yet been addressed in a limited fashion.

<sup>7</sup> Provide those indicator values in this table to the extent applicable to your proposed project. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the [GEF-6 Programming Directions](#), will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period. There is no need to complete this table for climate adaptation projects financed solely through LDCF and/or SCCF.

Among FSU countries, Belarus is arguably one of the most advanced in addressing this issue on a policy and practical level having initiated a national program on obsolete pesticides in 2002 with Danish assistance. Following its accession to the Stockholm Convention (SC) in May 2004, the country undertook a comprehensive National Implementation Plan (NIP) with GEF assistance which prioritized management of POPs stockpiles and legacies as defined by a detailed initial inventory of PCBs and OPs. This was submitted to the Convention Secretariat in January 2007 and formed the basis for a formal National Program on Implementation of the SC (National Program) with initial national funding commitments for the period 2007 thru 2010. This National Program has been updated and funding allocated for the period 2011-2015, and preparations are underway for its renewal over the next period of 2016 thru 2020, something that will underpin the significant state budget resources that will serve as co-financing for this project.

In parallel the country initiated development of a GEF-3 FSP targeted at the management of priority PCB and POPs pesticides stockpiles with the World Bank (WB) acting as Implementing Agency (IA). While administratively approved for implementation in 2007, the project was suspended due to the re-organization in the GEF, subsequently was finally approved in 2009 for implementation as a GEF-4 project in association with a World Bank waste management loan operation, and was implemented through the period (2009 - 2013). As now documented in a formal World Bank Implementation Completion Report (ICR) this GEF-4 project eliminated: i) 1,800 t of DDT and lindane based POPs pesticide waste from the country's primary depository of POPs pesticide (DDT and Lindane) at the Slonim burial site and 50 t of OP's from a major store house and; ii) 823 t of PCBs and PCB based equipment from priority higher risk holders stockpiles. Additionally 5,133 t of general OP stockpiles were consolidated and secured in 144 rural stockpile storage installations and likewise 964 t of out of service PCB based equipment and contaminated materials were secured in holder's stockpiles. In terms of technical and institutional capacity development the country now has in place: i) an operational and maintained comprehensive digital POPs/OP inventory management and reporting system; ii) a comprehensive national PCB phase out plan in place and being implemented that schedules the phase out of an estimated 3,100 t of PCB based equipment identified on a sector and holder enterprise level in accordance with the dead line obligations in the SC and supported by regulatory measures, financial commitments and technical guidance; iii) current updated reporting of POPs inventories in accordance with SC obligations; iv) implementation of the 2011-2015 National Program for SC implementation; v) upgraded human resource capacity for site assessment, monitoring and analysis; and vi) active public awareness programs on POPs. Finally in parallel with the GEF-4 project, the country under the sponsorship of MNREP continues to finance the development of a national central hazardous waste facility in the Chechersk district in Gomel Oblast including the operation of secure OP storage facilities and initiation of demonstration work on potential treatment and disposal technology that could operate at this site. Recent developments include demonstration of a pilot microwave treatment system on OPs and a current tender for a small treatment/disposal unit to be potentially funded by MNREP under the national program to eliminate stockpiles of OP contaminated material now stored at this site.

## **Barriers**

Notwithstanding the substantive progress in addressing POPs stockpiles and waste legacies, Belarus faces continuing barriers that GEF assistance can substantively assist in overcoming. These are noted in the following:

*Financial Capacity to Eliminate POPs Stockpiles and Wastes:* As noted above, while significant progress have been made in elimination and otherwise safeguarding of POPs stockpiles and in contributing to the GEF's strategic objectives in this area (1,800 t of POPs pesticide waste and 823 t of PCBs eliminated), the comprehensive nature of the country's program has also identified and secured significant amounts of both PCBs and OPs that remain to be phased out and/or eliminated. The country, while committed to undertaking this, is challenged financially to undertake it on its own, particularly in the time frames required under the SC for PCBs. This has in fact become particularly critical in the past several years with the return of general economic and now political instability in the region. This has created negative impacts on things like exchange rates and overall increased demands being made on the state budget. These financial capacity limitations are the primary barrier that the project can address by effectively incentivizing the rapid elimination of readily available PCB/OP stockpiles and accelerating phase out of in-service PCB equipment.

**Policy and Regulatory Implementation Barriers.** While the country has developed an effective legislative and regulatory framework for the original POPs management requirements of the SC, the expansion of the SC and more generally the need to expand the overall policy and program focus to broader environmental legacy issues and to sound chemicals management generally creates gaps related to policy integration as well as legislation and regulatory application that need to be addressed in order to sustain this progress. These gaps include updating the NIP, adopting supporting enabling legislative and regulatory amendments, broadening technical practice and standards to general chemicals legacy issues, particularly related to contaminated sites management, and development of supporting hazardous waste management infrastructure.

**Technical Capacity Barriers:** Notwithstanding the significant demonstrated technical capacity available in the country a barrier to sustaining progress and moving into the broader scope of sound chemicals management activities into the future remains limited by the need to upgrade skills and tools to deal with these requirements. This includes the expertise in areas such as contaminated site and associated risk assessment, supporting efficient appropriate analytical capability and familiarity with commercial application of appropriate and cost effective technologies.

**Information and awareness barriers:** While significant progress has been made and is being sustained in the understanding and awareness of both public and industrial stakeholders as well as policy makers related to POPs this has not generally extended to chemicals management, something that experience shows can constrain the rate of implementing comprehensive programs in this area. Specific knowledge gaps remain related to the extent of lower level PCB contamination at an operational level in holder operations, among owners and the public with respect to the number and severity of contaminated sites, and across institutions and the public in relation to chemicals management and associated impacts generally.

### **Baseline Scenario**

The results of the initial GEF-4 FSP and the continuing activities associated with it, including the parallel centralized hazardous waste infrastructure development, essentially constitute the baseline for the currently proposed project. The substantive component of that baseline is the remaining inventory of stockpiled PCBs and OPs as well as the pending addition to PCB stockpiles as equipment is phased out in accordance with SC obligations. The tables below provide a summary of the inventories of PCBs and OPs by type and location at closing of the GEF-4 project in 2013.

**Summary of PCB Inventories (2013)**

| <b>Equipment Type</b>   | <b>Status</b>                       | <b># of Enterprises</b> | <b># of Units</b> | <b>Total Wt(t)</b> | <b>PCB Wt(t)</b> |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>Transformers</b>     | In-service                          | 33                      | 262               | 1,903              | 634.4            |
|                         | Decommissioned-Containing Oil       | 11                      | 28                | 233.7              | 77.9             |
|                         | Decommissioned w/o Oil <sup>2</sup> | 0                       | 0                 | 0                  | 0                |
|                         | PCB Liquid                          | 3                       | 3                 | 2                  | 2                |
| <b>Power Capacitors</b> | In-service                          | 543                     | 26,604            | 1,201              | 400.4            |
|                         | Decommissioned                      | 384                     | 14,272            | 730.2              | 243.4            |
| <b>Small Capacitors</b> | In-Service                          | 16                      | 15,902            | 6                  | 2                |
|                         | Stored as Waste                     | 2                       | 187               | <1                 | <1               |
| <b>Other</b>            | Soil                                | 9                       | n/a               | 33.3               | <1               |
|                         | Misc. Waste                         | 1                       | n/a               | 1.6                | <1               |
| <b>Totals</b>           |                                     |                         |                   | 4,111.8            | 1,361.1          |



## Summary of Obsolete Pesticide Inventories including POPs Pesticides Remaining in Storehouses and Burial Sites (2013)

| Store Houses |             |             |                       |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Oblast       | # of Stores | Non-POPs(t) | POPs <sup>4</sup> (t) | Total OP(t) |
| Brest        | 0           | 0           | 0                     | 0           |
| Vitebsk      | 19          | 550.5       | 0                     | 550.5       |
| Gomel        | 1           | 2,158.7     | 9.6                   | 2,162.3     |
| Grodno       | 52          | 1,481.2     | 3.7                   | 1,484.9     |
| Minsk        | 72          | 923.2       | 5.8                   | 929.0       |
| Mogilev      | 0           | 0           | 0                     | 0           |
| Totals       | 144         | 5,113.6     | 19.1                  | 5,132.7     |

1.

| Burial Sites |              |                 |          |             |
|--------------|--------------|-----------------|----------|-------------|
| Oblast       | Site         | Non-POPs OP (t) | POPs (t) | Total OP(t) |
| Brest        | Brestsk      | 0               | 0        | 0           |
| Vitebsk      | Verknedvinsk | 444.4           | 7.1      | 454.5       |
|              | Postav       | n/a             | n/a      | 100.0       |
|              | Gordok       | n/a             | n.a      | 411.4       |
| Gomel        | Petrikov     | 316.2           | 39.6     | 355.8       |
| Grodno       | Slonim       | 0               | 0        | 0           |
| Mogilev      | Dribin       | 401.3           | 98.7     | 530         |
| Totals       |              | 1,161.9         | 145.4    | 1,851.7     |

This data indicates for PCBs, a current inventory of 984 t of stockpiled PCB equipment (containing 321 t of PCBs) is available for immediate elimination and a future requirement of 3,102 t (containing 1,034 t of PCBs). Accounting for continuing phase out in 2014, the above stockpiled numbers have increased while the in-service amounts have correspondingly decreased such that a working baseline PCB inventory used for the project is considered to be 1,000 t of available stockpiles and 3,000 t of in-service material.

For OPs, 5,133 t of packaged material is available for immediate elimination including 2,162 t stored at Chechersk. Estimated POPs pesticide content of this material is 19.1 t. Four (4) unaddressed burial sites also exist containing an estimated 1,852 t of OP of which 145.t is estimated to be POPs pesticides, all based on historical records. As further discussed under the respective components, the OPs currently held by the Chechersk facility are assumed to be handled without direct GEF assistance as will the remaining volumes extracted by Ministry of Emergency Situations (MES) from the Petrikov site. Similarly, the residual 310 t from the Slonim site is being handled under the EU/FAO assistance project. Therefore the inventory held in storage and available for purposes of using direct GEF support, and which is the effective project baseline, is taken as 3,000 t.

Other aspects of the project baseline are assumed to be the maintenance of the current level of regulatory activity under current legislation without modification for the Stockholm Convention amendments except as may be nominally addressed in the establishment of the next National Program for 2016-2020. The level of National Program funding anticipated in the absence of the GEF-6 national project would be largely directed to the currently contemplated maintenance and potential small scale technology development activities being undertaken by the operator of the Chechersk facility which may also entail capital funding through a separate GEF UNIDO regional project under development. Similarly the baseline scenario would assume the implementation at least in terms of PCB equipment phase out and stockpiling at a modest rate as nominally called for in the PCB Phase out program, maintenance of POPs information management, analytical and monitoring activities in MNREP, and continuing public awareness activities. However it would assume that no further direct work would be undertaken with respect to the remaining four burial sites, no direct work would continue related to contaminated sites generally, nor would any specific policy work broadening activities into more general sound chemicals management be undertaken.

## **Alternative (Project) Scenario**

The alternative scenario that defines the proposed GEF project would build on the strong basis already established for PCB and OP management. It would primarily target priority stockpiles and legacies with complementary technical and institutional capacity support with the overall objective of substantially eliminating POPs and OP legacies by 2019 and developing sustainable ongoing national POPs and chemical waste management capability in the country and as may develop on a commercial basis for the region generally.

The proposed project design and structure is based on the project having three components. Component 1 would address PCB stockpiles and accelerated phase out of in-service equipment, Component 2 would address OP storehouse legacies and securing remaining burial sites, and Component 3 would make provision for support of required regulatory, continuing national program/NIP update development, and key technical support initiatives related to analytical/monitoring capability and qualification of developing hazardous waste management capability. Imbedded in all three components and associated Outcomes would be target outreach, public consultation and training elements. This structure and scope is tabulated in Project Description Summary above by Component and Outcome (Part I Table B) and is elaborated in the following by specific anticipated outputs and activities.

**Component 1- Sustainable PCB Management:** This component is envisioned as having three outcomes covering: i) technical assistance in full implementation of the PCB Phase out Plan and where practical its acceleration; ii) developing sustainable support infrastructure for on-going implementation of the plan and maximize the actual management activities that can be undertaken in the country; and iii) environmentally sound elimination of present PCB equipment stockpiles and that portion of current in-service equipment whose accelerated phase-out over the project life is expected. The following elaborates on each Outcome in terms of anticipated outputs and activities:

### **Outcome 1.1- PCB phase out plan implementation support for sustainable and accelerated PCB phase out:**

This outcome would have three outputs/activities as follows. Output/Activity 1.1.1 would expand on the initial work related to establishing and implementing comprehensive technical procedures applicable to both stockpiles and in-service equipment related to registration, labelling and reporting inclusive of supporting coordination of prioritization for phase out and further stockpile consolidation and ongoing training/awareness activities with PCB holders. Output/Activity 1.1.2 would expand the evaluation of possible PCB cross-contamination in non-PCB equipment as a standard practice by major holders/operators of such equipment during maintenance cycles, inclusive of training as required. Outcome/Activity 1.1.3 would seek to further strengthen the existing PCB inventory and tracking system including extension to smaller more widely distributed sources of PCBs, as well as ensuring reporting of results to the Global POPs network.

**Outcome 1.2 - Sustainable PCB management infrastructure developed and operational in Belarus serving national and regional markets:** This outcome is directed to the investigation and development of management capability within Belarus to optimize the handling, treatment and potentially the disposal of PCB stockpiles. Output/Activity 1.2.1 contemplates the development of dedicated segregated PCB stockpile and waste storage such that such materials can be consolidated at one or more strategic locations under internationally accepted standards of environmental protection and security, pending further treatment, destruction and disposal. Candidate locations include the facilities of major PCB holders such as BelEnergo and Belarussian Railways, or potentially at the Chechersk national hazardous waste facility site subject to mutually acceptable commercial and administrative arrangements. Outcome/Activity 1.2.2 will assess and potentially develop in-country PCB equipment pre-treatment capability that will allow the overall volumes of PCB waste requiring final environmentally sound destruction out of the country to be minimized. The primary target of this will be development of PCB equipment draining and dismantling capability inclusive of decontamination of recyclable component parts and separation of PCB waste components requiring destruction. Investigation, depending on need, technical feasibility and economic return of other activities such as treatment of cross-contaminated mineral oil, and potentially application of destruction technologies locally would be undertaken. In terms of location again these activities may occur at holder's sites or potentially the Chechersk facility. With respect to the latter, if as currently proposed a small scale capability for destruction of chlorinated liquids and

contaminated granulated material is constructed in parallel, technical assistance for the formal qualification of such capability under international standards could be provided for. Output/Activity 1.2.3 contemplates investigation and assessment of regional market potential applicable to the capability potentially developed under Output 1.2.2.

Outcome 1.3: Environmentally sound elimination of present equipment PCB stockpiles and accelerated phased out equipment during the Project: This Outcome essentially finances the destruction, inclusive of pre-treatment of the estimated present (baseline) inventory of 1,000 t of PCB based equipment stockpiles (Output/Activity 1.3.1) and a significant portion of the remaining in-service equipment that would be phased out during the course of the project through 2019 (Output/Activity 1.3.2). While a final number would be developed during the project's PPG stage, for purposes of the PIF it is assumed that 70% of current in-service equipment (2,100 t) could be eliminated during this period. For estimating purposes, the costing of destruction is based on current export prices for destruction in Western Europe undertaken under the same proven specifications and procedures as successfully done for 14 enterprise on 823 t of equipment in the previous World Bank project. The possibility of utilizing domestically or regionally developed pre-treatment and potentially destruction capability would be pursued but ultimately on the basis that it was equally or more cost effective to the proven export option.

**Component 2 – Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Legacies:** This component is designed to support the ongoing work under the National Program related to elimination of the country's significant residual legacy of accumulated OPs. As noted above the GEF-4 World Bank project was directed to substantially eliminating POPs pesticides, the majority of which were located in the Slonim burial site where extraction and environmentally sound destruction was largely completed. However there remains a significant volume of general OPs which while generally non-POPs still represents a significant residual liability. This consists of an estimated 5,133 t of OP material and 4 unaddressed burial sites accounting for 1,852 t of material based on historical records. The design of this component is based on two Outcomes: one targeting elimination of stored OPs and one targeting more cost effective management of burial site legacies by applying accumulated lessons from the previous GEF-4 project, work by MES and the approaches now being used elsewhere, particularly UNDP GEF project in Vietnam, Georgia and Armenia.

Outcome 2.1 – Environmentally sound elimination of remaining OP storage site stockpiles: Based on experience both from the GEF-4 project and independent activities by MES and the Chechersk facility, MNREP have indicated that a priority should be attached first to the independent 144 pesticide stores. With respect to the OP store houses, the project will focus on eliminating OPs from these widely distributed stores on a prioritized basis and leave the 2,162 t stored at Chechersk to be eliminated separately using the planned hazardous waste disposal technology proposed for that site in the future. This leaves a target of approximately 3,000 t from the store houses for destruction under this project located in 144 sites. Similar to the approach taken to existing PCB stockpiles above, for purposes of cost estimating at this stage, it is assumed that dealing with these stockpile sites under Output/Activity 2.1.1 will be the packaging, export and destruction by high temperature incineration (HTI) in Western Europe, although the option of using domestic capability at Chechersk would be considered if competitive and with GEF financial exposure being limited to a market determined commercial cost. Output/Activity 2.1.2 will address any residual contamination associated with the sites and infrastructure where eliminated stores are taken from.

Outcome 2.2 – Obsolete pesticide burial site containment: A significant lesson learned in part from the Slonim site and particularly the Petrikov site being excavated over an extended period by MES is that a general “dig, pack and ship” approach to such sites can be improved in terms of cost and environmental effectiveness. Similar lessons have been noted on similar GEF projects in Vietnam and Georgia. The approach of direct excavation tend to significantly expand the amount of contaminated material that needs to be addressed well beyond the volumes of actual OPs originally deposited, particularly in previously disturbed sites. This increases the costs of addressing such sites beyond what might be initially estimated. In the case of Belarus the resulting financial exposure to the government due to the large volumes has required a major drain on National Program funding. Likewise, there are extended periods of an open site with resulting spread of contamination and broader release risk. Reflecting this experience and the fact that these remote sites are generally secure in

terms of the spread of surface and sub-surface contamination, a more targeted approach for dealing with these sites by this project will be adopted while focusing on elimination of storage sites under Outcome 2.1. This will involve, under Output/Activity 2.2.2, more comprehensive front end site assessment to better defining the extent and impact of the burial sites before devoting major resources to their excavation. Such comprehensive analytical site assessment with associated risk assessment would better define the location of concentrated OP deposits and be able to prioritize impacts. This would entail application of several advanced techniques such as using ground penetration radar and digital mapping/modelling along with a comprehensive environmental and public health risk assessment. Based on this, Outcome/Activity 2.2.2 would pursue options for selective contained excavation and adoption of optimum combinations of lower cost on-site active and/or passive treatment, as well as hydrological containment and monitoring will be pursued.

**Component 3 – Capacity Strengthening and Planning for Sound Chemicals Management:** Building on the country’s progress in establishing a strong overall environmental management framework, this component is designed to strength Belarus’ institutional and technical capacity both through updating and extending regulatory measures related to sound chemicals management, building on experience with POPs contaminated sites to develop a broadly based national contaminated sites management program, expanding and upgrading chemicals and particularly POPs monitoring capacity in the broader environment, and supporting the development and implementation of sustaining period based national programs related to SC implementation along with formulation of an updated NIP. The four Outcomes covering this are elaborated in the following.

*Outcome 3.1 - Legal, institutional and regulatory review of national chemicals management system with updates consistent with current sound chemicals management practice including EU legislation:* This Outcome relates to supporting the work undertaken to update national legislative and regulatory measures in several areas. Output/Activity 3.1.1 will specifically address the legislative and regulatory framework covering chemicals management generally through support of the current interagency initiative led by MNREP and Ministry of Health in this area with GEF funding support specifically directed to ensuring consistency with current international practice and specifically harmonization with the EU REACH system. Output/Activity 3.1.2 addresses specific legislative and regulatory measures related to ensuring compliance with the latest amendments to the SC respecting import, export, bans and other controls on recently added POPs, as well as examining legislative constraints that may exist related to the import of hazardous waste for treatment. This is of importance in supporting potential development of regional POPs management capability.

*Outcome 3.2 – Development of a national contaminated sites management system:* This outcome continues the work that was planned, started but never realized due to grant reallocation decisions in the previous GEF-4 World Bank project. Building on the extensive experience developed in MNREP and MES through their OP burial site clean up work, the proposed Outputs/Activities expand the focus on the broader legacies associated with chemical land and water contamination generally and specifically on the development of the necessary regulatory, information and technical standards base that would allow a pragmatic approach to dealing with this long term problem. Such an approach would benefit from the very positive experience developed with the National Program on Implementation of the SC and associated GEF enabling activity support. Similarly GEF-5 projects, notably in the current UNDP/UNIDO POPs project in Turkey and its connection to EU practice will be useful. Output/Activity 3.2.1 deals with the legislative and regulatory requirements to support effective identification, registration and prioritization of contaminated sites. Output/Activity 3.2.2 involves the development of an effective inventory database tool to capture information on identified sites, potentially building on the experience with the now operational POPs inventory management system developed for the previous GEF-4 project. Output/Activity 3.2.3 would address legal issues and clarification of assignment of liabilities for contaminated sites and their clean up. Output/Activity 3.2.4 would support the above with guidance on effective financing mechanisms for contaminated site clean up. Output/Activity 3.2.5 would address the updating of clean up standards based on land use, cost effectiveness, and risk assessment as well as guidance on BAT/BEP remediation technology selection, something that will benefit from emerging experience from GEF demonstration and clean up projects elsewhere, notably in Armenia, Georgia, Vietnam and Turkey.

Outcome 3.3 - Expanded national program for monitoring chemicals in the environment developed and implemented: Belarus has a sound basic ambient environmental monitoring system supported by excellent human resource capability and good but aging laboratory infrastructure. This outcome will provide support for its upgrading generally and specifically for chemicals with a specific emphasis on field capability and optimization of existing and potentially upgraded analytical capability. In this regard, attention will be placed on application of tools such as portable analytical capability and screening level analysis specifically to support activities such as contaminated site and associated impact assessment as will be involved with Outcomes 2.2 and 3.2. The details of this outcome in terms of specific outputs will be developed during the PPG stage that will include a gap analysis to identify critical areas of support. The approach taken will involve the integration of GEF funding for eligible components of state budget co-financing anticipated for overall enhancement of environmental monitoring capability over the project's life.

Outcome 3.4 – NIP Update prepared, endorsed and submitted in accordance with SC obligations: This outcome essentially covers the development of a formal updated NIP for required submission under the SC implementation as provided for as an Enabling Activity by GEF. In this regard it will adopt the methodology and formats prescribed by both the SC Secretariat and GEF for preparation and place specific emphasis on inventory determination and action plans related to dealing with “new” POPs added to the original convention including anticipatory inclusion of these chemicals under consideration for addition at the next Conference of the Parties. As was the case with the original high quality NIP developed by Belarus, the preparation of the updated SC NIP will be integrated with the development of the next periodic 2015-2019 SC Implementation National Program inclusive of funding commitments. It is proposed to initiate this work utilizing primarily national in-kind resources during the PPG stage noting that the funding for this program will provide significant co-financing to the overall project.

Outcome 3.5 - Supporting public and stakeholder awareness and information exchange for measures on POPs and sound chemicals management: This outcome is intended to support the first four Outcomes in Component 3 with a comprehensive public awareness and information exchange program on the measures being taken by the government and specifically under the project in relation to POPs and sound chemicals management generally. It will involve consultation and public information with all stakeholders throughout the project utilizing the established range of information dissemination and communication tools including utilization and expansion of a POPs web-site now operated for the issue, available social media tools and other more conventional tools. As has been the practice previously this activity will utilize partnerships with civil society organizations and ENGOs for consultation with the general public.

### **Incremental Cost Reasoning and Financing**

The overall incremental cost reasoning and associated approach to co-financing is based on using GEF funding to sustain the substantive progress and continue to leverage high level of national co-financing for elimination of POPs and OP legacies as targeted in the GEF-6 Chemicals and Waste focal area. Associated with this is also facilitating a broader policy focus on sound chemicals management into the future by using GEF support to move this agenda forward within the programmatic approach used by Belarus in implementing environmental management priorities generally. The following discusses the specific incremental reasoning and indicative financing by project component described above.

Component 1- Sustainable PCB Management: The baseline for this component is the country continuing to implement the PCB Phase out Plan established during the GEF-4 project to the degree capital budgets of PCB holders can sustain that commitment in terms of replacement costs. However, in general there would not be resources available for environmental sound elimination of the existing stockpiled inventory or what equipment is replaced. This would accumulate in storage, which, while generally secure and under competent care and custody, would remain widely distributed around the country. Likewise, limited if any development of modern PCB management facilities would occur. The incremental role of GEF funding would primarily be on environmentally sound elimination of the PCB equipment in stockpiles and replaced over the life of the project (Outcome 1.3) inclusive of

the substantive leveraging effect for accelerated phase out that the availability of this funding during that period has. Outcome 1.1 and 1.2 are likewise incremental to the baseline in that they address supplemental support for accelerated phase out within the PCB Phase Out Plan, adoption of modern routine screening practices for possible low level PCB contamination and support for the development of national PCB management infrastructure where justified, where this is otherwise unlikely to occur. With respect to financing, the projected GEF funding allocation to this component will be substantively co-financed by the holders of PCB equipment both stockpiled and in-service. The GEF grant amount of US\$3,200,000 would leverage an estimated overall co-financing amount of US\$30,013,000 of which US\$2,500,000 are MNREP cash contribution and US\$100,000 is in-kind contribution from MNREP. The remainder is from PCB holders, of which US\$22,813,000 is estimated to be cash contribution, largely from estimated equipment replacement costs and associated facility upgrading investment related to the 2,100 t of equipment estimated to be phased out during the project. Of this total co-financing \$4,500,000 is considered baseline which would likely be spent in the absence of GEF investment.

*Component 2 – Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Legacies:* The baseline for this component would be limited to the continued maintenance of secure but widely distributed storage of OPs (3,000 t) in the 144 rural storehouses, the continued storage of OPs, largely from burial sites being addressed independently by MES, and some investigation and potentially investment in the demonstration, installation and operation of small scale treatment and destruction capability at Chechersk, funded by the National Program on SC Implementation through budget allocations through MNREP and potentially at some point from a GEF/UNIDO Regional project. Additionally it is understood that the EU/FAO project will eliminate approximately 310 t of POPs contaminated soils left from the Slomin burial site. The GEF contribution is essentially on top of this baseline with grant funding and incremental National Program funding being primarily for environmentally sound disposal of 3,000 t of OPs in storehouses with GEF funds being directed as soon as possible to priority storehouse sites. The project is also supporting the continued activity related to the four unaddressed OP burial sites but recognizing that MNREP has elected to suspend the previous approach of open end excavation after completion of the separate Petrikov site. The GEF support relates to a new approach being adopted by MNREP based on more comprehensive risk assessment and emphasis on containment and monitoring. As such this is considered entirely incremental in nature. The GEF grant amount of US\$4,000,000 million is estimated to leverage US\$5,950,000 in overall co-financing. Of this US\$4,700,000 is cash contribution, largely through the National program over the period 2016-2020 but including US\$750,000 in EU grant funds, and an in-kind contribution of US\$750,000 over that period from MNREP and MES. Of this total co-financing \$3,750,000 is considered baseline which would likely be spent in the absence of GEF investment, and includes the EU grant funding, that portion of the National Program allocated to closure of the Petrikov site by MES and continued allocations to the Chechersk facility for storage and any facility contributions. It should be noted that MNREP is also discussing possible soft loan financing for facilities development work with NEFCO/Nordic Development Bank which may be considered co-financing, something that will be further pursued during the PPG stage.

*Component 3 - Capacity Strengthening and Planning for Sound Chemicals Management:* The incremental reasoning associated with this component is related to the adopted approach of using GEF resources to re-focus policy and program initiatives within MNREP on a broader sound chemicals management agenda as well as on specific measures associated with updating national regulations and documentation for purposes of maintaining compliance with the SC. The overall GEF grant amount of US\$700,000 allocated to this Component attracts an indicative US\$1,900,000 in co-financing entirely from MNREP and split roughly equally between cash and in-kind. Recognizing that a portion of this, particularly the in-kind contribution would exist without the project, albeit likely allocated to other activities, the baseline amount is estimated to be up to US\$1,000,000.

## **Global Environmental Benefits**

The primary Global Environmental Benefits attributed to this project are associated with the elimination and/or secure containment of POPs and OPs that would otherwise be subject to release into the broader environment with associated environmental and human health impacts. Quantitatively this is summarized as follows:

- Direct environmentally sound elimination of an estimated 1,000 t of PCB equipment containing at least 340 t of PCBs themselves.

- Provision for removal from service (phase out), capture, secure consolidated storage to prevent near and medium-term release of PCBs chemicals of 2,100 t of PCB equipment (estimated 700 t of PCBs) during the project, and provision for systematic accelerated phase out of remaining PCB equipment in service (estimated 1,000 t) consistent with SC convention obligations.
- Direct environmentally sound destruction of 3,000 t of OPs
- Primary secure containment and monitoring of an estimated 1,500 t of OPs in burial sites

Other global environmental benefits associated with the project which will be more definitively quantified in the PPG stage include:

- Capacity and functional action to decontaminate chemical contaminated land
- Substantive reduction and elimination of risk for populations near to POPs and OP stockpiles

### **Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up**

The project is generally conventional in terms of application of approaches and techniques that have been proven and are well established for the management of POPs, building on the experience of a very effective previous GEF project and on the mounting experience accumulating in the region. Its use of lessons learned from this involves some innovation through the prioritization of POPs and chemicals issues, notable high impact stockpiles for elimination while utilizing a risk assessment approach to deal with other stockpile (burial site) issues to maximize global environmental benefit and use of financial resources. Additionally the way of developing appropriately scaled national infrastructure and appropriate technology transfer allows an incremental approach to the developing chemical waste management in the country, while also allowing for potential scaling up to serve regional requirements as market, resource availability and political/public policies may permit. This underpins project sustainability.

2. *Stakeholders.* Will project design include the participation of relevant stakeholders from [civil society](#) and [indigenous people](#)? (yes  /no  ) If yes, identify key stakeholders and briefly describe how they will be engaged in project design/preparation.

During PIF preparation a wide range of stakeholders have been consulted, recognizing that these have been generally identified and have become engaged in the course of the earlier GEF-4 project and through the networks maintained by UNDP, other IAs and the primary national stakeholder agencies. In particular, a strong network of institutional shareholders at a senior level formally exist through the long standing Inter-Agency Coordination Commission on Implementation of the SC which serves to facilitate institutional participation.

The following identifies the principle institutional, industry, academic, international and civil society stakeholders with whom initial consultations have occurred and these that will be followed up with during the PPG stage. This specifically includes expanded engagement with the national network of ENGOs that have been previously involved in the development and implementation of previous POPs projects including the original NIP, and who would be involved in the NIP update. These organizations will also specifically be engaged in the design of public awareness and consultation activities related to elimination of rural OP storehouses, and PCB equipment in publically sensitive locations. Additionally they will be involved in the development of the national sound chemicals management program, particularly in relation expanded public awareness of chemical issues.

| <b>Stakeholder Organization</b>                            | <b>Role</b>  |
|--|--|
| <b>Institutional Stakeholders</b>                          |  |
| Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection | National Executing Agency, GEF and SC focal Points, national policy and project implementation coordination    |
| Ministry of Energy   | Coordination of PCB Phase out activities in national electrical utilities including allocation of state budget |

|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | resources   |
| Ministry of Industry   | Coordination of PCB Phase out activities in national industrial enterprises including allocation of state budget resources                            |
| Ministry of Transportation and Communication   | Coordination of PCB Phase out activities in Belarussian Railways including allocation of state budget resources                                       |
| Ministry of Agriculture  | Coordination of Regional and local agricultural organization on the management of OP stores.  |
| Ministry of Emergency Situations   | Service provider for hazardous waste clean up particular for OPs burial sites   |
| Ministry of Health   | Input and participation related to the development of a national sound chemical management program and associated health impact monitoring activities |
| Oblast and local level Agricultural Organizations  | Ownership, administration and custody of OP stores and burial sites   |
| Belarussian Scientific and Research Center “Ecology” under the aegis of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection | Maintenance and update of the electronic POPs database  |
| Institute of Nature Use of the National Academy of Science   | Inventory of PCB-wastes   |
| <b>Principle Industrial Stakeholders</b>   |   |
| BelEnergо and associated electrical transmission and distribution utilities  | Ownership, administration and custody of PCB stockpiles and in-service equipment  |
| Belarussian Railways   | Ownership, administration and custody of PCB stockpiles and in-service equipment  |
| Industrial and other PCB holders   | Ownership, administration and custody of PCB stockpiles and in-service equipment  |
| Gomel City Executive Committee – Complex for Processing and Disposal of Toxic Waste of the Gomel Region                                | Service provider for storage and potentially future treatment/disposal of OPs and PCBs  |
| <b>International Organizations</b>   |   |
| World Bank   | IA for the previous GEF-4 Project   |
| FAO  | IA for current EU Regional OP project (as represented in Belarus by Green Cross Belarus)  |
| UNIDO  | IA for related GEF/UNIDO Regional POPs project under preparation and a separate GEF-5 PCB project for Russian Railways.                               |
| European Commission  | Potential bilateral donor in the area of Chemicals management   |
| <b>Civil Society</b>   |   |
| NGO “Ecomir”   | ENGO active in local public consultation activities   |
| Green Cross Belarus  | ENGO active in public consultation activities related to OPs  |
| NGO “Ecological Initiative”  | ENGO active in public awareness activities in the POPs area   |

3. *Gender Considerations.* Are [gender considerations](#) taken into account? (yes  /no  ). If yes, briefly describe how gender considerations will be mainstreamed into project preparation, taken into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of men and women.

At this stage of project development there are no direct gender considerations identified beyond the overall issues related to the higher risks generally associated with POPs being distributed in the broader environment for women, specifically related to their bioaccumulation and transfer through breast milk. This along with the occurrence of other chemicals in both humans and the food supply has been an active field of monitoring by the Ministry of Health in Belarus for a number of years. At a local level in rural areas there are potential gender issues associated with the



presence of rural OP stores, noting the general demographic reality that rural populations have a high proportion of older women that have a higher consequence risk of exposure. During the PPG these aspects will be specifically explored and assessed to ensure that the project design throughout takes them into consideration.

*4 Risks.* Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design (table format acceptable).

| <b>Risk</b>  | <b>Risk rating</b> | <b>Risk mitigation strategy</b>   |
|--|--------------------|---|
| Government policy and financial commitment is not sustained for the project life   | Low                | The Government of Belarus has a proven track record of a strong and proactive commitment to dealing with environmental issues particularly those associated with man-made releases and legacies, noting the country's particular history related to a global scale industrial accident in the 1980s. Specific to the POPs issue their early preparation of an NIP and sustained implementation of a funded and periodically renewed National Programs on the issue are evidence of this. Building on the positive experience of the previous project, this project's design is specifically tailored to matching and facilitating the National Program implementation inclusive of direct integration of the substantial state budget resources to be dedicated to it.  |
| Institutional risks associated with poor coordination among institutional stakeholders at the national and international level | Low                | A well developed and stable institutional structure in the government with well-defined responsibilities and working relationships was put in place under the National Program for Implementation of the SC and utilized in a similar GEF-4 project between 2009 and 2014. Within the main executing agency, there is a clear focal point in the Waste Management Department experienced in working with a resident PMU structure and international organizations on such projects. Similarly, virtually all the major stakeholders come with direct experience on international projects of this type and have good working relationships with all principle stakeholders.<br><br>At the international level the project involves a GEF Agency with a long successful track record of GEF and other project implementation in the country, a strong portfolio of like projects in the region and globally and good working relationships with other IAs undertaking related activities in the immediate region and major bilateral donors, particularly the European Commission. |
| Cost risks associated with POPs legacy elimination   | Low                | There are always some uncertainties associated with the cost of eliminating POPs stockpiles, being subject to free market pricing for disposal and specific to this region at this time's exchange rate variability. However, the well-defined inventories already established, the use of current market pricing in cost estimating and contracting in hard currencies in bulk over the project period will all serve to mitigate these risks.   |
| Industrial sector commitment to the project in terms of technical support and co-financing.                                    | Low                | The principle risk in this area relates to the inevitable potential that fiscal constraints will prevent major holders of PCBs from being able to undertake the anticipated accelerated replacement programs associated with the project. At this point, positive and proactive action including financial planning has been initiated based on   |

| Risk   | Risk rating | Risk mitigation strategy  |
|--|-------------|---|
|  |             | the prospect of this project which serve to mitigate this risk.   |
| Level of capacity (technical, institutional) is underestimated | Low         | Belarus has demonstrated solid technical capacity developed over the last decade dealing with POPs issues and this depth along with the directed training and capacity strengthening measures designed in to project should substantively mitigate this risk. |

The project will be monitored and evaluated on a regular basis according to applicable GEF and UNDP procedures for results-based management. An annual reporting exercise in the form of the project implementation review (PIR) will take place, where the project will be tracked for progress against the relevant performance indicators (including application of the POPs tracking tool), evaluated for progress made towards development results, and assessed with regard to its degree of adaptive management and its flexibility to respond to changing circumstances.

5. *Coordination.* Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives.

The project itself represents an example of coordination with other GEF initiatives in that it directly builds on the highly successful initial World Bank GEF-4 POPs Stockpile Management Project in Belarus addressing priority POPs stockpiles and legacies. The current project is basically a continuation of that project which will effectively move Belarus into a position of largely having addressed its Soviet era POPs and OP legacies. In this regard a close working relationship is maintained with the World Bank and specifically the Task Manager for this previous project in Minsk as well as the international experts responsible for its original design and onwards supervision.

Within UNDP, coordination between this project and a number of other related GEF projects in the region and globally will be maintained, specifically with respect to ensuring the transfer of experience to and from this project as part of a South-South Cooperation strategy for experience sharing and replication. Specific examples of such linkages will involve: i) Vietnam GEF-4 Building Capacity for POPs Pesticide Elimination (Completing) – provides reference experience in cost effective POPs and OP pesticide site assessment and remediation technologies; ii) Vietnam GEF-4 Environmental Remediation of Dioxin Contaminated Hot Spots (Completing) – demonstration of soil remediation technologies; iii) Georgia GEF-5 Disposal of POPs Pesticides and Initial Steps for Containment of Dumped POPs Pesticides (Implementing) – site assessment, POPs export, and containment methodologies; iv) Armenia GEF-5 Elimination of Obsolete Pesticide Stockpiles and Addressing POPs Contaminated Sites (GEF Approved) – dealing with POPs pesticide burial sites; v) Turkey GEF-5 POPs legacy Elimination and POPs Release Reduction Project (GEF Approved) – elimination of POPs pesticide/PCB stockpiles and POPs destruction facility qualification; vi) Kyrgyzstan GEF-4 Management and Disposal of PCBs (Implementing) – storage and transborder export issues; vii) Kazakhstan GEF-4 Design and Execution of a Comprehensive PCB Management Plan (Implementing).

In addition, the project will be coordinated with a second Chemicals and Waste Focal Area project that the country has requested from UNDP, namely a GEF-6 project addressing Health-care waste, E-waste and mercury which is now included in UNDP's GEF-6 business plan and for which initial preparation is planned in 2015. It is intended that the two UNDP GEF-6 projects in the country will complement each other through linkages related to infrastructure capacity, the development of an overall sound chemicals management framework and sustaining supporting policies and the overarching national program on implementation of the Stockholm and related Conventions. Common supervision through UNDP Country Office in Minsk and Regional Hub in Istanbul as well as PMU structures in MNREP are contemplated.

Beyond UNDP's own activities, close coordination has been initiated and will be maintained with two developing UNIDO projects in the region. One of these projects is a Regional GEF-5 Initial Technical Assistance for the Regional Demonstration Project for Coordinated Management of ODS and POPs Disposal in the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Armenia (Under Preparation) that is understood to potentially involve

development of POPs management capability in Belarus, specifically at the mentioned Chechersk facility. The second project is the Russian Federation GEF-5 Environmentally Sound Management and Disposal of PCBs for the Russian Railway and other PCB Owners (Implementing). The specific objective of this coordination would be to ensure there is no duplication of GEF funding activities, something that has already been considered in the project design and also leave the option open for the utilization of regional capability by this project which might be developed under these projects and assuming they offer competitive commercial treatment and destruction services.

A final GEF project where coordination would be pursued is the UNEP/UNITAR Global GEF-5 on The Implementation of PRTRs as a Tool for POPs Reporting which would link to a national activity in Component 3 that builds on the national POPs reporting system and its extension to chemicals related pollutants generally.

Finally, an important coordination relationship is already in place with the parallel EU regional obsolete pesticide project being implemented in the CIS and administered by FAO. The component of this EU project in Belarus in the amount of EUR 567,731 provides TA related to inventory management, safeguarding as well as limited disposal resources for current and potential future OPs management. This project will run in parallel with coordination through the Waste Management Department of MNREP and common national experts.

*6. Consistency with National Priorities.* Is the project consistent with the National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? (yes  /no  ). If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.

The project is consistent with and specifically linked to the National Program on the Implementation of the SC and its continuation for the next program period (2015-2019). Likewise it is consistent with the action plan in the original NIP adopted and submitted in 2007 following up on the country's accession to the SC in 2004. The current project includes a specific Outcome covering the preparation and submission of an update NIP to make Belarus fully compliant with its SC obligations. Going beyond this, the project has a specific focus in Component 3 to broaden the country's established programmatic approach to implementation of environmental policy to a more general sound chemicals management agenda.

*7. Knowledge Management.* Outline the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

Section 5 above elaborates the linkages with a range of other similar projects that will be mutually supportive in terms of knowledge sharing and transfer which will also be tied into the extensive network of knowledge management initiatives operational both in the region and globally. This will include active participation into the activities of various organizations, groups and networks who provide forum for knowledge sharing, transfer and dissemination. These include the International HCH and Pesticides Association (IHPA) that provides an extensive forum for knowledge and awareness exchanges, particularly in this region as well as a number of active international NGOs supporting particularly obsolete pesticide initiatives. Likewise, SC Convention based mechanisms like the PCB Elimination Network (PEN) and participation in collective information events such as Webinars organized by the Basel Convention Secretariat provided will be utilized as knowledge management tools both for following and learning from activities elsewhere, and to disseminate national experience as it evolves. Within the project itself, Outcome 3.5 is intended to serve both a public/stakeholder awareness and knowledge management purposes.


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT<sup>8</sup> OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter](#)(s) with this template. For SGP, use this [SGP OFP endorsement letter](#)).

| NAME            | POSITION   | MINISTRY  | DATE (MM/dd/yyyy) |
|-----------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Ms. Iya Malkina | First Deputy Minister,<br>GEF Political and<br>Operational Focal Point | Ministry of Natural Resources<br>and Environmental Protection<br>of Belarus | 20/12/2014        |

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

|   |
|---|
| <b>This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>9</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for project identification and preparation under GEF-6.</b> |
|---|

| Agency Coordinator,<br>Agency name                    | Signature   | Date<br>(MM/dd/yyyy) | Project Contact<br>Person                           | Telephone             | Email                      |
|---|---|----------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| Adriana Dinu,<br>UNDP-GEF<br>Executive<br>Coordinator |  | 12/30/2014           | Jacques Van<br>Engel,<br>Director,<br>MPU-Chemicals | 00-1-212-<br>906-5782 | jacques.van.engel@undp.org |

**C. ADDITIONAL GEF PROJECT AGENCY CERTIFICATION (APPLICABLE ONLY TO NEWLY ACCREDITED GEF PROJECT AGENCIES)**

For newly accredited GEF Project Agencies, please download and fill up the required [GEF Project Agency Certification of Ceiling Information Template](#) to be attached as an annex to the PIF.

<sup>8</sup> For regional and/or global projects in which participating countries are identified, OFP endorsement letters from these countries are required even though there may not be a STAR allocation associated with the project.

<sup>9</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF