



GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Environmentally Sound Management of Products and Wastes Containing POPs and Risks Associated with their Final Disposal			
Country(ies):	Honduras	GEF Project ID: ¹	9079
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	5615
Other Executing Partner(s):	The Ministry of Energy, Natural Resources, the Environment and Mines (MIAMBIENTE, formerly SERNA)	Submission Date:	2016-12-02
GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Wastes	Project Duration (Months)	60
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	[if applicable]	Agency Fee (\$)	328,700

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES²

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
(select) CW-2 Program 3 (select)	Reduction and elimination of POPs	GEFTF	3,460,000	26,600,325
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
(select) (select) (select)		(select)		
Total project costs			3,460,000	26,600,325

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To minimize global impacts and risk to environment and to human health in Honduras, enhancing Environmentally Sound Management of POPs (both, original and new), by implementing PPPs, enforcing regulations and introducing institutional models to control new-POPs pesticides, PBDEs and PCBs disposal, unsound solid waste management and unsound management of Health Care Waste (HCW						
Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type ³	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1: Develop institutional capacities and strengthen the regulatory and policy framework to address emerging POPs issues	TA	A) Key public and private institutions and entities to implement and enforce the regulatory and policy framework for the	A1) Institutional, financial and capacity building plans developed and implemented for government and private	GEFTF	798,000	1,415,291

¹ Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.

² When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF](#) and [CBIT programming directions](#).

³ Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		<p>Sound Management of Chemicals and Wastes, including newly listed POPs, trained</p> <p>B) Regulations for ESM of chemicals developed and updated as required and infrastructure for their fulfillment strengthened</p>	<p>entities to enable them to address issues related to newly listed POPs and PPPs for their management and disposal established</p> <p>A2) Capacity of Chemicals National Management Committee (NMC) on SMC enhanced and emerging POPs issues taken up in the national agenda</p> <p>B1) Analytical capacity of CESSCO to monitor SMC/POPs regulations strengthened</p> <p>B2) Regulations on ESM of chemicals and products containing chemicals (PCBs, PBDEs in vehicles, POPs contaminated sites/soils, Extended Producer Responsibility, etc.) updated and implemented</p> <p>B3) PRTR developed and implemented.</p> <p>B4) Standards on allowable emissions from waste co-processing in cement kilns developed</p>			
2: Management and disposal in an environmentally sound manner, of POPs pesticides, PCBs and newly listed POPs	Inv	<p>C) Technical Knowledge on POPs for support of their management developed</p> <p>D) POPs containing materials stockpile eliminated by innovative approaches</p>	<p>C1) In depth inventory of "old" and "new" POPs completed, building upon the NIP update</p> <p>C2) Management manuals for "new" POPs (Pesticides, PFOS and PBDEs) developed</p> <p>D1) Pilot project for sound disposal of vehicle foams (PBDEs containing) using LCA approach agreements with importers/retailers implemented</p>	GEFTF	844,000	6,456,404

			<p>D2) Pilot Project for POPs pesticides management and stockpile elimination at a certified facility</p> <p>D3) Pilot project on PPP for ESM of PCB decontamination and disposal with nationally based handling and disposal entities</p>			
3: Reduction of UPOPs releases from priority sources	Inv	E) Reduction of UPOPs emissions and elimination of POPs in collaborative schemes	<p>E1) Pilot project on ESM hazardous waste co-processing in a cement kiln implemented by officializing partnerships between waste producers/holders and cement kilns.</p> <p>E2) Pilot project of BAT/BEP treatment of healthcare waste implemented</p> <p>E3) BAT/BEP approaches for municipal waste management in 5 communities implemented</p> <p>E4) Technical guidelines for: co-processing of waste in cement kilns, of BAT/BEP for Healthcare waste treatment; and BAT/BEP for Municipal Waste management issued</p>	GEFTF	1,320,000	16,903,365
4: Awareness raising, capture lessons-learned, disseminated experiences, monitor project progress and provide adaptive feedback and evaluation	TA	F) Education and awareness on risks of “new” and “old” POPs, and ways in which to minimize their releases raised in private entities, students and communities as well as the larger public implemented	<p>F1) SMC aspects incorporated into school curricula and Teachers trained on it</p> <p>F2) Strategy for incorporation of SMC in College/University programs implemented</p> <p>F3) Awareness raised on: risks related to new POPs and municipal waste management at</p>	GEFTF	325,000	1,185,265

		G) Project results monitored and sustained, adaptive feedback and evaluation undertaken and results replicated	community level; and for the development of PPPs for hazardous waste management and disposal G1) M&E and adaptive management applied in response to needs G2) Results, lessons-learned and best practices captured in knowledge management products and disseminated at national and international level			
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
Subtotal						3,287,000 25,960,325
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⁴ – including Direct Project Costs of up to 40,972 US\$				GEFTF	173,000	640,000
Total project costs						3,460,000 26,600,325

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	MiAmbiente, Ministry of Education, Municipalities	In-kind	4,230,201
Recipient Government	MiAmbiente, Ministry of Education, Municipalities	Grants	3,930,671
Private Sector	Argos Honduras, S.A de C.V., Cementos del Norte, S.A, Recyclers Association	In-kind	12,702,033
Private Sector	Argos Honduras, S.A de C.V., Cementos del Norte, S.A, Recyclers Association	Grants	5,737,420
(select)		(select)	
(select)	(More detailed description of co-finance can be found in UNDP ProDoc table 6 in paragraph 82.	(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
Total Co-financing			26,600,325

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

⁴ 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.

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee ^{a)} (b) ²	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEF TF	Honduras	Chemicals and Wastes	POPS	3,460,000	328,700	3,788,700
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
(select)	(select)		(select)	(select as applicable)			0
Total Grant Resources					3,460,000	328,700	3,788,700

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS⁵

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
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 _{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	metric tons
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	<i>102 metric tons</i>
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	<i>metric tons</i>
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	<i>ODP tons</i>
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	<i>Number of Countries:</i>

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Fund) in Annex D.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF⁶

⁵ Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. 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.

⁶ For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF, no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 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, GEF focal area⁷ strategies, 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, CBIT and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

No changes have been made to the overall framework. Minor restructuring in the Project Framework, but no substantial changes have been made. Co-finance is substantially higher than what was anticipated at the PIF stage. Direct Project Cost of 40,972 US\$ has been included in the CEO endorsement request, and the LOA signed by the Government of Honduras has been included in annex 11 of the UNDP ProDoc.

A.2. *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

N/A

A.3. *Stakeholders*. Elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement, particularly with regard to [civil society organizations](#) and [indigenous peoples](#), is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project.

An extensive list of Partners and stakeholder can be found in the UNDP ProDoc in paragraph 51, table 1 for Partnerships and Table 2 for Stakeholder engagement. Table 2 also includes a description about the role CSOs will play during project implementation. Indigenous people will not play a special role in the implementation of the project, but will, as the rest of the population in Honduras, benefit from improved Chemicals and Waste Management, which will lead to reduced emission of POPs and UPOPs in Honduras.

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment*. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men.

In daily life, men, women and children are exposed to different kinds of chemicals in varying concentrations. Biological factors - notably size and physiological differences between women and men and between adults and children - influence susceptibility to health damage from exposure to toxic chemicals.

Social factors, primarily gender-determined occupational roles, also have an impact on the level and frequency of exposure to toxic chemicals, the kinds of chemicals encountered, and the resulting impacts on human health. Scaling-up of the improved management of domestic waste, resulting in reductions of household incineration, will have differentiated benefits for woman, who are principally responsible for decisions related to waste management and also those mostly directly exposed to UPOPs emissions when wastes are burned in backyards.

Government partners Institutions have a weak structure for gender mainstreaming, particularly at municipal level, where their staff lack capacities for a comprehensive approach to this subject.

Waste pickers: An estimated 80 people in the 5 communities make a living out of waste separation, driving around and separating wastes from household, business or industry garbage before they are collected by the formal collection services, and some 30 people work in the waste dumps as waste pickers. Although no hard data exists, it is recognized that an important percentage of these informal waste pickers are women.

The Project will during the first year of implementation prepare a more detailed Gender strategy for the implementation and Monitoring of the results.

A.5 *Risk*. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

⁷ For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

The risk identified during the PIF stage has not changed.

In the UNDP ProDoc in table 3, Project Risks, there is a description of the potential project risk (probability and impact) as well as the potential mitigation measures.

As per standard UNDP requirements, these risks will be monitored quarterly by the Project Manager. The Project Manager will report on the status of the risks to the UNDP Country Office who will record progress in the UNDP ATLAS risk log. Risks will be reported as critical when the impact and probability are high (i.e. 5). Management responses to critical risks will also be reported to the GEF in the annual PIR.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The Governance and Management Arrangements are described in Paragraphs 72-77 in the UNDP ProDoc.

As described in the PIF, the project will coordinate close with the below described initiatives as well as with all other UNDP GEF implemented initiatives in the Chemicals and Waste Focal area in Latin America

- The GEF/UNDP Project “Environmental Sound Management of Mercury and Mercury Containing Products and their Wastes in Artisanal Small-scale Gold Mining and Healthcare”, meanwhile, aims to protect human health and the environment from Mercury releases originating from the intentional use of Mercury in artisanal small-scale gold mining (ASGM), as well as the unsound management and disposal of Mercury containing products from the healthcare sector. Implementation period: 2015-2018. GEF Funding: US\$ 1,300,000.
- The NIP is currently being updated, along with associated strategy documents, through the GEF/UNIDO project “Enabling activities to review and update the national implementation plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs)”, in order to take into account evolving POPs conditions in Honduras as well as to ensure the inclusion of new POPs in the country's NIP. Implementation period: 2013-2016. GEF Funding: US\$ 189,000.
- The UNDP-UNEP Partnership for SMC Mainstreaming has supported the country to approve the National Policy for Sound Management of Chemicals Products in collaboration with National Commission for the Chemicals Products Management and under coordination with local stakeholders, such as public and private sector actors, Academia, NGOs and CSOs. The project allowed the use of integrated instruments to facilitate the institutional planning for the management of chemical products at national and local level, such as the elaboration of a national plan to mainstream the SMC. Implementation period: 2011-2013. Funding: US\$ 250,000.
- The GEF/UNIDO Project "Strengthening of National Initiatives and Enhancement of Regional Cooperation for the Environmentally Sound Management of POPs in Waste of Electronic or Electrical Equipment (WEEE) in Latin-American Countries" aims to contribute in achieving environmentally sound management and disposal of WEEE with special focus on POPs management at the national and regional level. Implementation period: 2016-2020; GEF Funding: US\$ 9,500,000 (all participating countries). .

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 Benefits. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

Adequate Hazardous Waste Management in Honduras is a necessary condition for the wellbeing of its people in general, but especially for those whose daily activities require being exposed to these substances. This includes recyclers at waste dumps, agricultural workers, and people working in cement and recycling industries. Decreased exposure will result in economic benefits for public health systems; will reduce health care costs, workdays lost, and human suffering.

Furthermore, the lack of adequate management presents a biological risk from water or soil pollution that can damage biodiversity resources and ecosystems of global importance.

The overall socioeconomic benefit of the project is derived from the decreasing of POPs releases from and the environmental destruction of PCBs, PBDEs and POPs pesticide stockpiles that are having significant negative impacts on biological resources, inclusive of human health. The associated risk reduction at both a local and national level will positively impact the productivity of populations and reduce the financial burden imposed by potentially degraded public health, as well as contributing to general wellness, economic development and quality of life. This is particularly true for vulnerable parts of the population and for maternal health that would be improved by reduced POPs exposure.

More specific socioeconomic benefits from the project are associated with its proactive approach to integrating the industrial (cement) and recycling/waste management sector into an environmentally sound chemicals management in POPs and chemicals waste processing. The informal sector generally involves low income sectors of the population who currently undertake the polluting informal picking of waste, essentially in their own environments with the significant health effects on all ages and genders in close proximity. The transition of collection and primary processing activities of Municipal Solid Waste to appropriately sited and equipped locations supported by collective environmentally sound infrastructure and operating with appropriate workplace standards will positively change this situation, as well as better assuring an equitable distribution of revenues for labour provided.

With the advance in development of new PPPs, since they are in general labour intensive, the projection of the facilities that will be needed will generate 200 to 500 direct jobs, including all the product and waste chain

A.8 Knowledge Management. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

The project component # 4 is the knowledge management component of the project. It aims at raising the awareness, share lessons learned, disseminate experiences, monitor project progress and provide adaptive feedback and evaluation.

Project outputs 4.1.1, 4.1.2. and 4.1.3 are closely linked to awareness raising of different part of the population, and has a strong link to public education and how the concept of Sound Management of Chemicals to be integrated into the curricula of the school system in Honduras, at different levels.

The Chemicals and Waste Team in UNDP-GEF in Latin America organizes every year a workshop for all UNDP-GEF funded Chemicals and Waste project a workshop for Project Coordinators and Government Officers. The aim is to share experiences and lessons learned, and see what solutions can be brought to other parts of the world. This has been a very effective way to create an informal network among all the CW projects in the region.

For this specific project, it is expected that it can learn a lot from the recently CEO endorsed UPOPs project for Colombia.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 Consistency with National Priorities. Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

This project is fully aligned with the results and action plan of the NIP update (and previously the NIP) for Honduras that was completed in 2015. The development of the PIF was a direct effect of the results obtained during the NIP update process.

Honduras has signed and ratified the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and is in full compliance with all the reporting obligations under the Convention.


C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

Kindly refer to the UNDP ProDoc paragraphs 60-71.

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies⁸ and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator , UNDP-GEF		12/02/2016	Jacques Van Engel, Director, MPU/Chemicals	1-212-906-5782	jacques.van.engel@undp.org

⁸ GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Kindly refer to the UNDP ProDoc part V, table 4, Project results Framework

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Kindly refer to the UNDP ProDoc Annex 13. All comments have been addressed.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁹

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$110,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Definition of needs and strategies for Institutional Strengthening	15,000	15,000	0
Definition of needs and strategies for improvements to regulatory and policy framework including enforcement in relation to POPs (new and old) and UPOPs	20,000	15,000	5,000
Preparation of Pilot projects	25,000	25,000	0
Development of M&E schemes	10,000	5,000	5,000
Stakeholder consultations	15,000	10,000	5,000
Project Scoping and Definition	25,000	20,000	5,000
Total	110,000	90,000	20,000

⁹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A